

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO COPY

In presenting this paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this paper for scholarly purposes may be granted by my major professor, or, in his absence, by the Director of Libraries. It is understood that any copying or publication of this paper for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature John Stephen Chesarek
Date March 17, 1976

STATUS AND PROSPECTS
FOR BILINGUAL INDIAN EDUCATION IN MONTANA
by
JOHN STEPHEN CHESAREK

A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of
MASTER OF EDUCATION
with concentration in
Elementary Education

Approved:

Elmora A. Old Coyote
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

David D. Sullivan
Head, Major Department

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

March, 1976

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much of the background for this paper derives from classwork and discussion with several outstanding scholars of linguistics and related fields, including Kenneth Pike and the late Sarah Gudschinsky of S. I. L., Vera John-Steiner and Barnard Spolsky of the University of New Mexico and particularly G. H. Matthews, formerly of M. I. T. and Raymond Gordon of S. I. L, whose studies of the Crow language and training of the bilingual staff members at Crow Agency and Wyola has so benefitted those projects.

The heart of bilingual education is the local project staff and I have been fortunate to have had so many fine colleagues in the two projects for which I have worked--particularly Dale Old Horn, George Reed, Euna He Does It, Lawrence Big Hair, William Stops, Joy Toineeta and Robert Howe, who have all made important contributions to the Crow projects and John Dracon, a courageous administrator who helped organize the three Montana projects. I am appreciative also of fruitful contact with the Cree project at Rocky Boy through Bert Corcoran, Sam Windy Boy and Bob Murie and the Northern Cheyenne project through Dan Alford and Ted Rising Sun

during the formative years. We have also benefitted greatly from the exchange of ideas and visits with Wayne and Agnes Holm and the Navajo staff at Rock Point, Arizona.

This paper could not have been possible nor the progress of bilingual education on the Crow Reservation without the help of my friend, teacher, and colleague, Dr. Elnora Old Coyote. I also wish to acknowledge the strong support in all my academic endeavors at Montana State University by Dr. Harry Hausser, Dr. Hari Dam, and Dr. P. D. Skaar. My life and learning were vastly enriched there also by the late Dr. Gordon Simpson.

I am indebted to Jean Wright for assistance in the typing of this paper. Finally I am indebted to my wife Rose for her strong support and involvement in my efforts in the field of bilingual education and for her patience and encouragement during the hectic days of preparation of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
VITA	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I - THE BACKGROUND OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION MOVEMENT	5
THE BILINGUAL CHILD--PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EDUCATIONAL CONCERNS	5
THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION MOVEMENT-- SOCIAL FORCES	13
CHAPTER II - MODELS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION .	18
CHAPTER III - THE EMERGING FEDERAL POLICY ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION	30
CHAPTER IV - SPECIAL CONCERNS IN INDIAN BILINGUAL EDUCATION	38
CHAPTER V - BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN MONTANA .	49
THE PRESENT MONTANA PROGRAMS	49
CHAPTER VI - SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	65
REFERENCES	71

ABSTRACT

The bilingual education movement in the United States derives from educational considerations of intellectual development, linguistic interference, mother tongue literacy, compensatory education, and self-image, and from social forces including the war on poverty, civil rights issues, minority group pride, and linguistic pluralism as a value.

Models of bilingual education either as a transition to English or to maintain fluency in both languages derive focus from current studies in child development, linguistics and new related disciplines and special research on bilingual children and may be expressed in various instructional patterns.

Federal policy strongly favors bilingual education, although there are special difficulties for Indian language programs.

The history and status of existing bilingual programs for three Montana Indian groups indicate the type of efforts which will be required for successful program implementation. Present state policies in Montana have some potential for support, but structures are currently inadequate to maintain present programs or extend to meet the state's actual needs. Recommendations indicate potential national, state, and local options to support bilingual education for Montana groups.

INTRODUCTION

The recent emergence of bilingual demonstration projects on three Montana Indian reservations (Crow, Rocky Boy Cree, and Northern Cheyenne) signals the state's involvement in one of the most far-reaching educational reforms to be attempted in this country. Review of the status of these programs in terms of meeting the short-range educational goals set for themselves, predictable success in meeting long-range goals or replication of pilot demonstrations at other sites with similar needs appears, at best, uncertain. One major reason for this uncertainty is the very limited awareness within the state of the background and rationale of the bilingual education movement in the United States, the particular needs of the state in terms of populations which might benefit from the bilingual approach, the actual needs of bilingual programs to attain success in a given situation and the types of policies to be articulated and decisions to be made at both state and local levels regarding bilingual education.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive (though certainly not exhaustive) review of the psychological, social and political viewpoints that inform the bilingual education movement, the variety of educational

approaches it has prompted, and the federal policies and programmatic opportunities and limitations which presently exist. There is also a review of the special characteristics of Indian language programs, a discussion of existing bilingual programs in the state and of related state activity which supports bilingual education. Finally there is an attempt to indicate the necessary processes in terms of needs assessment, public awareness, policy decision and program support which appear to be necessary if the bilingual approach is to be successfully introduced and maintained for any non-English speaking minority group in the state.

The limitations of this paper are numerous. There is no presently available study which addresses itself to the needs of the state in bilingual education, indeed, as the study indicates, virtually no organized effort at the state level to deal with the issue of bilingual education. The theoretical literature which is germane to bilingual education is multidisciplinary in nature and widely scattered in journals and monographs which are not readily available in the state. The empirical evidence which would permit any sort of confirmation of the success of any particular application of a bilingual program is even more

inaccessible. Although the projects funded under Title VII have stringent guidelines for educational accountability, there has been no method for systematic codification or evaluation of educational results--only an unprocessed mass of local reports collected under very dissimilar circumstances. Finally, the author writes as an active participant in on-going projects in Montana for the last six years. There has been no opportunity for the systematic research and reflection a study of this sort properly demands. The paper was developed in the field in a few days without the aid and comfort of institutional library facilities. Finally the paper has particular emphasis on Indian bilingual education due to an apparent (but not carefully assessed) indication that Indian language groups are the only sufficiently concentrated population groups in the state to occasion programmatic efforts in bilingual education.

Nevertheless, despite the above limitations and topical delimitations, the educational issues involved in bilingual education are of tremendous import and the policy decisions which face state and local educational agencies are of pressing immediacy. In this light the paper will have served its purpose if it provides a starting point for

understanding of the issues and if it provokes further discussion of the policy decisions or more sophisticated inquiry into the educational problems which activity in the field of bilingual education poses for the State of Montana.

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION MOVEMENT

THE BILINGUAL CHILD--

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EDUCATIONAL CONCERNS

The bilingual child may be defined as any child who is capable of carrying on oral communication in more than one language. The level of his skills (his fluency) may vary tremendously, or be quite high or low in both languages. The need for him to communicate in either language may also be quite different in terms of contact time or social situation. It is this issue of communication need which gives rise to the question of bilingual education, since education in any society may be viewed as the process of providing experiences for the child which that society feels will prepare him to its (perceived) future needs.

Thus the child of the family stationed overseas has become bilingual when he engages in his first halting conversation in a foreign tongue with street playmates, and ceases to be bilingual when he moves home and the words and syntax fade. The immigrant child becomes bilingual as he gains purchase of the new community language and, perhaps, ceases to be bilingual as he grows older and his family renounces its native tongue or discourages his use

of it. These are psychological processes which take place when an individual moves in and out of certain social situations. The experience may be either pleasant or unpleasant, but the results are highly predictable and usually occur rather quickly in the instances above. It is only when the social conditions themselves, not just the experience of a single child or family, involve prolonged contact of two languages that bilingual education becomes an issue. In other words, it is only when the child must make his way between two more or less permanent groups in contact with each other and using different languages that the groups begin to consider the experiences (the education) which will best suit the needs of that child and other similar children in a special way with regard to language experiences.

One of the long standing debates regarding bilingualism is whether ^① it was generally beneficial to the child during his developmental years. A review of research during the 1950's indicates several studies found lower I. Q. scores for bilinguals than for monolinguals, leading to the notion that it would be harmful to rear a child as a bilingual. (1) The study further notes, however, that several more recent studies involving non-verbal intelligence showed no dif-

ference between bilinguals and monolinguals, indicating that the earlier scores were primarily language based tests which discriminated against bilingual subjects who were not yet proficient in the language of the test.

One recent study which has been a cornerstone of pro-bilingual education argument indicated that under favorable socio-economic conditions, bilingual students had superior verbal and non-verbal intelligence scores.(2) The bilingual students in this instance demonstrated greater mental flexibility and superior concept formation in addition to their ability to speak a second language. This experiment, however, was carried out in an educational context designed to produce French-speaking bilingual students in Montreal and may have been based on different factors than those which occur when a child must learn the dominant (or national) language in order to fully participate in the educational system of that country.

A second concern regarding bilingualism is the issue of interference. Each language has a special set of structures which are usually described on three levels by linguists. Phonology studies the sound patterns and characteristics of a language. Grammar studies the organizational characteristics and can be conveniently

divided into morphology (the structure of words) and syntax (the higher order organization of word patterns such as sentences or discourse). Semantics studies the meaning aspect of language as opposed to the more abstract and systematic concerns of the first two areas. The problem of interference arises when the code of one language interferes (impedes communication) with the code of the other language at any of these three levels. The most extended study of the problem of interference argues that "the greater the difference between the systems, i.e., the more numerous the mutually exclusive forms and patterns in each, the greater is the learning problem and the potential area of interference." (3) There are definite implications for when a child might best learn a second language, since the theory of interference would indicate that bilingual children would take a longer time to master either language if both were present from infancy, and that there would be frequent confusion of the languages on every level. The first pattern has generally been confirmed; however the second is in some question, since more recent studies of early language acquisition in very different languages do not always reveal the extent of interference that the research based on Indo-European pairs

of languages seemed to exhibit.

The question of interference has a practical concern for parents who are making a planned choice of when to introduce their child to a second language. It also has a pragmatic bearing on the specific instructional problems and techniques utilized in presenting a second language to children. The area of applied linguistics known as contrastive analysis seeks to compare the patterns of two languages so that areas of potential interference (such as different sounds, lack of similar gender marking in pronouns, different order of subject, verb, and object) can be identified. (4) From such differences, predictions of these areas which might be potential learning roadblocks can be assessed and specific instructional routines to address the problems can be planned.

A third debate which has taken on immense importance in the area of bilingual education has to do with the nature of the reading process. Theorists who see a critical relationship between oral language and reading success have argued for many years about the advantages of learning to read in the mother tongue. The many theoretical arguments advanced by language scholars and literacy workers gave rise to an important position paper by the education branch

of the United Nations regarding the advantages of teaching reading in the child's own language.(5) During the following decade there was a gradual accumulation of empirical evidence supporting the position, including important studies in the Philippines, (6) South America, (7), and Mexico (8) which indicated higher success for those minority language children who learned to read in their own language, then transferred the skill to the national language. Each of these studies furthermore involved previously unwritten minority languages with only minimal instructional materials available.

It is interesting to note that the last study was carried out in Mexico by an American researcher who could not find a suitable instance of the instructional practice in our country which could be evaluated at that time.

A fourth educational debate also occurred in the 1960's which had profound effects on bilingual education in this country. This was the compensatory education movement. Based on the argument that most intellectual development takes place during the first five years, there was a push for early childhood school programs, such as Head Start, which would intervene at an early age in areas where the conditions of low income and other socio-

economic patterns might be linked to poor school achievement in older children. (9) Since most of the bilingual population lived in program areas and since most staffing was derived from local areas, there was an immediate involvement of the bilingual communities in the issues of proper language instruction. (10)

A related concern which was articulated during the period of emerging compensatory programs was the relationship between self-esteem and language proficiency. There are numerous statements concerning the importance of a child's affective experience in terms of his ability to learn. One such statement notes the following: (11)

A number of problems are related to how you learn a second language. One is how you feel about yourself as a speaker of your first language. If you have had negative experiences speaking your first language then you become a non-speaker or someone who speaks very very infrequently; the spontaneous and free rehearsal of either your native language or your second language is self-inhibited, not even other inhibited. The one thing we know about children who use their own language in situations where they do not feel they are being observed, or being judged, the more language they acquire.

Language development really is not that different from what we know about other areas of development; that is, self-rehearsal and working through something new on your own

is important for language too even though the true purpose of it will eventually be to communicate.... If you feel uncomfortable because someone has made fun of your language and you have also been in some way strongly oriented to being a passive listener (for example you have limitless television, but limited opportunity to relate verbally with a variety of adults with whom you have a strong emotional bond) then there may be a lessening of this spontaneous rehearsal of language even in situations of solitary play. Spontaneous rehearsal is a substantial source of continuous growth.

THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION MOVEMENT--

SOCIAL FORCES

The various psychological and educational issues noted above were all significant factors in providing a rationale for a movement toward bilingual education in the mid 1960's. However the movement itself may be viewed best in terms of social and political forces operating in the country at that time.

First, there was the complex set of events sometimes referred to as the Civil Rights movement. Introduced in 1954 with the historic decision of the U. S. Supreme Court *Brown vs. Board of Education* and extending through the sixties, there was a period of court decisions and legislation which affirmed the rights of the individuals to equal opportunities, due process of the law and of greater participation of minority groups in the democratic process. The specific activities under the area of civil rights which have become incorporated into federal policy are discussed in a later section. Several other ideas and movements also have played an important role in forming the context of the bilingual education movement. These are discussed briefly below:

(1) The War on Poverty - during the Kennedy and Johnson administration, there was a massive effort through civil rights action and domestic program implementation to directly reduce or eliminate the many social impediments to full participation in American society. These programs extended early childhood education, legal aid, low cost housing, vocational training and a host of other special purpose programs to low-income areas of the country. Furthermore, many of the programs were specifically designed to involve parent boards in the decision making process and to identify and train local minority-group leadership to operate. The new programs opened a range of federal subsidy to communities and local education agencies that had previously included only select areas, such as sciences.

Although many of these programs were curtailed with the change to a more conservative administration and the costly involvement of the Vietnam war, the Nixon administration provided further significant action in terms of particular programs and policies which have a bearing on the

topic of this paper, including an increased emphasis on special program concern for the bilingual child and a major series of policies regarding American Indians, including a move away from the long standing federal policy favoring termination of the reservation system. Perhaps the most significant Indian related legislation in decades, the "Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act" was passed into law. (12)

- (2) There was a growing movement among many minority groups to emphasize pride and group awareness. This was a period which saw high interest in ethnic studies programs on the campus, a massive production of historical research and publication about various ethnic groups and a number of social indicators, such as music and dress which indicated a search for group pride and identification and a serious questioning of the ideals of acculturation or assimilation to the dominant American lifestyle. This concern had a direct manifestation on educational programs ranging from the alternative freedom school of some more militant minority groups to the emphasis on affective

objectives or new additions such as values clarification to standard school curricula over the country.

- (3) Closely related to the growing concern for self pride among various minority groups (one might include the non-minority feminist movement) was a growing attitude in the country favoring cultural pluralism. Many of the very books or fashions which were products of minority group self-awareness became popular far outside that circle. It was as though there had been a sudden realization that America was not a melting pot after all, but perhaps much more like a great bowl of salad. Leaders in the bilingual education movement, such as Bruce Gaarder of the U. S. Office of Education stressed the positive aspects of bilingual education as well as the need to overcome educational handicaps in stating, "Our people's native competence in other languages and cultural heritage each language transmits are a national resource that we badly need and must conserve by every reasonable means." (13) Several scholars, notably Joshua Fishman, have documented

the patterns of language maintenance throughout the world and commented on the social role of cultural and linguistic pluralism. (14)

CHAPTER II

MODELS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Generally speaking there are two major models of bilingual education, although one author identifies models of informal permissiveness in using the minority language and the supplemental use of the minority languages as at least positive additional steps toward the two major models. (15) The first is the transitional or bridge model. It involves instruction in content skills including literacy in the child's mother tongue along with second language instruction until the second language is well enough established to permit full instruction. This is the minimum acceptable model under ESEA Title VII regulations and is also entirely sufficient to its purpose. It usually involves program activity focus on the first one to five years of elementary school, since efforts to deal with older bilingual children who have had poor experience with initial English language programs are usually viewed as remedial. The essential characteristic of the transitional model is that the native language of the child is not necessarily valued for its own sake, but recognized as a useful tool toward a longer range goal of success in later school experiences which will be conducted in the national language.

The second model is the language maintenance model. Here the long term goal is different, since there is a plan to continue instruction and increase abilities in the first language even when relative fluency in the second language has been attained. There is a long tradition of this approach where both languages are major world languages with an existing body of literature or widespread use. (Although many people have observed that the English speaking countries, particularly the United States, have placed much less emphasis on the value of fluency in more than one language by adults.) This is, in fact, a goal of most foreign language instruction and is a logical extension to large groups of students in situations where two languages already exist. The language maintenance model, however, raises interesting problems for groups whose literacy is not presently established or whose literature is not extensive in all fields. There are, besides the policy decisions regarding educational advantages or disadvantages, a number of additional concerns, such as economics. For example, it is an economic question whether a government can heavily subsidize the necessary costs for extensive materials development by a small group of speakers of a newly written language if the group itself

does not have sufficient resources. In this country, there are over 100,000 speakers of Navajo, but only 5000 Crows (most of whom speak their own language), and some Pueblo groups who have high language retention but only a few hundred speakers. In certain countries such as the Philippines or Indonesia there are literally hundreds of different language groups.

One of the interesting considerations in looking at such policy decisions is that history instructs us there are no real predictable guidelines to judge the feasibility of a particular language changing its status or influence. Bernard Spolsky noted the re-emergence of Hebrew as a modern spoken tongue after nearly two thousand years of only literary use. (16) This has been accomplished in less than fifty years. The language used as the major language of more people than anyone else in the world, Mandarin Chinese, is virtually unknown in other portions of the world. Who could have predicted the cultural impact of tiny groups like the Greeks of Athens or the Hebrews on world culture? One little known instance of a highly successful experiment in literacy occurred among the Cherokee Indians of this country. According to a study cited in one major discussion of language policy

in this country, the Cherokee, using the syllabary invented by the illiterate Seyquoiah, had attained 90% literacy in their native tongue.(17) In Oklahoma, through the use of bilingual materials, they also achieved a higher literacy rate in English than the white population of either Texas or Arkansas. The experiment came to an abrupt end with forced relocation and the destruction of the Cherokee printing press, so that today 40% of the adult Cherokees are illiterate.

It is difficult to estimate the actual cost of production of an adequate amount of materials. Sarah Gudschinsky related an incident which occurred during her work with a group in Mexico.(18) She had asked for printing of a few hundred copies of an experimental reader. The left-wing political leader of the country ordered a million copies in a fancy edition. Before they could be used, a right-wing government came into power, impounded the materials and destroyed most of them. A few years later, a new, more liberal regime took control, identified the materials with the previous group in power, and destroyed most of the remaining copies. At this point, although several years had intervened, Miss Gudschinsky reported she was able to obtain the remaining copies,

now reduced to about the number she had originally wanted, and to actually use the materials in the field.

The decision to pursue a maintenance model may involve other factors beyond merely economic issues or local interest. One interesting area of research involves the practicality of carrying out certain technical areas of instruction such as mathematics or science in a previously unwritten language. For example, one study considers whether the proper linguistic and other factors exist in an African language to be used in teaching modern mathematics. (19) In many cases the practical problem arises of developing a level of sophistication in a particular subject by a bilingual who is then willing to translate the concept back into his own language.

In any case, the question of language maintenance vs. the transition model is more of a political decision than an educational one, but it is a decision which has considerable impact on the actual work activities and goals of those who work in bilingual education. It should be carefully considered in each particular situation.

Once the basic question of goal is resolved (or postponed as in many cases), there are a number of remaining choices regarding the actual type of program

which is designed. These choices involve both judgements about how children learn and how a skill or subject is to be taught, for as Bruner observes there is a difference between a theory of learning which investigates psychological patterns and a theory of instruction which incorporates ever changing social concerns and cultural accumulation of knowledge. (20)

Regarding basic learning abilities of children, there are several lines of inquiry which provide a backdrop for bilingual instruction. First, there are those studies which consider the basic development of learning abilities in children. Of major interest are the psychological studies of a behaviorist orientation which view learning as the accumulation of discrete bits of information and the studies of cognitive theorists who postulate learning in certain predictable stages or patterns with integrative structures characteristic of human learning. Of the latter group, there is an interesting split between the theories of the French psychologist Jean Piaget and others. (21) Piaget views intelligence as an interaction between the organism and the environment with predictable mental stages or structures of increasing power or sophistication as the mind develops. A tradition

of psychologists from Vygotsky (22) to A. Luria (23) and J. Bruner (24) shares a similar viewpoint but sees language as a much more important factor in the child's mental development than Piaget holds it to be.

Second, there is a tremendously rich development of empirical research during the past fifteen years from the new interdisciplinary fields of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. Much of the psycholinguistic research derives from attempts to explore the implications of the ideas of Noam Chomsky and his linguistic colleagues who have almost completely restructured prevailing views of what language is and how it is acquired by humans. (25) These new disciplines have produced a vigorous scholarly debate with a strong empirical base, including several studies of the detailed process of acquisition of first and second languages by children which were simply unavailable in previous years. This research and theoretical debate, in turn, has stimulated new techniques of assessing child language development within ongoing language programs as it becomes clear that many older techniques focused on an aspect of language such as vocabulary development which may have only limited relevance. There is particular emphasis on the role of syntax in

language development in recent years. Chomsky built a case for the "independence of syntax." (26) He characterized it as a peculiar set of mental operations (transformations) on some deep structure which resulted in a particular surface structure or arrangement of words. There would be a rather small set of such rules, but with a finite set of words which could be rearranged creatively, a speaker could produce an infinite number of sentences. Recent psycholinguistic work has indicated that there are definite levels of development of syntax in children and that some structures occur quite a bit later than originally supposed. (27) This has teaching implications in oral situations, where a young child or bilingual child would not understand a structure used by an adult in everyday speech. It also has implications for the teaching of reading since the complexity of a syntactic structure is not correlated with certain traditional readability formulae, (28) and may produce reading mistakes because the beginner cannot hold the sentence in short-term memory long enough to derive comprehension, (29) or otherwise affect the reading process in a measurable way such as eye-voice span (evs). (30) Finally, in addition to developmental psychology and psycholinguistic-sociolinguistic insights into child

learning, there is an interesting set of studies on cross-cultural or bilingual learning which highlights similarities or differences across groups or in a bilingual individual. These include areas such as cross-cultural concept learning, cognitive style differences between cultures, and interesting psychological processes of bilinguals. An extended and provocative example of the first type of study was conducted with an African group to discover not only which cognitive strategies that particular culture had not required the people to develop but also for which particular things experience had prepared that group. (31) An example of the cognitive style type of research in a cross-cultural setting is the classroom observation research currently being conducted by John-Steiner and her colleagues, although relevant research is also being carried on among monolingual populations in the course of investigating individual learning and special education programs. (32) The question of mental processes which have interesting manifestations can be illustrated by a study by Kohlers which explored which concepts could be taught in one language and then be accessible to testing in another. (33) In this instance, it was found that math concepts could not be re-applied readily in the non-

presentation language, although it was not investigated as to whether re-learning in the second language was a simpler process.

One basic conceptualization of the workings of the bilingual mind which has produced considerable research and is given serious consideration in some instructional models is the notion of compound vs. coordinate bilingualism first advanced by Ervin and Osgood. (34) Compound bilingualism is a situation in which some bilinguals (who presumably learn a language late) map the second language onto the first and are always engaged in a translation process. The coordinate bilingual, on the other hand, learns the languages as separate systems and utilizes a "switch" mechanism to go from one language to the other. Research at the semantic (meaning) level seems to support this latter idea. (35) Jakobovits suggests useful elaboration of this model to include a multi-dimensional consideration of both the compound-coordinate continuum and the relative dominance and overlap of the two languages. (36)

The question of whether the child will become a compound or coordinate type bilingual has direct implications for assessing the role of the languages in his

pre-school environment and the way the languages are to be utilized in the classroom. The Rock Point School in Arizona, for example, has consciously valued the coordinate type of bilingual and arranged classrooms so that a Navajo language teacher operates at one end of the room in one language exclusively and an English language teacher (who may well be a Navajo bilingual) instructs exclusively in English at the other. (37) Mackey has developed an extensive international typology of bilingual instruction models which reflect such things as language dominance and compound-coordinate concerns, the language characteristics of the community, school and nation, status of language and difference between languages. (38) A less comprehensive list of instructional models with dominance, community make-up and actual time schedule over several years characterizing most types of programs now observable in this country was described by Valencia. (39)

In general, it has been indicated that a fundamental choice, which may be more political than educational, involves whether the goal of a particular program or language group is to develop a transitional model which simply provides a bridge to the national language or a language maintenance model which calls for continuing

development in the first language even when fluency in the second has been attained. It is further indicated that there is a rich source of theory and research in cognitive development, language acquisition and other aspects of bilingual-bicultural learning which has bearing on the questions of how children learn and how instruction might be appropriately planned in the case of bilingual situations. These questions would underlie implementation decisions once the goal of a program is determined. Furthermore, the very richness of theory and research which have been brought to bear on bilingual education problems indicates that the significance of the bilingual education movement may extend beyond meeting the immediate needs of particular groups and make a fundamental contribution to our understanding of human learning and the nature of the mind.

CHAPTER III
THE EMERGING FEDERAL POLICY
ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

During the mid-1960's, the cumulative impact of successful experiments in bilingual instruction around the world and recognition of the need to overcome serious deficiencies in the achievement of bilingual children in the United States began to provide a focus for several social forces. These include civil rights, the war on poverty, minority self-pride, and the recognition of cultural and linguistic pluralism as a national resource, discussed in the first chapter. Extensive lobbying and studies culminated in public hearings which provided the basic rationale for bilingual education and in the final form of the Title VII Bilingual Education Act of 1968. The act states the following: (41)

✓ In recognition of the special educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local education agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs to meet these special needs.

Funding was authorized for programs for low income

children from three to eighteen in areas of greatest need. Uses of funds included planning, pre-service training, and establishment and operation of programs with several possible activities. The grants were competitive and ultimately involved appropriations of \$6.7 million in 1969 to \$33.2 million in 1973, as opposed to the statutory authorization of \$15 to \$135 million. A 1970 amendment extended eligibility to Indian controlled private schools and BIA schools. As with most ESEA title programs, certain services were to be extended to private non-eligible schools within a funded district. Although the funded programs had strong emphasis on accountability, the small technical staff in Washington and the lack of any systematic guidelines for evaluation resulted in only limited information about successful programs or models. For this reason, the first national evaluation did not examine student progress, but primarily compliance with guidelines. (42)

The Bilingual Education Act of 1974 clarified several aspects of bilingual education and eliminated the low income criterion. The first official definition of a program of bilingual education specified the following. (43)

A program of instruction designed for children of limited English-speaking ability in elementary or secondary schools, in which, with respect to the years of study to which such a program is applicable there is instruction given in, and study of, English and, to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the education system, the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability and such instruction given with appreciation for the cultural heritage of such children, and, with respect to elementary school instruction shall, to the extent necessary, be in all courses or subjects of study which will allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system.

The act goes on to detail other requirements involving limited voluntary participation of children whose language is English, regular class participation of target children in art, music and physical education, non-discriminatory grade placement of target children and parent, teacher, and secondary student involvement in the program application process.

The act provides for support of local programs, supplemental community activities, training programs, fellowships for bilingual teacher trainers, planning and technical assistance, including requirements for a national assessment and reports to Congress. There is additional

provision for regional centers to develop materials, provide implementation assistance and evaluate and disseminate materials. There is further provision for grants to state agencies and special assessment directives to the Secretary of the Interior regarding assessment reports on Indian bilingual education.

As in previous years, funding is not anywhere near the authorized amounts (\$85 of authorized \$135 million was appropriated for 1975). Still the new act has clarified many areas of concern and given a much more forceful indication of the intended federal policy of support for bilingual program development.

During the same period other funding sources for bilingual activity have also developed for certain classes of potential applicants. The Emergency School Aid Act, Title VII of the Education Amendments of 1972, provides for 4% of its allocated funds to be spent for bilingual programs. There is authorization under Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act ESEA, for bilingual-bicultural programs. Some bilingual activities have been funded under the Right to Read and the Ethnic Heritage Act programs. The Indian Education Act of 1972 (Title IV) has been the major source along with ESEA Title VII for

Indian programs. The Bilingual Vocational Education Act has been recently funded. Moreover several existing programs such as Title II (Library Assistance) have added priority provisions for bilingual children. The funding has, in fact, become so varied and complex that without adequate technical assistance and information clearing house provisions at the state and national level, local districts with serious needs may not be aware of the many resources for which they are eligible.

Along with enabling legislation, the major indicator of federal policy toward bilingual education has been recent court decisions and civil right actions. Based on provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin in the operation of any federally assisted program, the Office for Civil Rights issued a memorandum to all school districts with more than five per cent national origin minority group children. It stated four specific areas of potential non-compliance with Title VI involving minority children deficient in English language skills.(44)

- (1) Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national

origin-minority group children from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students.

- (2) School districts must not assign national origin-minority group students to classes for the mentally retarded on the basis of criteria which essentially measure or evaluate English language skills; nor may school districts deny national origin-minority group children access to college preparatory courses on a basis directly related to the failure of the school system to inculcate English language skills.
- (3) Any ability grouping or tracking system employed by the school system to deal with the special language skill needs of national origin-minority group children must be designed to meet such language skill needs as soon as possible and must not operate as an educational dead-end or permanent track.
- (4) School districts have the responsibility to adequately notify national origin-minority group parents of school activities which are called to the attention of other parents. Such notice in order to be adequate may have to be provided in a language other than English.

In 1974 a landmark Supreme Court decision clarified the implications of these regulations. In Lau v. Nichols it was found that failure to provide an adequate preparation

to full participation in an English language school program where a significant number of Chinese-speaking children were involved constituted a violation of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act. In the majority opinion, Justice Douglas observed the following: (45)

Basic English skills are at the core of what these public schools teach. Imposition of a requirement that, before a child can effectively participate in the educational program, he must have already acquired these basic skills is to make a mockery of public education. We know that those who do not understand English are certain to find their classroom experiences wholly incomprehensible and in no way meaningful.

The court decision did not specify an instructional remedy, although it specifically mentioned bilingual education and English-as-a-second-language (ESL) as viable approaches. The court further declined to consider the constitutional issue arguments of the case, since the civil rights legislation had been clearly violated. A rationale for the constitutional basis of the rights of non-English speaking children to equal educational opportunity along with many of the source documents and an excellent review of the general aspects of bilingual education may be found in a recent publication by the

Commission on Civil Rights, which argues the following.(46)

A public school system discriminates against non-English speaking children in violation of their right to equal protection under the 14th Amendment of the U. S. Constitution when it fails to educate them in a language they can understand....subjected to discrimination because of their minority group origins, these language minority students suffer further discrimination from "monolingual" schools (schools which conduct their instructional programs exclusively in English) which ignore, and all too frequently reflect society's prejudices against, their native languages, cultures and heritages.

In general, it may be noted that the federal government since 1968 has pursued an increasingly active and aggressive course in both insuring the rights of children of limited English-speaking ability to equal educational opportunity and in increasing the levels and types of funding to initially implement appropriate bilingual programs. The present structure of educational activity and funding indicates that the long term responsibility of bilingual education, as with all educational programs, lies with the states and local districts.

CHAPTER IV

SPECIAL CONCERNS IN INDIAN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Indian education holds a rather unique position in American education. About one third of the 150,000 Indian children whose education is supported by federal funds are in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. During the past few years, a growing number of these schools have been contracted to local Indian organizations for operation. Less than five percent of these Indians is in mission schools, which were once prominent. The remaining two thirds are in public schools on reservations. The trust status of most reservation lands prohibits property taxes which primarily operate local public schools. The government makes payments in lieu of local taxes to school, for operation under PL874 and for building under PL815, laws commonly referred to as Federal Impact Aid. The BIA also makes payments to the schools under the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 and 1936.

For many years the BIA schools, and indeed most reservation schools, operated on a policy of acculturation of Indians to the dominant white society. They reflected the prevailing national policy of termination of the reservations and assimilation of the Indians.

The recent trend discussed earlier toward self-determination and away from forced assimilation has brought significant changes in many schools. There is increased participation of Indian parents and a greater emphasis on programs emphasizing Indian heritage.

Many of these changes are the result of a period of difficult struggle. One major legal study documents the abuses of public schools in using federal funds for non-authorized activities. (47)

By every standard, Indians receive the worst education of any children in the country. They attend shabby, overcrowded public schools which lack even basic resources. They are taught by teachers untrained, unprepared, and sometimes unwilling to meet their needs. They enter school late and leave early. The percentage of Indians who drop out of school is twice that for all other children. Among the Indian population, fully two-thirds of the adults have not gone beyond elementary school, and one-quarter of Indian adults are functionally illiterate--they can't read street signs or newspapers. The educational system has failed Indians. The Federal government's obligation to support Indian education has not been fulfilled.

One reason for this failure lies in the misuse of Federal dollars intended to benefit Indian children. That is the heart of our story. Those dollars have been used for every conceivable school system need except the need that Congress had in mind. Impact Aid and Johnson-O'Malley dollars support

general operating expenses of local school districts, and thus make it possible for those districts to reduce taxes for non-Indian property owners. Special programs --which should serve Indian needs--in fact serve the total school population. Title I and Johnson-O'Malley dollars purchase systemwide services. Those dollars pay for teachers' aides who serve all the children, not just the educationally deprived Indian children. They buy fancy equipment for every child, not just the eligible Indian children. They provide kindergarten classes for all children, not just the eligible children. They buy mobile classrooms which become permanent facilities for all students. In sum, Indians do not get the educational benefits that they are, by law, entitled to receive.

However the most comprehensive study of Indian education cautions that funding alone is not the only concern. (48)

Objectivity is difficult and it is easy to over simplify both the problems and solutions. Emotionality often dictates repentance, a recognition of past errors and increasing amounts of money as a solution. Money is, in fact, necessary, but many years of massive Federal spending have indicated that it is the development of better teaching methods rather than ever increasing expenditures that make improvement.

It is also clear that a large part of school achievement depends on factors other than school and that poverty, isolation and language differences lead to low scores on academic achievement tests.

Several Indian groups recognized an important opportunity in the Title VII legislation. Four projects were funded in 1969, five more in 1970, and seven in 1971. By 1973, eighteen Indian projects served eighteen language groups. The Navajo language was represented in five projects and six projects served multi-language populations.(48) The variety of these projects and the general progress they were making are reviewed in Spolsky's compilation of Indian project information. He notes the serious problems facing bilingual programs in their local communities.(49)

The attitudes of Indian parents and community leaders to bilingual education make up a complex patchwork of varying influences and beliefs. In very few cases do parents or community have any real control of the school or the bilingual program. While Title VII guidelines insist on the use of advisory boards and extensive community liaison work, these activities do not necessarily lead to any real change in authority. Thus, the bilingual program, often with a white or assimilated Indian director, is still seen as an externally imposed method of dealing with Indian children. Additional complexity is created by the make-up of the local advisory board. It can easily be the case that the board is made up of people whose qualification for election is knowledge of English and of Anglo ways. One result of such a case will be that the board, whose members would be considered progressives, will fail to reflect the opinions of the

traditional members of the community whose support is necessary to an effective bilingual program. There again, these same progressive leaders whose success may well have depended on their own learning of English, are often hard to convince of the value of maintaining the native language. There are paradoxically two opposing points of view from which the use of the native language in school may be opposed: from that of the progressives, who feel English is more important, and from the traditionalists, who feel their language is too sacred for school use. A third point of opposition is generally serious: the fear of many parents that bilingual education is a method of preventing their children learning English well enough, a way, in other words, of keeping Indians as second class citizens.

The opposition from the educational establishment, whether administrators or teachers, is likely to be equally strong. First, the proposal to teach in the native language can only be interpreted as rejection (or at least strong criticism) of all the past and present educational programs and practices. It is a fundamental attack on the validity of the education that America has provided for its Indian peoples. That there is good evidence supporting such an attack does not make it any more acceptable to the people who have been responsible for educating Indians. And the implications of the bilingual proposal are clearly more radical than others. To establish bilingual education is not just changing the curriculum: it leads to basic changes, not just of philosophy but of teachers and control.

Even with such local problems to contend with, there is a particular problem which is true primarily only for

American Indian groups in this country, but reflects the problems of non-world language groups discussed in Chapter I. This is the basic problem of having a previously unwritten language or only limited literature. As mentioned earlier, one group, the Cherokees, had an extensive literacy movement in the 1800's, but it was forcibly eradicated during relocation of the tribe. Walker reports an active revival during the early 1960's. (50) The Navajo and Sioux had many materials developed during a special educational effort during the liberal BIA administration of John Collier. (51) Although this effort was abandoned around 1945, the backlog of materials was used in the sixties as the base for Navajo materials development so that over two hundred items of literacy materials were produced or identified by 1970. (52)

Most tribes, however, had no such wealth to draw on. The Crees in Montana were able to identify community people who knew a syllabary which had been used by the larger portion of the tribe in Canada for almost a century for correspondence. They quickly set to producing materials. Many tribes like the Crow and Northern Cheyenne in Montana had linguistic descriptions of their

language, but no system in actual use by the people. Initial years in such programs have involved establishing an acceptable orthography, training key staff to use it, then producing general literacy materials--a process which can take several years if no preliminary work is done. The usual practice has been to undertake oral bilingual program activity until a base of written materials is established.

As indicated in Chapter I, there are judgements which are political and economic as well as educational which bear on the activity of these programs. While over 100,000 Navajos constitute a sizeable group for extensive materials production, there are less than 100 speakers in groups like Pomo or Haida. In theory, a full bilingual program would require enough materials to introduce literacy. This may not be feasible in terms of fiscal or human resources for some groups. The Office of Education made a significant policy decision regarding the guidelines of the 1974 Act which promises to create even graver concerns in this area for Indian projects. In an effort to avoid duplication and produce higher quality materials, it reduced local budget authorization for materials production and developed

several regional centers for that purpose. This is an excellent solution for the needs of Spanish language programs which dominate Title VII, but it has currently left only one regional center with commitment to Indian language materials (mostly Navajo) in the southwest. There is no feasible way to utilize such a system for the tremendous variety of American Indian languages which must be developed by local speakers, so that unless alternate funding is found, the Indian projects throughout the country may wither from lack of materials.

Another and related problem which plagues the Indian project is in the area of staffing. Ideally, highly trained specialists would create new educational material and experienced teachers would field test new materials and methods. In fact, the research findings reviewing the Indian Education Act indicated that in the 2,565 districts enrolling Indians, fewer than one percent of the Indian students receives instruction from Indian teachers. (53) There is an indication that bilingual teachers in their own language communities are even fewer. One notable consideration is that while trained bilingual teachers may sometimes be recruited from outside a particular area for the world language bilingual

projects, an Indian teacher must of necessity come from that tribal group and any special training must adapt in part to the particular tribal language. The problem is compounded by the fact that the very problem with which bilingual education seeks to deal are reflected in many of the excellent aides who have been identified by local programs--namely that weak content background, their own limitations with English skills, negative self-image due to geographic isolation and academic failure, and family and financial handicaps prevent extended leave for college training at a distant campus. To date the most successful programs for overcoming the problem have been innovative new teacher training programs which are partly carried out in the field, including Teacher Corps and the Careers Opportunity programs.

There is finally recognition of this concern in the new teacher training provisions of Title VII and the Indian Education Act, Part B, programs, but it will take long term programs to break the vicious cycle which prevents an adequate number of Indian teachers to meet the needs of Indian students.

Recognizing the common concerns of the Indian language projects, a meeting for strictly Indian

programs was sponsored in Denver in 1972 under Office of Education sponsorship. On April 17-19, the first National Indian Bilingual Education Conference met in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The published proceedings indicates a serious and lively exchange of concerns and ideas with great similarities in diverse geographic situations.(54) The recommendations of the conference focused on a general affirmation of bilingual education for Indian people. It is interesting to note that one year later the NIBEC resolutions in Billings, Montana, demonstrated a forceful statement of specific policy concerns which stressed special needs of Indian programs not being adequately met under Title VII practices. At the same conference, the group became international and arranged for a Canadian site conference in 1974. The general trend seems to indicate a complete lack of identification with the Spanish language developments which dominate most Title VII policies and national bilingual conferences.

In general, then, there are special funding situations for Indian schools which have had implications for both the quality and stability of programs. There are also local and community factors which may limit program implementation, especially bilingual programs.

In the programs funded for Indian groups, the resources and tremendous needs for materials development and lack of trained staff are major problems. Specifically Indian organizations indicate an attempt to deal with these problems.

CHAPTER V

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN MONTANA

THE PRESENT MONTANA PROGRAMS

In the fall of 1967, personnel from the office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction invited educators and community representatives from the seven Montana Indian Reservations to a meeting in Helena. The idea of bilingual education and the opportunity to obtain funding under Title VII were discussed at length. At that meeting, three groups (Crows, Crees, and Northern Cheyennes) indicated that there were sizeable numbers of bilingual children in their situations and that they would be willing to undertake the development of bilingual education programs. School District 17-H at Hardin agreed to accept the responsibility of writing a proposal for a planning grant and of developing a cooperative program for those three reservations.

There had been considerable activity on the Crow Reservation to support this sort of project. The Head Start Program of the Crow Tribe made extensive use of Crow-speaking teachers and aides for about two years. Its sponsor, the Community Action Program, actively sought expansion of this concept. Montana State University had been involved in teacher-training projects on the

reservation over the same period, both for Indian undergraduate and for graduate students interested in Indian education. Dr. Elnora Old Coyote, later to become curriculum coordinator for the Crow Agency project, had been particularly active in promoting this interest at Montana State University. Eastern Montana College at Billings had been identified as the base institution for the Careers Opportunity Program, and became involved in the emerging bilingual program when Dr. Tom Kennedy agreed to assist in the planning of the original proposal. An independent scholar, Mr. Ray Gordon, had been studying the Crow language under the sponsorship of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the Wycliff Bible Institute and became a key consultant. The Crow Tribe itself had been extremely active in promoting educational programs at all levels and was interested in seeing the language and culture become a part of the public school program. Finally people within the public schools, notably John Dracon, the first director of the Crow Agency Project, had realized that Indian students were not successful in the schools and that language was at the root of the problem.

A decision was made for the central administrative

staff at Hardin and functional groups in the schools at Crow Agency and Rocky Boy (Cree). The interest of the Northern Cheyennes had not come from any particular school and it was decided to simply undertake planning and community interest and language surveys there until a site was established.

Under the leadership of school superintendent Bert Corcoran at Rocky Boy, a capable nucleus staff was developed with technical advice from Hardin. Because of this development, Rocky Boy was able to obtain funding as a separate project in spring, 1970. With extensive groundwork in the communities and schools and with the development of a small nucleus staff under linguist Dan Alford during the first and second year and identification of a school site at Lame Deer, the Northern Cheyennes were successfully funded for a Title VII project in 1972.

As a result of the above independent funding of projects at Rocky Boy and Lame Deer, the staff at Crow Agency and Hardin had the much more realistic and manageable job of program development for one area and one language group only.

Each of the three sites continued to receive

~

slight funding increases in the succeeding years.

A second Crow language program was funded at Wyola in January, 1975, under a supplementary appropriation grant competition, Title VII. Several former staff members from the Crow Agency project were involved in the new project. In the renewal competition of 1975, which signaled the implementation of the provisions of the new Bilingual Education Act of 1974, a third Crow language grant at a much lower proposed activity level was funded at Lodge Grass. There were also significant funding reductions in the existing four Montana projects. This was part of a general trend to fund more new projects with funds which had been reduced below the initial appropriation level by presidential action.

Each of the three Montana reservations exhibits rather different concerns. The Cree program promoted heavy community involvement, in keeping with the already established pattern as the state's first Indian controlled school district. With an established offset press and darkroom, an attractive array of supplementary materials, using the existing Cree syllabary was quickly produced. However, the rather small percentage of Cree dominant speakers promoted a greater concern for oral Cree and

Cree cultural materials than basic academic program materials in Cree.

The Northern Cheyenne project was seriously limited by lack of a Cheyenne speaker with more than two years of college. Primary emphasis in the initial project stages was on establishing an orthography and gaining community acceptance of the program. Extensive staff turnover made it difficult to assess the general direction of the project or its level of support.

The Crow Agency project had established an early commitment to developing a full-scale academic program in Crow. The unusually high level of language maintenance documented by Dracon seemed to indicate a pilot demonstration which could be extended to the three other public districts and two private schools serving large numbers of Crows. (55) For the same reason, there was a strong project emphasis on heavy assessment of oral language and academic achievement data at Crow Agency and a similar control school. Consequently, the project carried out one of the most extensive longitudinal testing programs in the above areas, as well as non-verbal intelligence and personality measures for an

American bilingual project. Currently most of these data are scattered in several interim and annual reports which are being processed by the author for a general publication.

In 1974, the Crow Agency project made a major breakthrough for Montana bilingual education programs in successfully carrying out a full year's initial instruction in Crow reading and mathematics for an experimental group. Evaluation indicated the children mastered basic reading and mathematics skills and showed significantly greater gain in oral English compared to a control group of Crow speaking peers at the school who received the standard English reading and mathematics program. (56) Unfortunately there was major staff turnover and inadequate planning for second year follow-through instruction in Crow and transition to the English language, so that a longer term impact cannot be assessed.

The sudden development of three separate grants on the Crow Reservation poses an interesting set of problems. Although there is discussion of shared responsibility of materials development and a shared teacher training program under an interlocal cooperative agreement, it appears that no single program has the concentration of

staff or level of funding which permitted materials development and extensive basic research in the early Crow Agency project. It may be said more generally that all the Montana projects lack the capacity to sustain their efforts without continued special funding. At the same time there is little question that all have made significant strides toward developing materials, training staff and implementing bilingual instruction as evidenced by positive evaluation and strong community support.

Nevertheless, there is a need for realistic assessment of long term prospects for maintaining such programs. This is particularly true of the high cost developmental aspects of materials production and teacher training. There is a serious question whether these are properly functions of a local school in any case, or whether some higher level of organization is more appropriate. There are also major questions for future bilingual programs within the state. These topics will be the concern of the next section.

Presently there is no discernible structure to support bilingual education above the local school district level. Districts must submit competitive

grants directly to Washington with only courtesy state review. On the one hand, this may discriminate against other potential applicants who lack the technical expertise shared by the original program developers. More importantly, it may mean the complete lack of necessary support structures above the district level. Such structures may be essential for ultimate program success, and, in fact, do exist in many other states. This section will attempt to review areas of potential development. As with other aspects of this paper, the discussion will focus on Indian language programs, since there is no apparent other language group sufficiently concentrated to require or desire bilingual education. However this supposition itself is made in spite of the fact that there is no statewide needs assessment.

First, it has been noted that the federal government primarily funds demonstration programs for a limited period (usually five years). Yet if we are to follow the reasoning of the *Lau v. Nichols* decision and the constitutional rationale of the Office for Civil Rights, this type of program is a fundamental right of bilingual children wherever there is a sufficient concentration. Even if confined to present language groups, this would

mean at least four additional programs on the Crow Reservation and two on the Northern Cheyenne. The nature of both school financing and school law is such that this would appear to be the responsibility of the state, not of the federal government.

Thus far, bilingual programs have been rather costly in Montana. All projects except Lodge Grass which depends heavily on the Wyola project are in the range of \$95,000 to \$155,000. The Crow Agency project budget at one point exceeded \$200,000. Many of these costs would be unnecessary to local schools if the training and materials costs were located with other agencies, as is the common practice. It is also possible that the two person team of district funded teacher and bilingual aide could be reduced to one person if there were sufficient trained certified bilingual teachers.

Still the programs would probably cost more than regular programs. The state presently provides categorical funding to special education, speech impaired, learning disabilities and sensory impaired students. One possibility would be enabling legislation along these lines.

Four states currently have such legislation.

Several more are considering legislation. The first and model law was passed in Massachusetts in 1973. It provided for mandatory 3-year transitional bilingual education in districts with 20 or more children of limited English speaking ability. It requires annual survey, parental notification of placement and specific mixed courses. Teacher certification standards are also included. Similar laws have been passed by Texas, Illinois, and New Jersey. Varying amounts of supplemental funds are set up for each state, and Massachusetts and Illinois have established departments of bilingual education in their state agencies. (57)

Besides fiscal considerations, there are legal and policy decisions which reflect the attitude of the state. Presently state laws exist which specify certain subjects to be taught in English. There is no interpretive case to prohibit bilingual presentation, but such a restriction has been inferred by districts in the past. Montana statutes read as follows. (58)

Section 75-7503, R. C. M. 1947, states:

All elementary schools shall be taught in the English language. Instruction shall be given in reading, penmanship, mathematics, language arts, social sciences, science, health,

physical education, music and art. Instruction may be given in additional subjects when approved by trustees.

Section 75-7504, R.C.M. 1947, states:

All middle schools, junior high schools and high schools shall be taught in the English language. Instruction shall be given in accordance with the requirements of the standards of accreditation adopted by the board of public education. Such standards shall require instruction in English, American history, American government, mathematics, science, health and physical education. Instruction may be given in additional subjects when approved by the trustees.

Other legal aspects which have a bearing on bilingual education include the ultimate interpretation of a provision in the new state constitution which has been characterized as the most positive statement in any state of the union for Indian recognition. It states the following: "The state recognizes the distinct and unique cultural heritage of the American Indian and is committed in its educational goals to the preservation of their cultural integrity." A second provision requires special training experiences for teachers of Indian children.

Background studies growing out of such provisions include an extremely thorough study of certain character-

istics of Indian people in Montana.(59) Yet it is precisely this area in which the lack of state coordination hampers adequate needs assessment. There are, for example, no usable achievement data available for Indian students. There are no data on the linguistic background of Montana students. The data on teacher racial background are interesting, but do not tell if the few Indian teachers indicated are able to use their own language to facilitate learning.

The role of the Office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction has potential for major involvement in this program. To date, it has been a fairly active role for Indian education in terms of competent and aggressive staffing. Unfortunately the tremendously complex linkages involving bilingual instruction have simply not been given to the already overburdened two-man Indian Education staff. Presently that office simply reviews new proposals. A much more elaborate role would be possible under federal funds authorized for that purpose, including needs assessment, coordination of information and systematic review of evaluation at the state level, as well as the usual technical assistance function. One further possible role which the state

department has handled very effectively for other new and innovative programs is the organization of public information about bilingual education, a vital effort to develop sensitivity to bilingual education and positive attitudes throughout the state. There is a pressing need for greater public awareness. There have been centers designated as general assistance centers in each region of the country to make sure that the civil rights of children as expressed in the Lau v. Nichols decision are protected. Lacking awareness of such policy enforcement throughout the country, many districts may be quite unaware that they face potential lawsuits or loss of federal funding if they do not institute affirmative action toward bilingual children's needs.

The fine efforts of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in the development of informational handbooks might be further extended into the area of bilingual education. This would permit collection, codification and dissemination of already useful information, such as the language supervisor's listings of bilingual teachers in the state. Such communication would also enhance input into such notable state documents as the basic quality of education report which mentions

bilingual children as one parent's concern, but pursues it no further. (60) It is particularly important to all the federal sources of funding available so that potential applicants could be identified, encouraged and advised.

Finally, there are other aspects of a support structure which may be identified in terms of the college and university system. One central concern is that there is a dearth of reference materials regarding bilingual education at any one site. Most of the materials referenced in this paper, for example, are not readily available in any state library. This would also serve as a repository for all Indian language materials. The experiences of the Cherokee and Navajo indicate the possibility for loss of programs and materials developed locally if no such safeguard exists.

The role of involvement regarding teacher training and certification is another issue. Although there has been good cooperation from both Eastern Montana College and Montana State University and Northern Montana College for the Cree in meeting ad hoc requests for special instruction, there is need for greater involvement. Montana State University has prepared grant proposals this year for graduate fellowships for training teacher trainers

and bilingual education traineeships. In the development of this proposal and of a similar unsuccessful one at Eastern Montana College last year, it was quite evident that there existed little expertise in the bilingual education area on those campuses. Yet over 300 Indian college students, mostly bilingual, currently are enrolled at these institutions and both have been actively developing Indian Studies programs with Indian staff; and many of these students are training to return to their home communities as teachers. Efforts in teacher training programs thus far include Teacher Corps and Careers Opportunity Programs at Eastern Montana College and an Indian Education Option in the Department of Elementary Education at Montana State University, this latter just now in the developmental process. In spite of these efforts, there needs to be extension beyond existing programs, such as Indian fee waiver, special counseling and Indian studies courses, useful as these might be. Also to be recognized are other significant acts, such as Eastern Montana College's adoption of Indian language competency tests to satisfy a modern language requirement or of the only Indian language related courses currently in state college catalogues.

As the initial chapters point out, the theory and research behind the bilingual movement has implications for all students, so that new courses and library holdings are again called for.

Finally the universities may be places with the technical facilities and talents to assist in materials production. It is interesting to note that the vast materials output of Navajo, Eskimo, and Choctaw projects is strongly tied to active materials centers on college campuses.

In summary it appears that there is little existing structure, but there are several promising points of departure for increased involvement and support for bilingual education. These include financial involvement, legal actions, technical assistance and clearing house functions, teacher training and materials development, with the state and university system the potential locus of such activity.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper has attempted to provide an initial assessment of the implications of the bilingual education movement for the state of Montana. To achieve this purpose, the first chapter presented an extended discussion of major educational and psychological arguments, such as the effect of bilingualism on intellectual development, interference patterns between two languages, the advantages of mother-tongue initial literacy instruction, the logic of the compensatory early childhood programs, and the concern over the child self-image. It further characterized several American social movements or forces such as civil rights activity, the war on poverty legislation, a concern with cultural pride among minority groups, and the advancement of arguments regarding linguistic and cultural pluralism as beneficial to society. These two sets of factors are described as culminating in the movement for bilingual education in this country.

The second chapter reviewed the federal bilingual education legislation and program trends and several important civil rights enforcement policies which grew out of civil rights cases involving bilingual children.

The next chapter indicated that Indian programs face particular problems to successfully implement programs in response to federal policy, particularly due to lack of materials and trained teachers and the need for each language group to develop these things in terms of its own language.

Chapter five detailed the history of the five currently funded projects in Montana. It then discussed the lack of support structures within the state which appear necessary for full long-term implementation of bilingual education. Some of the states have existing policies or structures which, if extended, could help produce the necessary level of support.

Given these considerations, the following recommendations are advanced for the state of Montana or Montana Indian programs regarding bilingual education:

- (1) There is an immediate need for a statewide coordinating activity. The complexity of the bilingual issues suggests that this might be a new position or agency within the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction with adequate training and budget to conduct a statewide needs assessment, provide technical

assistance to present and developing projects and to gather and disseminate such data as required for effective planning and policy decisions regarding bilingual education in Montana. Current Title VII regulations require state review of proposals, but do not ask for the required evaluation reports to be submitted in duplicate to the state. There is an additional need to conduct an effective public information campaign on the state level to advise schools of their obligations and parents of their children's rights regarding special programs. Partial funding of such an agency could derive from the state assistance provisions of the Title VII of 1974 and the general assistance center in this region charged with technical assistance under the Lau decision.

- (2) The higher education system in the state should review its present strength and potential in the field of bilingual teacher training. Present efforts to fund such a program and its present new degree option in Indian Education suggest the possibility of centering both the instruc-

tional program and necessary new library resources in one place. The present situation of project initiated coursework through continuing education is simply too costly and haphazard to meet manpower needs in the state. The role of the colleges in providing teacher training and other technical assistance, such as materials development or program evaluation, could be greatly enhanced by development of comprehensive plans and policy guides for teacher training and other assistance on a state-wide basis. Excellent guidelines along these lines have been developed for Indian bilingual teacher training and Indian language policy by the Center for Applied Linguistics. Training of school administrators, perhaps arranged through the state office, is a highly essential prerequisite to program initiation and maintenance, and may suggest special certification requirements such as those presently required of teachers of Indian students.

- (3) There is a need for state policy legislation including financial consideration in the area of bilingual education. The federal government

presently only funds demonstration projects, although it is possible that once state policies are developed it may continue to provide heavy subsidy through the state as in the case of funds for special education. In any case, Montana needs to establish its position in this area. The model legislation of Massachusetts discussed earlier is one possible direction. It would appear that the concentration of bilingual populations is sufficient to merit special programs few enough in number to keep costs reasonable, although there is every indication that bilingual programming will always be somewhat more expensive than regular programming and therefore a fiscal hardship on the local districts involved. The critical cost factor of materials development for various Indian language groups would also have to be included in such policy, although the individual tribe might also have some responsibility here, as well as its own resources through the various fundings available specifically to Indian groups. The problem again is to remove the

responsibility for such development from individual schools as this may tend to discourage program implementation.

REFERENCES

1. Einar Haugen, "The Bilingual Individual," Psycholinguistics: A Book of Readings, ed. Sol Saporta, New York, Hold, Rinehart and Sinton, 1961, pp. 403-405.
2. Elizabeth Peel and Wallace E. Lambert, "The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence," Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, Vol. 76, No. 37, 1962.
3. Uriel Weinreich, Languages in Contact, New York, Linguistic Circle of New York, 1954, p. 1.
4. James E. Atalis, ed., Bilingualism and Language Contact, Anthropological, Linguistic, Psychological and Sociological Aspects. Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics 23, Washington, D. C., Georgetown University Press, 1970.
5. The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education, Monograph in Fundamental Education, No. 8, Paris, UNESCO, 1953, pp. 688-712.
6. Pedro O. Orata, "The Iloilo Experiment in Education Through Vernacular," The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education, Monograph on Fundamental Education, No. 8, Paris, UNESCO, 1953, pp. 123-31.
7. Donald Burns, "Bilingual Education in the Andes of Peru," in Language Patterns of Nations, J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta (eds.), New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1968, pp. 403-413.
8. Nancy Modiano, "National or Mother Tongue in Beginning Reading: A Comparative Study," Research in Teaching English, Vol. 1, 1968, pp. 32-43.
9. J. McVicker Hunt, Intelligence and Experience, New York, Ronald Press, 1961.
10. Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

11. Vera John, "Aspects of a Bilingual Classroom," Notes from Workshop Center for Open Education, New York, Workshop Center for Open Education, March, 1973, p. 6.
12. Public Law No. 93-638, 93rd Congress, 2d Session, January 4, 1975.
13. Bruce A. Gaarder, "Two Statements on Bilingualism," Bilingual Education for American Indians: Indian Education, Robert Rebert, ed., Curriculum Bulletin No. 3, Washington, D. C., Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1971, p. 7.
14. Joshua A. Fishman and others, Language Loyalty in the United States, The Hague, Morton and Co., 1966.
15. Vera John, Early Childhood Bilingual Education, New York, Modern Language Association of America, 1971.
16. Bernard Spolsky, Informal lecture to staff at Wyola, Montana, Jan. 13, 1976.
17. Arnold Liebowitz, Educational Policy and Political Acceptance: The Imposition of English as the Language of Instruction in American Schools, Washington, D. C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.
18. Sarah Gudschinsky, personal conversation, Norman, Oklahoma, 1969.
19. John Gay and Michael Cole, The New Mathematics in an Old Culture, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
20. Jerome Bruner, Toward a Theory of Instruction, Cambridge, Mass., Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1966.
21. Jean Piaget and Barbel Inhelder, The Psychology of the Child, New York, Basic Books, 1969.
22. L. S. Vygotsky, Thought and Language, Cambridge, Mass., The M. I. T. Press, 1962.

23. A. R. Luria and F. Ia. Yudovich, Speech and the Development of Mental Processes in the Child, London, Staples Press, 1968.
24. J. S. Bruner, R. Oliver and P. Greenfield, Studies in Cognitive Growth, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
25. Noam Chomsky, Language and Mind, New York, Harcourt, Brace and Javonovich, Inc., 1972.
26. Noam Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Cambridge, Mass., The M. I. T. Press, 1965.
27. Carol Chomsky, The Acquisition of Syntax in Children 5 to 10, Cambridge, Mass., The M. I. T. Press, 1969.
28. John Bormuth, "New Measures of Grammatical Complexity," in The Psycholinguistic Nature of the of the Reading Process, Kenneth Goodman, ed., Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1968.
29. Frank Smith, Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971, pp. 223-228.
30. Harry Levin and Eleanor Kaplan, "Grammatical Structure and Reading," in Basic Studies on Reading, Harry Levin and Joanna P. Williams, eds., New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1970, pp. 119-134.
31. Michael Cole, John Gay, Joseph Glick and Donald Sharp, The Cultural Context of Learning and Thinking, New York, Basic Books, 1971.
32. Vera John-Steiner, "Cognitive Style in the Pueblo Classroom," pre-publication draft, 1974.
33. Paul Kohlers, "Bilingualism and Information Processing," Scientific American, Vol. 218, No. 3, March, 1969, pp. 78-86.
34. Susan Ervin and C. E. Osgood, "Second Language Learning and Bilingualism," in E. Osgood and T.

Sebeck, eds., Psycholinguistics (Suppl.), Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49, 1954, pp. 139-146.

35. W. E. Lambert, J. Havelka and C. Crosby, "The Influence of Language Acquisition Contexts on Bilingualism," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVI, 1958, pp. 239-244.
36. Leon A. Jacobovits, Foreign Language Learning, Rowley, Mass., Newbury House, 1970, pp. 167-69.
37. Paul Rosier, personal interview, Rock Point, Arizona, 1974.
38. William F. Mackey, Bilingual Education in a School, Rowley, Mass., Newbury House, 1972, pp. 149-171.
39. Atilano A. Valencia, Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Perspective Model in Multicultural America, Albuquerque, N. M., Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1969.
40. Joshua Fishman, Bilingual Education Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Ninetieth Congress, First Session on 5.428, Parts I and II, May-July, 1967, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1967.
41. 20 U.S.C. § 880b et seq., 1970.
42. A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Education Program, Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Vol. 1, prepared by Development Associates, Inc. under contract to the U. S. Office of Education, Dec., 1973.
43. 20 U.S.C.A. § 880b - 1(a)(4)(A)(6)(Supp. 1975).
44. J. Stanley Pottinger, "Identification of Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of National Origin," Memorandum from Department of Health, Education and Welfare, May 25, 1970.

45. 483 F. 2d, 791, 793, 1973.
46. A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual-Bicultural Education, United States Commission on Civil Rights, Clearinghouse Publication No. 51, May, 1975.
47. An Even Chance, New York, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, Inc., 1971, p. 2.
48. Estelle Fuchs and Robert Havighurst, To Live on This Earth, Garden City, New York, Doubleday, 1972, p. 135.
49. Bernard Spolsky, American Indian Bilingual Education, Navajo Reading Study Progress Report No. 24, The University of New Mexico, May 1974, pp. 50-53.
50. Willard Walker, "An Experiment in Programmed Cross-Cultural Education: The Import of the Cherokee Primer for the Cherokee Community and the Behavioral Sciences," mimeo., 1965.
51. Evelyn Bauer, "A History of Bilingual Education in the BIA Schools," Bilingual Education for American Indians, Curriculum Bulletin No. 3, Washington, D. C., United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1971.
52. Bernard Spolsky, Agnes Holm and Penny Murphy, Analytical Bibliography of Navajo Reading Materials, Curriculum Bulletin No. 10, Washington, D. C., United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1970.
53. National Advisory Council on Indian Education, Through Education: Self Determination--A Bicentennial Goal for American Indians, Second Annual Report of the Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, March, 1975, p. 3.
54. 1973 Proceedings National Indian Bilingual Education Conference, Curriculum Bulletin No. 15, Indian Education Resource Center, Albuquerque, N. M.
55. John Dracon, The Extent of Bilingualism among the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Indian School Population, Grades One Through Twelve, A Study, ms., Eric Clearinghouse No. ED 044 205)

56. "Continuation Proposal, Title VII Bilingual Education Project for 1975-76," Crow Agency, Montana, 1975.
57. A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual Bicultural Education, op. cit., pp. 213-244.
58. Board of Public Education, State of Montana, Basic Quality of Education, Helena, Montana, Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1975, p. 25.
59. A Profile of the Montana Native, prepared for Mr. Merle Lucas, Coordinator of Indian Affairs, Office of the Governor, Helena, Montana, Management Consultants of San Francisco, Inc., August, 1974.
60. Basic Quality of Education, op. cit., p. 18.