

**BILINGUAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE EDUCATION
OF BILINGUAL CHILDREN DURING EARLY CHILDHOOD**

**Eugene E. García, Ph.D
Arizona State University
Tempe**

**Steve Martínez, Ph.D
Department of Health and Human Services
Washington, D.C.**

**No. 1
1981**

ISSN 0732-7749

MASRC WORKING PAPER SERIES

The goal of the Mexican American Studies & Research Center's Working Paper Series is to disseminate recent research on the Mexican American experience. The Center welcomes papers from the social sciences, public policy fields, and the humanities. Areas of particular interest include economic and political participation of Mexican Americans, health, immigration, and education. The Mexican American Studies & Research Center assumes no responsibility for statements or opinions of contributors to its Working Paper Series.

Manuscripts and inquiries should be addressed to Dr. Antonio L. Estrada,
MASRC Director, in care of the Center.

Working Papers are available directly from the Center for \$3.00.
Arizona residents add 5.6% sales tax.

The MASRC Working Paper Series
© The Arizona Board of Regents

Mexican American Studies & Research Center
César E. Chávez Building, Rm 208
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona 85721-0023
(520) 621-7551 • FAX (520) 621-7966
MASRC website: <http://masrc.arizona.edu/>
E-mail: masrc@email.arizona.edu

Bilingual Development and the Education of Bilingual Children During Early Childhood

The " simultaneous" development of two languages during early childhood has begun to receive increased research and educational attention in the last decade. Linguistic, social and psychological investigation of this phenomenon has produced an extensive literature often segmented by parochial disciplinary boundaries. The present review attempts to congregate these uni-dimensional approaches into a multidimensional perspective of bilingualism cognizant of concurrent interactive forces which act to define the bilingual experience. Moreover, there is a specific attempt to consider the educational character (including the evaluation of instructional paradigms) of bilingual education endeavors in this country. Lastly, specific curricular implications for early childhood are addressed and related to empirical information presently available.

INTRODUCTION

The issues surrounding bilingualism are of specific interest to a large bilingual segment (Mexican-American, Chinese, Haitian, Native American, Puerto Rican, Cajun, Vietnamese, etc.) of this nation's population (U.S. Commission of Civil Rights, 1974) and, of general interest to those individuals studying the general phenomenon of language acquisition (McNeil, 1966). Other reviews of bilingualism and second language acquisition have dealt with the definition of bilingualism, linguistic overlap, linguistic "interference," cognitive interaction, and theoretical issues related to each of these areas (See MacNamara, 1967; Reigel, 1968; John and Horner, 1971; Vildomec, 1971; McLaughlin, 1977; and Cummins, 1979). The purpose of the present review will be to discuss some of these same issues in light of more recent research and applied information specific to bilingual development in young children with special attention to bilingualism in the United States. Therefore, this review should (a) serve as an update from earlier reviews in this area, (b) provide some functional information to those individuals concerned with early childhood bilingualism, and (c) elucidate certain areas which are in need of immediate attention in the context of bilingual instruction in the United States.

Not so surprisingly, as one searches for a comprehensive definition of bilingualism, a continuum of definitional attempts unfold. On one end of this continuum are general definitions such as "the practice of alternately using two languages." At the other end of

this continuum are the operational definitions common to the field of experimental psychology ("subjects answered positively to questions concerning their use of two languages"; "subjects scored 90% on a standardized test of language proficiency in each language"; etc.). Regardless of the definition adopted for any empirical or theoretical treatment of bilingualism, it does without emphasizing that "bilinguals" come in a variety of linguistic shapes and forms. Therefore, any definition worthy of consideration must address built-in linguistic diversity (Valdes-Fallis, 1979). But to consider only the linguistic domain would be an error. Thorough definitions of bilingualism must additionally consider cognitive and social domains: the acquisition of language or languages coincides with identifiable periods of cognitive development within significant social contexts.

Early childhood bilingualism defined. The term bilingualism here suggests the acquisition of two languages during the first five years of life. This definition includes the following conditions:

- (a) Children are able to comprehend and/or produce some aspects of each language beyond the ability to discriminate that either one language or another is being spoken. This is not an extremely limiting condition since, it allows many combinations of linguistic competence to fall within the boundaries of bilingualism. (The most "simple" to be included might be the child who has memorized one or more lexical utterances in a second language).

- (b) Children are exposed "naturally" to the two systems of languages as they are used in the form of social interaction during early childhood. This condition requires a substantive bilingual environment in the child's first three to eight years of life. In many cases this exposure comes from within a nuclear and extended family network but this need not be the case (visitors, and extended visits to foreign countries are examples of alternative environments).
- (c) The simultaneous character of development must be apparent in both languages. This is contrasted with the case in which a native speaker of one language, who after mastery of that language, begins on a course of second language acquisition.

It is the preceding combined conditions which define the present population of interest. It is clear from this definition that an attempt is made to include both the child's linguistic abilities in conjunction with the social environment during an important psychological "segment" of life.

BILINGUAL DEVELOPMENT

Certainly, one of the most impressive characteristics of children's development is related to language acquisition. It seems remarkable that within the first few years of life, drastic changes in linguistic competence can clearly be identified (Menyuk, 1971). Although the exact

variables influencing this development are still not evident, research in this field has been voluminous and theoretically varied (Lenneberg and Lenneberg, 1975; DeVilliers and DeVilliers, 1978). The main focus of this research has centered on single language acquisition (Brown, 1973) although more recent research has employed comparative linguistic analysis with children who are learning different languages (Bowerman, 1975; Braine, 1974). Compared to these bodies of literature, very little systematic investigation is available regarding children who are acquiring more than one language, simultaneously, during the early part of their lives.

It does seem clear that a child can learn more than one linguistic communicative form in many societies throughout the world and many children do so. Sorenson (1967) describes the acquisition of three to four languages by young children who live in the Northwest Amazon region of South America. In this Brazilian-Columbian border region, the Tukano tribal language serves as the lingua franca, but there continues to exist some 25 clearly distinguishable linguistic groups. In the United States, Skrabanek (1970) reports the continued acquisition and support of both English and Spanish language systems among young preschool children of our Southwest for the last hundred years with no indication that this phenomenon will be disrupted. Although not apparent from a cursory scanning of linguistic literature, research with bilinguals is not a recent subarea of linguistic or psychological interest. Ronjat (1913) reports the development of French and German in his own son. Finding little deleterious effects of bilingual development, he

attributed such positive outcomes to the separation of the languages. In this particular case, one parent consistently spoke French and the other German. Pavlovitch (1920) also reports the development of two languages, French and Serbian, in his son. Similarly, languages were separated across individuals. The languages reportedly developed simultaneously with minimal confusion. Geissler (1938) reports, anecdotally, that as a teacher of foreign languages he had observed young children acquire up to four languages simultaneously without apparent difficulty. However, Smith (1935), in a study of missionary families who spoke English and Chinese, reports difficulty during simultaneous acquisition. This difficulty was most apparent in the language mixing character of some children's speech.

One of the first systematic investigations of bilingual acquisition in young children was reported by Leopold (1939, 1947, 1949a, 1949b). This author set out to study the simultaneous acquisition of English and German in his own daughter. These initial descriptive reports indicate that as the subject was exposed to both languages during infancy, she seemed to weld both languages into one system during initial language production periods. For instance, early language forms were characterized by free mixing. Language production during later periods seem to indicate that the use of English and German grammatical forms developed independently.

More recent studies have systematically addressed several issues relevant to bilingual acquisition. Carrow (1971, 1972) has restricted

her study to the receptive domain of young bilingual Mexican-American children in the Southwest. Children (ages 3 years 10 months to 6 years 9 months) from bilingual Spanish-English home environments were administered the Auditory Test for Language Comprehension. This test consists of a series of pictures representing referential categories that can be signaled by words, morphological constructions, grammatical categories and syntactic structures. These include verbs, adjectives, adverbs, nouns, pronouns, morphological endings, prepositions, interrogatives and syntax complexity in both languages. A comparison of English and Spanish comprehension on this task for bilinguals revealed (Carrow, 1971): (1) linguistically, children were very heterogeneous; some scored better in one language than another, others were equal in both; (2) a greater proportion of children scored higher in English than in Spanish; (3) older children scored higher on these measures in both languages. (This was the case even though Spanish was not used as a medium of instruction for children who were in educational programs).

In a cross-sectional comparison of English comprehension among monolingual English and Bilingual, Spanish-English children (ages 3 years 10 months to 6 years 9 months), Carrow (1972) reports a positive developmental trend for both Spanish and English in bilingual children. Additionally, bilingual children tended to score lower than monolingual children on English measures during ages 3 years 10 months to 5 years 9 months; but for the final age comparison group (6 years 9 months), bilingual and monolingual did not differ significantly on these same

English measures. These combined results seem to indicate that at the receptive level, Spanish-English bilingual children were: (a) progressing (increasing their competence) in both Spanish and English; (b) heterogeneous as a group, most favoring one language (typically English) over another; and, (c) "lagged" behind monolingual children in their acquisition of English at an early age (4-5), but eventually "caught up" at a later age (6-7). Since these studies were only at the receptive level, used specific "test" procedures, and restricted the population of study to one regional bilingual Hispanic population (Texas Mexican-Americans), there exist serious constraints to the conclusions reported above. But, they do offer some initial empirical information relevant to the study of early childhood bilingual development.

With respect to expressive development, Padilla and Liebman (1975) report the longitudinal analysis of Spanish-English acquisition in 2, 3-year-old bilingual children. These researchers followed the model of Brown (1973) in recording linguistic interactions of children over a five month period. By an analysis of several dependent linguistic variables (phonological, grammatical, syntactic and semantic characteristics) over this time period, they observed gains in both languages although several English forms were in evidence while similar Spanish forms were not. They also report the differentiation of linguistic systems at phonological, vocabulary and syntactic levels. They conclude:

"the appropriate use of both languages even in mixed utterances was evident; that is, correct word order was preserved. For example, there were no occurrences of 'raining esta' or 'a es baby,' but there was evidence for such utterances as 'esta raining' and 'es a baby.' There was also an absence of the redundancy of unnecessary words which might tend to confuse meaning." (page 51)

Garcia (1982) reports developmental data related to the acquisition of Spanish and English for Spanish-English bilingual preschoolers (3-4 years old) and the acquisition of English for a group of matched English-only speakers. The results of that study can be summarized as follows: (a) acquisition of both Spanish and English was evident at complex morphological (grammatical) and syntactic levels for Spanish/English four-year-old children; (b) for the bilingual children studied, English was more advanced based on the quantity and quality of obtained morphological and syntactic instances of language productions; and (c) there was no quantitative or qualitative difference between Spanish/English bilingual children and matched English-only controls on English language productions.

Huerta (1977) has provided a report of a longitudinal analysis for a Spanish/English, bilingual, two-year-old child. She reports a similar pattern of continuous Spanish/English development, although identifiable stages appeared in which one language forged ahead of the other. Moreover, she reports the significant occurrence of mixed language utterance which made use of both Spanish and English lexicon as well as Spanish and English morphology. In all such cases, these mixed linguistic utterances were well formed and communicative. Garcia (1980b), in a national study of bilingual children age four, five, and six years of age, found regional differences in the relative occurrence of switched language utterances. That is, bilingual Spanish/English children from Texas, Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico, showed higher (15-20%) incidences of language switched utterances than children from

California, Illinois, New York or Florida, especially at pre-kindergarten levels. These findings suggest that some children may very well develop an "interlanguage" in addition to the acquisition of two independent language systems later in development.

The above "developmental" findings can be capsulized succinctly but not without acknowledging their tentative nature:

1. The acquisition of more than one language during early childhood is a documented phenomenon.
2. the acquisition of two languages can be parallel, but, need not be. That is, the qualitative character of one language may lag behind, surge ahead, or develop equally with the other language.
3. The acquisition of two languages may very well result in an inter-language, incorporating the aspects (lexicon, morphology and syntax) of both languages.
4. The acquisition of two languages need not hamper, developmentally, the acquisition of either language.

Of course these conclusions are very broad in character. The specific nature of bilingual development and its causal links to environmental variables remains unavailable.

Beyond the basic developmental research discussed above, a second popular form of research has considered the interactive influence of multiple language acquisition. That is, does learning more than one language influence the rate and/or quality of acquisition of each language? When referring to the interactive phenomenon between

languages of the bilingual, the terms "linguistic transfer" or interference" are often used. This later term has gained multiple meanings as is shown by its gain of various modifiers, "linguistic interference," "psychological interference," and "educational interference" (Saville and Troike, 1971). Experimental studies of specific instances of "transfer" or lack of it are available with bilingual children. For instances, Evans (1974) reports the comparison of word-pair discriminations and word imitations in Spanish and English for monolingual English and bilingual Spanish/English children. Elementary school children were asked to discriminate between words containing English phonemes /b/ and /v/ which are clearly separate in English but not so clearly separate in Spanish). Additionally, children were requested to imitate a series of words in each language which were also considered "difficult." Bilinguals did not differ from monolinguals on any of the English tasks. But as expected, bilinguals scored significantly higher than monolinguals on all Spanish tasks. Garcia and Trujillo (1979) report a similar finding when they compared bilingual (Spanish/English) and monolingual (English) three, four, five, six, and seven year olds on high error risk phonemes in Spanish that adult Spanish speakers mispronounce, and simple to complex syntactic forms (sentences containing plural and possessive morphemes). Bilinguals did not differ from monolinguals on English imitation tasks where both groups scored near 100% correct; but, they did differ significantly, and made less errors than English speakers on Spanish tasks. This was the case across all

age levels. These studies suggest that negative transfer at the phonological level in young bilingual children is non-existent.

In this same study (Garcia and Trujillo, 1979), however, the imitation of complex Spanish sentences which involved adjective placement were not imitated correctly by the bilingual subjects. Complex English sentences of this type presented no significant problem for either bilingual or English-only children. Recall that adjective placement in Spanish ("pato azul") differs from adjective placement in English ("blue duck"). Therefore, it is likely that transfer (both positively and/or negatively) is a possibility as syntactic complexity increases and as difference in syntactic structure across the languages of the bilingual are involved. An earlier report (Garcia, 1977) has indicated the existence of transfer in the form of language substitution during the acquisition of prepositional labels in the "weak" language of the bilingual. In this study, bilingual, Spanish/English children whose performance on the labeling of prepositional concepts differed across languages served as subjects. That is, subjects could provide the correct prepositional label in one language (first language) but not the other (second language). Language substitution occurred when subjects were taught to label prepositions in the second language. Therefore, transfer may very well take the form of "failure to discriminate" the language deemed socially appropriate. Such transfer effects are more sociolinguistic in character rather than linguistic.

On the other hand, Dulay and Burt (1972), 1973) report finding few linguistic errors in English which could be attributed to children's

first language even when the child's first language varied from Oriental to a Western European derivative. They have concluded that identifiable English linguistic errors were much like those of young children acquiring English as a first and only language.

The studies in the field of linguistic transfer with young bilingual children can be used to support one or more of the following contradictory conclusions concerning the acquisition of two languages during early childhood:

1. A linguistic transfer phenomenon is evident in which the specific structures of the "dominant" language influence the developmental quality of the less "dominant" language.
2. A linguistic transfer phenomenon is evident in which the structures of the two independent languages influence the developmental quality of both languages, likely producing a third identifiable "interlanguage."
3. The developmental character of the bilingual is not significantly influenced by the simultaneous linguistic development of two languages; the developmental character of each language is similar to that of a native speaker of either language.

Given the contradictory nature of the evidence available at this time, it is safest to conclude that the specific character of transfer between the languages of the bilingual continues to be an area of

significant research interest and controversy. It would appear inappropriate at this time to make any other conclusion.

LINGUISTIC INPUT AND SOCIAL CONTEXT

As Reigel (1968) suggests, any chronological record of the child's linguistic output coupled with linguistic input information would allow an important correlational analysis of language development. Although this extensive information remains unavailable, some systematic semblance of this type of data is becoming available for monolingual English children (Brown and Fraser, 1963; Schacter, Krishner, Klips, Friederricks, Sanders, 1974). Unfortunately, little information of this calibre is available for young bilingual children.

Although this absence of empirical data is crippling, some cautious notions of bilingual input seem justifiable. If one considers the eventual bilingual character of the child, it seems appropriate to suggest that some percentage of the child's linguistic information is in one language and some other percentage is in a second language. One might tie the acquisition of either language to the general theoretical notion of "degree of linguistic input." Mathematically, the extent of bilingualism would be directly related to the proportion of language information made available.

This simple relationship must be qualified due to several theoretical and empirical considerations. Edelman (1967) reports the differential use of Spanish and English vocabulary in Puerto Rican children on a word naming task as a function of the different contexts (school, home neighborhood, church) the children were asked to describe. Skrabanek (1970)

in a study of Spanish maintenance among Mexican Americans, found that the use of Spanish differed as a function of the age of the speaker. Older subjects spoke more often in Spanish although both young and old alike used Spanish a substantial proportion of the time. Kuo (1974) reports the differential use of language by Chinese American children was related to age and other socialization variables.

These data have specific implications for the earlier formulation of an input analysis. That is, linguistic input may differ for each language across both physical and social settings. Of course, the qualitative nature of the input may also differ (the phonetic, morphological, syntactic and semantic characteristics). This variability of input may predictably influence bilingual development. For instance, Harris and Hassemer (1972) found that complexity (in terms of length of sentence) of Spanish and English syntax usage for bilingual children was affected by direct Spanish and English models exemplifying differential levels of syntactic complexity. Recent sociolinguistic formulations of bilingual use, especially the consideration of codeswitching (the alternating use of more than one language by the bilingual), further elucidate the importance of considering more than the simple notion of linguistic input. Zentella (1978) in a study of Puerto Rican children's use of language switching reports that the eight year-old children studied already were proficient in using switched utterances to provide emphasis and elaboration. Lindholm and Padilla (1979) have reported similar findings for three and four year-old bilingual Mexican American children.

Useful accounts of early childhood bilingualism must, therefore, take into consideration more than the child's linguistic ability. They must consider the child's surrounding environment. The environmental context will determine:

1. the specific linguistic and meta-linguistic information important for the development of each language.
2. the specific social language use rules for each language.
3. the specific linguistic and sociolinguistic rules governing codeswitching.
4. prestige of the language, and, therefore, the "motivation" to learn-maintain, or ignore-dissipate languages differentially.

This form of analysis is one of the most needed within the bilingual arena. It is also one which holds much promise in providing information drawn directly from bilingual acquisition but of direct importance to the understanding of language acquisition in general. For as McNeil (1966) has previously indicated, differential development of specific language features in the course of bilingual acquisition may very well signal important relationships between that differential development and socio-cultural variables.

INTELLIGENCE, COGNITION, AND BILINGUALISM

Social input and linguistic output have been discussed as they are related to bilingual acquisition in early childhood. Left unattended, however, has been the cognitive processes related to this same issue. Based on information relating childhood bilingualism to decreased

performance on standardized tests of intelligence, a causal statement linking bilingualism to depressed intelligence is tempting. Although this pervasive negative relationship characterizes much early work (Darcy, 1953), the methodological problems of studies investigating this type of relationship are serious and any conclusions concerning bilingualism and intellectual functioning (as measured by standardized individual or group intelligence tests) are extremely tentative in nature (Darcy, 1963).

With the general shift away from standardized measures of intelligence, the information processing of bilingual children as it is related to specific areas of cognitive development has received attention. Leopold (1939) in one of the first investigations of bilingual acquisition with young children reported a general cognitive plasticity for his young bilingual subject. He suggested that linguistic flexibility (in the form of bilingualism) generalized to non-linguistic, cognitive tasks, Peal and Lambert (1962) in a summarization of their work with French/English bilinguals and English monolinguals suggested that the intellectual experience of acquiring two languages contributed to an advantageous mental flexibility, superior concept formation, and, a generally diversified set of mental abilities. Padilla (1977) reasoned that bilinguals must be cognitively advanced because they are able to process information in more than one language. Additionally, many bilinguals are capable of receiving information in one language, process that information, and produce allied information in another language. (I refer here to the ability of a child to understand a problem statement

in one language, solve that problem, and produce the answer in a second language). For example, Keats and Keats (1974) report a study in which German/English bilinguals who did not exemplify weight conservation were trained to conserve in one of the two languages. Results from English and German post-tests indicated that the concept was acquired in both languages. This suggests the possible increased flexibility of bilinguals during conceptual acquisition.

Feldman and Shen (1972), Ianco-Worall (1972), Carringer (1974), and Cummins and Glatson (1975) have begun to provide relevant evidence. Feldman and Shen (1973) report differential responding between Spanish/English bilinguals and English monolinguals across three separate cognitive tasks. The first, an object constancy task, required subjects to identify an object (a cup) after its shape had been altered (smashed) in their presence. The second, a nonsense labeling and switched-name task, required subjects to label familiar items with either nonsense words ("wug") or to switch the names of these familiar items (label a cup a "glass" and vice versa). The third, an associative sentence task, required subjects to use familiar, nonsense and switched labels (of the second task) in a sentence describing a relation between the labeled items ("the wug is on the plate"). Results indicated significantly increased cognitive flexibility for bilinguals. Ianco-Worral (1972) compared matched bilinguals (Afrikanos/English) and monolingual (either Africans or English) on separation of word-sound, word-meaning tasks. Comparison of scores on these tasks indicated that bilinguals concentrated more on attaching meaning to words rather than sounds.

In an attempt to identify more specifically the relationship between cognition and bilingualism, Cummins (1979) has proposed an interactive theoretical proposition: that children who achieve "balance proficiency" in two languages are advantaged cognitively in comparison with monolingual children, and, that children who do not achieve balance proficiency in two languages (but who are immersed in a bilingual environment) are cognitively disadvantaged in comparison to monolingual and balanced proficient bilinguals. This formulation presents most directly the shift away from a disadvantaged perspective (Darcy, 1953, 1963) to an advantaged perspective while at the same time continuing to consider the potential negative influence of bilingualism (unbalanced). This interactionist position attempts to account for the success of Canadian French immersion bilingual programs for English speaking children and the failure of English immersion programs for Spanish speaking children in the United States.

MacNab (1979) takes issue with this interactionist conceptualization on several grounds. First, the data to support the interactionist position is primarily Canadian. Secondly, this same data has previously been criticized on a more severe subject selection criterion. As MacNab indicates, it is likely that only high achieving and highly intelligent children were selected for inclusion into bilingual education groupings. Therefore, cognitive advantages already existed prior to bilingual "instruction" and most likely contribute to the success of bilingual development, not vice versa. Moreover, successful subjects came from either majority, middle or high socio-economic strata where education

was a premium and learning a second language was openly rewarded. Learning a second language under such conditions is quite different from one dictated by economic depression as well as social and psychological repression of a minority language and culture. In sum, it is not necessary to account for differences in bilingual (balanced or not) and monolingual's cognitive performance on the basis of a cognitive advantaged/disadvantaged conceptualization. Instead, it remains possible that individual differences in intellectual functioning combined with the support/non-support of the social context for acquiring linguistic and academic skills are the factors for any specific differences in bilingual and monolingual performance on cognitive measures.

An additional note of caution is warranted in attempting to make direct causal statements between bilingualism and cognition. Ramirez and Castaneda's work (1974) introduced the potentially strong relationship between specific cultural experiences and cognitive style. In young children, bilingualism and biculturalism are easily confounded. As Price-Williams (1976) asserts, the study of cultural differences as they relate to psychological processes is in its infant stages. It awaits the challenge of the new theoretical, methodological, and technical advancement. Yet, any researcher concerned with the relationship of bilingualism and cognition must be aware of the possible cultural confounds.

In sum, any detailed conclusions concerning the relationship between the bilingual character of children and cognitive functioning must remain tentative. It is the case that:

1. Bilingual children have been found to score both higher and lower than monolingual children on specific and general measures of cognitive development, intelligence and school achievement.
2. "Balanced" bilinguals have outperformed monolinguals and "unbalanced" bilinguals on specific cognitive tasks.
3. Specific hypotheses relating bilingualism to cognitive and intellectual functioning have been advanced (Darcy, 1953, 1963; Cummins, 1979).

Like so much of the data in the bilingual area, this data must be perceived as tentative, and, must be considered as further evidence of the need for more specific research concerning the relationship between language and cognition..

IMPLICATIONS FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

It is almost universally accepted that language and social repertoires have their origins in early childhood years. It seems that almost all the basic linguistic skills (phonology, morphology, syntax) of adult language as well as important personal and social attributes (self-concept, social identity, social interaction styles) are significantly influenced during these years. Consequently, one motive for early educational intervention has been the potential removal of barriers related to the development of these important linguistic, psychological and social attributes. With respect to early childhood programs for

bilinguals, it would be important to recognize the linguistic and cultural character of these children in any such effort. In 1975, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights spoke directly to issues of language diversity and education by stressing the importance of early childhood instruction incorporating the native language of the children it serves. Put directly, the instructional staff must be able to communicate in the child's native language and the instructional curriculum must also significantly reflect the child's native tongue.

When language is recognized as the means for representing thought, and as the vehicle for complex thinking, the importance of allowing children to use and develop the language they know best becomes obvious.

(Commission on Civil Rights, 1975, p.44).

In line with the above recommendation, the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, the Department of Health and Human Services has initiated a national effort to assist local Head Start centers to "implement sound developmental, bilingual-bicultural programs" (Arenas, 1978). In doing so, efforts are underway in four areas: curriculum development, staff training, resource network development, and research and evaluation of curriculum development and implementation efforts. The results of the evaluation of these curriculum development efforts are not yet available but the presence of this overall effort is indicative of the educational relevancy of bilingualism to early childhood. As Williams (1978) has concluded, bilingual education is a natural extension of the maturing of early childhood education and will hold a prominent position in future years.

The bilingual education legislation of 1967-68 began a nationwide trend of great significance. As with many educational trends, this trend has as its impetus social and political forces. It was not a program based on a long history of sound empirical research related to bilingual development and bilingual education. Instead, it was a movement cognizant of a new hope for bilingual populations who had previously been ignored. It was never clear that bilingual education would provide effective educational programming; but it was clear that the "traditional" program was unsuccessful. Some 10-12 years after this initiative, it seems appropriate to at least briefly review this educational endeavor and its relationship to specific and related empirical research which it has directly or indirectly spawned. In doing so, we are cognizant of the investigatory paradox: empirical investigations (research) of applied/educational phenomenon most often generate more "new" questions without providing substantive answers to questions they are meant to address. Research in bilingual education is no exception to this paradox.

General Implications. The seemingly most direct educationally relevant question reflects the general intent of bilingual education programs: Does bilingual education benefit those children it serves to a larger degree than "traditional" educational efforts? This question seems to require answering and seeking that answer has produced a relevant body of research literature. Unfortunately, these studies are first to admit that the number of variables influencing the evaluation of bilingual education are formidable. The diversity of the linguistic

population, curriculum content, teaching models, program resources, quantity and quality of staffing, and degree of community support do not allow any single statement concerning the differential efficacy of bilingual instruction as compared to traditional monolingual instruction possible. This is not to suggest that such evaluative research is unavailable.

Lambert and Tucker (1972) provide one of the few extensive evaluation efforts related to a bilingual education effort. Recall that the program evaluated, "the St. Lambert experiment," involved the total immersion of native English speaking children in an elementary French schooling experience. Although the formal educational program did not incorporate English as an area of curricular importance, these children continued to live in home environments almost totally dominated by English speakers. The evaluation of the program was longitudinal in nature and obtained several measures of the children's progress academically, linguistically, and intellectually, and, compared these with those of children participating in monolingual English and French educational programs who were equated across several relevant indices: (1) age, (2) general intelligence, (3) socioeconomic status, (4) family motivation for academic success.

The effects of the program were overwhelmingly positive. First very few substantive differences between experimental (bilingual) and control (English and French) groups were reported across the multitude of measures obtained. Some differences were observed during the first

one or two years, especially differences between bilinguals and monolingual French groups. But, by the fifth year, no substantive differences in intellectual, academic or linguistic measures were apparent across groups. A later report by Bruck, Lambert and Tucker (1974) on these same groups, after seven years, finds the same pattern of positive results.

It seems difficult to argue with these extremely impressive results. Children who began schooling in a language foreign to their own homes were able to acquire and achieve the same educational objectives in two languages without detrimental effects and within the same temporal period as those children participating in "traditional" monolingual programs. Similar results of programs in Canada have been informally and formally (Barik and Swain, 1975) replicated. Thus, this immersion model has been dopted extensively throughout the French/English speaking provinces of Canada.

Empirical evaluation of bilingual education efforts in this country are not as clear cut. Cohen (1974) reports one of the first detailed description and evaluation of bilingual programs which involve Mexican American children. The analysis concerns two bilingual education programs: The Redwood City Project and the Culver City Project.

Redwood City Project. Redwood City, California is a city with a substantially large population of Mexican Americans. The bilingual education program was not an immersion model. Classes were made up of both Mexican American and Anglo children with the languages of

instruction, Spanish and English. Several academic and linguistic measures indicated the following:

- a. Anglo students were comparable to other Anglo controls in English measures.
- b. Anglo students did poorly on all Spanish measures.
- c. Mexican American students did generally as well as Mexican American controls on English measures.
- d. Mexican American students did better than their controls on Spanish measures.
- e. Anglo students generally outscored Mexican American bilingual and control students on all English measures.

Culver City Project. Culver City is a city within the Los Angeles, California area. This project attempted to replicate procedurally and functionally the impressive results of the Canadian program discussed earlier. Spanish was introduced as the language of instruction in Kindergarten for a group of Anglo, native English speaking children. At first grade, Mexican American, Spanish-speaking children were incorporated into the class. Although this project failed to incorporate appropriate control groups, the following results were reported after first grade between the bilingual immersion group and monolingual English controls:

- a. There was no significant difference between the two groups on measures of English language development and reading.

- b. There was no significant difference between the two groups on measures of quantitative (mathematics) development.

The results of Cohen's Work is not as clear or at least not as comprehensive as that of Lambert. It especially leaves unanswered crucial questions related to the benefits of bilingual education accrued by linguistic minority children, the main target of bilingual education in this country. A more recent report concerning the significance of bilingual education was commissioned and presented to the Congress of the United States. This report purported to evaluate the specific educational influence of bilingual education programming on linguistic minority children. In effect, it purported to directly answer the important question posed earlier as it relates to the thousands of bilingual children who have participated in the federally funded efforts of the last 10-12 years.

The AIR REPORT. In 1974, the Office of Education, Department of Health Education and Welfare, contracted with the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct an evaluation study of major proportion related to the federally funded initiatives in bilingual education. A report of the study design and interim findings which was released in February of 1977 (American Institutes for Research 1977) sent ripples of praise and criticism throughout the educational community. The study took as its subjects a stratified sample of 38 Spanish/English bilingual education sites who were in their fourth or fifth year of federal funding during the 1975-76 academic year. Second through sixth grade classrooms,

inclusive of children, teachers, teacher-aides, administrators and parents were considered as providers of important empirical information in the overall evaluative design. For comparison purposes, each Title VII site was expected to nominate non-Title VII classrooms in the same locale containing students matched, as equally as possible, on ethnic background, linguistic competence and socioeconomic status for inclusion in a two-group pretest/posttest design. However, 18 of these sites were unable to identify matched comparison samples. The final evaluation sample consisted of 11,073 students, in 384 classrooms in 150 schools, in 38 separate sites. Moreover, scores on nationally normed achievement tests were used for academic expectancy comparisons.

This effort produced an abundance of information describing critical features of these federally funded projects. Following is a summary of this report:

1. Although 75% of the participants in the bilingual education programs included in the study were Hispanic, approximately 60% of these students were judged by their teachers as English dominant.
2. Two-thirds of the bilingual teachers and aides reported themselves to be "native-like" Spanish/English bilinguals. Teacher experience in the program was at a minimum of two years with either a bilingual or regular teacher's credential.
3. The average cost per pupil to the bilingual program was \$310 (this was in addition to normal district per-pupil costs).

4. Academic achievement measures indicated:
 - a. Average Fall 1975 to Spring 1976 achievement gains in English Language Arts for Title VII Hispanic students were not superior to those of non-Title VII Hispanic students.
 - b. Title VII Hispanic students who were judged to be Spanish monolingual by their teachers (for test and questionnaire administration purposes) showed no gains in English Language Arts achievement between pretest and posttest with respect to national norms.
 - c. Title VII white non-Hispanic student pretest and posttest means showed that the relative standing of these students on English Language Arts declined slightly between pretest and posttest in four of the five grades included in the study (grades 3, 4, and 5).
 - d. Title VII black student pretest and posttest means showed that the relative standing of these students on English Language Arts national norms stayed the same or increased slightly in three of the six grades included in the study (grades 2, 3, and 4).

- e. Title VII Hispanic students in all grades (2 through 6) performed better than non-Title Hispanic students with respect to the acquisition of computational skills in mathematics.
- f. Relative to national norms, the achievement gains in computational mathematics of Title VII Hispanic students who were judged to be Spanish monolingual by their teachers were greater than expected for all grades in the study.
- g. White non-Hispanic and black students in Title VII classrooms demonstrated positive gains relative to national norms in computational skills in mathematics.
- h. Posttest Spanish Language Arts achievement did exceed that measured by the pretest for Title VII Hispanic students but lack of suitable comparison groups of students did not permit these gains to be uniquely associated with participation in a Title VII project.
- i. In regard to gains in English reading, English vocabulary, and mathematics, several Title VII and non-Title VII classrooms were found to be producing unusually effective results when

compared to the rest of the sample. Thus, while educational procedures found in some Title VII classrooms resulted in such unusual gains, these gains were also found in some non-Title VII classrooms.

- j. Several Title VII classrooms had students who, compared to the rest of the sample, made unusual gains in Spanish reading, vocabulary, and reading comprehension.
- k. No clear trend related to the relative proportion of Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in the classrooms with unusually effective or usually ineffective English reading or mathematics performance was evident. The percent of Hispanic students in classrooms unusually effective in English reading and English vocabulary ranged from 44% to 96%. The percent of Hispanic students in the classrooms unusually ineffective in these academic areas ranged from 30% to 100%. Essentially the same findings were evident with regard to mathematics performance and Spanish reading performance. (Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program, Volume 1, Feb. 1977, pp. VIII-3 to VIII-5).

Any project of such magnitude, that attempts to empirically evaluate the effect of a particular educational intervention is clearly in the best interest of the children it serves. However, methodological critiques, secondary analyses of the data, and questions concerning the utility of the statistical analyses of these data have been raised. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, 1977; IDRA, 1977; O'Mally, 1977). Moreover, issues about the utility of conducting large scale samplings in evaluation of bilingual education efforts and the methods in which experimental demonstration efforts were implemented have been questioned. The major concerns addressed by IDRA are listed below:

1. Language classifications were done by teachers in spite of the facts that one-half of the teachers did not speak any language other than English and that research indicates teacher judgement to be an unreliable indicator of student language characteristics.
2. Only students who spoke no English whatsoever were classified as "limited English Speaking".
3. District Title VII personnel were allowed to nominate groups to be used for comparisons from classrooms outside of their own. Differences between school districts, such as, organization, teaching methodologies, teacher training, teacher qualifications and competence, and varying financial resources were not controlled for.
4. About one-third of the non-Title VII teachers and aides were involved in a bilingual program. In view of the AIR data, this suggests that perhaps bilingual program children do better in state or locally

funded programs than in Title VII programs.

5. Eighteen out of thirty-seven projects were unable to find a comparison site.
6. Measures of English reading ability were obtained by the use of an English language achievement test given to Spanish monolinguals who were, "just learning to read and write in English."
7. Air used total Reading scores although a large number of these Spanish monolinguals did not take the reading subtests. Consequently, the overall reading scores were lowered for this entire sample.
8. Instructional time, content and teaching methodologies varied considerably and this variation was not controlled for.
9. Only 26% of the teachers reported having a bilingual teaching credential, which is the minimum criteria for adequate teaching determined by many states.
10. IDRA analyses of Title VII bilingual inservice training revealed that, in the five year span prior to the study: 6.6% of the teachers received no training; and, possibly, as many as 46% of the teachers received less than 3 days of training in the implementation of this new and different instructional methodology.
11. 49.6% of the Title VII bilingual program teachers admitted to not being proficient in the other language.
12. Cost analyses, per se, were not performed. Instead, subjective responses were collected from "cognizant local personnel", ignoring developmental vs. operational costs, first year vs. continuation

program costs, etc. (The AIR evaluation of the impact of Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual education programs: An IDRA response, June, 1977, pp. ii,iii,iv).

Other concerns raised in the Congressional Hearings (1977) and by O'Mally (1979) focus on evidence in the AIR study which suggests that the comparison groups were not equivalent at the outset, and, probably less so (due to differential attrition) at the end of the evaluation.

Unfortunately, this evaluation fails to resolve the critical question: Is bilingual education an intervention of benefit to language minority children? The failure of the evaluation to control for qualitative aspects of bilingual and traditional program efforts is a weakness which precludes clear, decisive answers to this question. Instead, the evaluation poses many more questions than it answers: Were projects administered poorly? To what extent were teachers "qualified" to implement and support program initiatives? How was the diversity of curriculum models so prevalent in bilingual education controlled for? How was the adequacy of curricular implementation controlled in such comparisons? Why so much variability in academic results across the programs studied?

Therefore, although this major evaluation effort has attempted a comprehensive and critical look at bilingual education in general, it in no way provides the answers to the specific questions of critical concern. Most disappointing, it failed to assess the influence of bilingual education in early childhood (ages 2-6), a crucial time for the acquisition of linguistic and cognitive repertoires so significant in later educational achievement.

To conclude at this time that bilingual education programs do not differ significantly from "traditional" English language education programming in achieving academic objectives for linguistically minority children would be a gross error. In fact, attempting to answer such a question seems educationally inappropriate. Given the language in the education of these children, the crucial question is, "What form of bilingual instruction will significantly influence the education of the bilingual or potentially bilingual student."

A recent report by the Carnegie Corporation of New York (Pifer, 1979) assessing the relationship of bilingual instructional strategies specific to Hispanic populations of the United States concluded:

"Whatever happens, the fact remains that at least 1.75 million Hispanic children have limited proficiency in English and need some form of special language assistance before they can fully participate in the educational system. Since neither quick submersion in regular classes nor ESL alone has worked well with children from low income, non-English speaking backgrounds, teaching such youngsters in their first language while they are learning English would appear a sensible alternative."

(Pifer, 1980, pp. 14-15)

In a recent review of selected bilingual education program data, Troike (1981) readdresses program evaluation concerns and the results of more recent bilingual education program evaluations. Specifically, he reports positive academic achievement results for bilingual education students compared to similar "regular" program students in several U.S. contexts which varied across languages of instruction (Spanish/English, French/English, Chinese/English, and, Navajo/English). Unfortunately, even such positive results are subject to the same criticism of impreciseness which has underscored those evaluations which purport to evidence negative results (AIR, 1977).

Not until ambiguous teacher, administrative and curricular variables are sufficiently defined and subjected to analysis will the answer to this question be possible. What seems clear-cut in the evaluation of a decade of bilingual education is that bilingual education is here to stay. Its future is not linked to its comparative evaluation to traditional programming. Instead, evaluations of bilingual programs must identify the specific character of the programs which succeed, acknowledging the diversity of languages, culture, curriculum, personnel and community support which specifically define any bilingual education effort. Such evaluative enterprises must go beyond a pre-post assessment mentality. They must assess qualitative aspects of programmatic and community features using ethnographic and other socio-cultural observational techniques. In essence, the relationship between the implementation of experimental demonstrations and evaluation efforts in bilingual education

must be closely managed and monitored to ensure that independent variables are well defined and functioning within these definitional parameters before the factorially defined dependent variables (Winer, 1971) of process/implementation and impact are constructed and introduced. The intended efforts of bilingual program demonstrations (i.e., replicability) and their evaluation (empirical assessment and generalizability) will not be achieved in elementary and other educational programs until this goal is achieved.

Specific Implications

Teaching/Learning Strategies. It is always difficult to extract from a body of research literature specific implications for an applied teaching technology. The character of controlled research environments, the uncharacteristic control of intervening variables, and the starchiness of independent variable intervention often precludes generalization of findings to "real" classrooms. Yet, within these stodgy environments of controlled experimentation and observation, information potentially of relevance to bilingual classrooms had emerged. McLaughlin's (1978) review of such research led him to conclude that many misconceptions are prevalent with respect to second language and bilingual acquisition in early childhood:

1. The young child acquires a language more quickly and easily than an adult because the child is biologically programmed to acquire languages, whereas, the adult is not.
2. The younger the child, the more skilled in acquiring a second language.

3. Second language acquisition is a qualitatively different process than first language acquisition.
4. Interference between first and second language is an inevitable and ubiquitous part of second language acquisition.
5. There is a single method of second language instruction that is most effective with all children.
6. The experience of bilingualism negatively (or positively) affects the child's intellectual development, language skills, educational attainment, emotional adjustment and/or cognitive functioning.
(McLaughlin, 1978, pp. 197-205).

McLaughlin is not admitting total ignorance in concluding that the above propositions are false. Instead, he is following the strategy of any "good" scientist: propositions which are extracted from empirical observation and experimentation are to be handled with extreme caution and doubt. It is possible that some or all of the above propositions are true, but to claim their truth at a time when supportive evidence is unavailable is unwarranted and clearly not in the best interest of future research and the applied technology of education.

Is it possible to answer any bilingual education concerns? With the above issue of caution in mind, there are some questions specifically related to bilingual education and bilingual research which deserve discussion.

Will bilingual education efforts in early childhood negatively effect children's linguistic and cognitive development? Given the

data discussed previously, it seems clear that exposure to two language systems and subsequent proficiency in these two languages does not retard linguistic or cognitive development. That is, children who were operating at complex levels in Spanish were not "retarded" in English as compared to other "matched" monolingual English speaking children. Moreover, bilingual preschool children did not score lower on measures of cognitive development than their "matched" monolingual English peers. Therefore, a bilingual experience in early childhood alone does not necessarily retard linguistic or cognitive development. Unfortunately, important questions still remain:

1. How are differences in the qualitative nature of the bilingual experience related to linguistic and cognitive development?
2. How are cognitive process variables related to bilingual development?

Do bilingual education efforts in early childhood positively effect linguistic and cognitive development? Although there is evidence for the lack of negative effects of bilingual acquisition on general linguistic development, there is no evidence of advanced linguistic development for bilinguals when compared to "matched" monolinguals. That is, there is no report of bilingual subjects increased proficiency in either language as compared to native monolingual speakers of either language. Cognitively, there is evidence that bilinguals score sig-

nificantly higher on several cognitive measures than "matched" monolingual peers. These measures tend to be those reflecting the ability to consider properties of the environment in a more "flexible" manner: to construct more general semantic categories than monolingual peers. Critical questions remain, however:

1. Are these advantages related to bilingualism or other (potentially cultural) variables associated with bilingualism?
2. Are these advantages related to proficiency levels of bilingualism?
3. Are these advantages related to the specific languages involved and specific cognitive measures (tasks)?

Should bilingual education efforts be immersion, transition, or maintenance? It seems evident from the foregoing review that many critical issues related to bilingual development and the education of bilingual students remain unresolved. Contradictory research findings have emerged regarding the qualitative nature of bilingual development, although this form of research is not new. Moreover, cognitive correlates of bilingualism have only recently begun to receive systematic attention at the empirical level. Formal evaluations of bilingual instruction models have proven to be a difficult and often disappointing enterprise. Only the Canadian bilingual French/English programs have provided thorough and comprehensive evaluation information. Unfortu-

nately, due to critical ethnolinguistic, socio-economic and socio-political differences regarding the context of the Canadian programs, the results of those evaluations are impossible to relate to ongoing bilingual education programs for minority ethnolinguistic groups of the United States.

Besides reemphasizing the need for more and better basic and .. applied research in the area of bilingualism and bilingual instruction, what recommendations regarding instructional procedures for the education of bilingual students might be made? First, the previous discussion of research has emphasized the interaction of linguistic, cognitive, and social domains. That is, bilingual children must be perceived as developing linguistic, social and cognitive attributes interdependently. Therefore, a bilingual child brings to the schooling environment (1) two linguistic systems, (2) the history of immersion within a complex social milieu utilizing those two systems (3) at a time when cognitive and academic growth is most influenced by the social milieu. It seems reasonable to suggest that it is these differential social milieus which have produced the discrepancies in research outcomes discussed previously. And, since the classroom is a systematic extension of these social/interaction patterns, it will either serve to enhance or impede continued linguistic, social and cognitive development.

How might the classroom serve to enhance that development? Linguistic ability is the first key variable, although it alone is not of independent importance. Recall that bilinguals possess diverse linguistic functioning repertoires: (1) The child may be more proficient in L_1 than L_2 the (Dominant L_1 Child); (2) The child may be equally proficient in L_1 and L_2 the (Balanced Bilingual Child); and (3) The child may be more proficient in L_2 than L_1 (the Dominant English Child). Proficiency here is meant to take into consideration the broader definition of communicative competence rather than standard "morphological and syntactic" competence. If effective instruction is to take place in the classroom, communication between student and teacher must be maximized. Most directly, this mandates instruction in the child's dominant language. Where English is not the student's dominant language, academic instruction should not reflect an English emphasis. Should English be taught at all in this circumstance? In almost all regions of the country, English "pervades" the child's natural social and educational environment. The physical presence and the psychological weight of such a presence "impels" English development. Therefore, although some English as a Second language (ESL) instruction may be beneficial, it is unlikely for a child immersed in such an English environment not to become proficient in this language. Of course, this acquisition will take time. But, by moving forward with academic instruction in the child's dominant language, no academic/cognitive retardation is likely to result.

The balanced bilingual presents a different educational challenge.

This student is exceptional and should be considered gifted. Therefore, instruction for this child should reflect this exceptionality. Instruction should emphasize both languages wherever possible. Ten years ago bilingual instruction for balanced bilinguals would have been almost impossible. With the development of bilingual materials and the training of bilingual personnel within the last decade, it is not only possible but educationally desirable to maintain and further extend the child's bilingual competency.

For the unbalanced, English dominant student, instruction should reflect this English proficiency. This is not to suggest that bilingual instruction for these students should be unavailable. These children bring with them their ethnolinguistic status to the English curriculum. It is important psychologically, not to negate this ethnolinguistic consciousness. Bilingual instruction should emphasize the inseparable nature of culture and language, with some systematic L₂-as-a-second-language instruction. The goal of this form of instructional model would not be to produce proficient bilinguals, but instead, to explore culturally and linguistically the ethnolinguistic heritage of the student in order to maximize the educational influence of the classroom.

Recall that the above commentary regarding classroom policy is based on a scarcity of sound empirical research. But, it is consistent with the present knowledge base regarding multilingual acquisition. The commentary is made in regard to early schooling years, a time of critical importance for establishing effective instructional programming.

This is especially true for children from ethnolinguistic minority groups where educational history has been pervaded by educational neglect and failure. Bilingual instruction in its various forms holds for these children a promise for educational parity.

References

- American Institutes for Research. Evaluation of the impact of the ESEA, Title VII Spanish/English Education Program. Volume I: Study Design and Interim Findings. Palo Alto, CA.: American Institutes for Research, 1977.
- Arenas, S. Bilingual/bicultural programs for preschool children. Children Today, 1978, July/Aug., 43-48.
- Bell, T. H. Letter to the recipients of the report of the National Council on Bilingual Education, Nov. 1, 1975.
- Barik, H. C., and Swain, M. Three-year evaluation of a language scale early grade French immersion program: The Ottawa Study. Language Learning, 1975, 25, 1-30.
- Bowerman, M. Crosslinguistic similarities at two stages of syntactic development. In E. Lenneberg and E. Lenneberg, Foundations of Language Development. London: UNESCO Press, 1975.
- Brown, R. A. A first language: The early stages. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Braine, M.D.S. Children's first word combination. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1976.
- Bruck, M., Lambert, W. E., and Tucker, G. R. Bilingual schooling through the elementary grades: The St. Lambert project at grade seven. Language Learning, 1974, 34, 183-204.
- Carrow, E. Comprehension of English and Spanish by preschool Mexican-American children. Modern Language Journal, 1971, 55, 299-306.
- Carrow, E. Auditory comprehension of English by monolingual and bilingual preschool children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 1972, 15, 407-457.

- Carter, T. Mexican Americans in school: A history of educational neglect.
New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.
- Cohen, A. D. The Culver City Spanish immersion project: The first two years. Modern Language Journal, 1974, 57, 58, 95-103.
- Cota, R. E. Personal statement of the chairperson. In Bilingual education: Quality education for all children. Annual report of the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education. Washington, D. C.: J. A. Reyer Associates, 1975, 1.
- Cummins, J. Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49 222-251.
- DeAvila, E., and Duncan, S. Bilingualism and cognition: Some recent findings. NABE Journal, 1979, IV, 15-50.
- DeVilliers, J. and DeVilliers, P. Language Acquisition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Dulay, H. C., and Burt, M. N. Natural sequence in child second language acquisition. Language Learning, 1974, 24, 37-53.
- Dulay, H. C., and Burt, M. K. Goofing: An Indication of children's second language learning strategies. Language Learning, 1972, 22, 235-252.
- Epstein, N. Language, ethnicity and the schools: Policy alternative for bilingual-bicultural education. Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University Institute for Educational Leadership, 1977.
- Epstein, N. The bilingual battle. Washington Post, 1977, June 5, C1.
- Fishman, S. A., and Lovaas, S. Bilingual education in sociolinguistic perspective. TESOL Quarterly, 1970, 4, 215-22.

- Garcia, E. Early Childhood Bilingualism. Albuquerque, NM.: University of New Mexico Press, 1982 (in press).
- Garcia, E., Maez, L. and Gonzalez, G. A National study of Spanish/English Bilingualism in Young Hispanic children of the United States. Bilingual Education Paper Series, 1981, 4, 1-37.
- Geissler, H. Zweisprachigkeit Deutscher Kinder im Ausland. Stuttgart: Kohlhammas, 1938.
- Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Part 3: Bilingual Education, June 7, 8 and 9, 1977.
- Huerta, A. The development of codeswitching in a young bilingual. Working Papers in Sociolinguistics, No. 21, June 1977.
- Intercultural Development Research Associates, The AIR Evaluation of the Impact of Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Programs: An IDRA Response, San Antonio, Texas, 1977.
- Interstate Research Associates: Mexican American Systems. Program evaluation of day-care centers in the Southwestern United States. Denver, Colorado: Interstate Research Associates, 1972.
- Lenneberg, E. and Lenneberg, E. Foundations of language development, Vol. I and Vol. II. London: The UNESCO Press, 1975.
- Leopold, W. F. Speech development of a bilingual child: A linguist's record, Vol. I, Vocabulary growth in the first two years. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1939.

- Leopold, W. F. Speech development of a bilingual child: A linguist's record. Vol. II, Sound learning in the first two years. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1949(a).
- Leopold, W. F. Speech development of a bilingual child: A linguist's record, Vol. III, Grammers and general problems in the first two years. Evanston, ILL.: Northwestern University Press, 1949(a).
- Lindholm, K. J. and Padilla, A. M. Child Bilingualism: A re-analysis of studies. Linguistics, 1979, 17, 231-255.
- McLaughlin, B. Second language acouisation in childhood. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1978.
- McLaughlin, B. Second language learning in children. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978.
- O'Mally, M. J. Review of the evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English bilingual education program, 197, 6-10.
- Pacheco, M. T. Approaches to bilingualism: Recognition of a multi-lingual society. In D. C. Lange (Ed.), Pluralism in foreign language education. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook, Inc., 1973.
- Padilla, A. and Liebman, E. Language acquisition in the bilingual child. The bilingual review/La revista bilinque, 1975, 2, 34-55.
- Pavlovitch, M. Le langage enfantin: Acquisition du serbe et du francais par un enfant serve. Paris: Champion, 1920.
- Pifer, A. Bilingual education and the Hispanic challenge. 1979 Annual Report. Carnegie Corporation of New York. New York: Carnegie Corp. of New York, 1980.

Mexican American Studies & Research Center

<http://masrc.arizona.edu>

WORKING PAPER SERIES



The goal of the MASRC Working Paper Series is to disseminate research on the Mexican American experience. Scholars from the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Public Policy fields, and the Humanities are encouraged to submit manuscripts. Areas of particular interest include the Mexican immigrant experience in the United States, History, Minority Economic Participation, and Public Health.

- No. 1: Bilingual Development and the Education of Bilingual Children During Early Childhood. Eugene García and Steve Martínez, 1981.
- No. 2: The Border Patrol and News Media Coverage of Undocumented Mexican Immigrants During the 1970s: A Quantitative Content Analysis in the Sociology of Knowledge. Celestino Fernández and Lawrence R. Pedroza, 1981.
- No. 3: The Evolution of Higher Education in Mexico: A Profile. Martín M. Ahumada, 1982.
- No. 4: Reformation of Arizona's Bilingual Education Policy: Litigation or Legislation? Michael D. Sacken, 1983.
- No. 5: Hispanic Youth in the Labor Market: An Analysis of "High School and Beyond." Roberto M. Fernández, 1985.
- No. 6: Selections from *De la Vida y del Folclore de la Frontera*. Miguel Méndez, 1986.
- No. 7: Entrepreneurship and Business Development: The Case of Mexican Americans. David L. Torres, 1986.
- No. 8: Mexican American Youth Organization: Precursors of Change in Texas. Ignacio García, 1987.
- No. 9: Determinants of Involuntary Part-Time Work Among Chicanos. Roberto M. De Anda, 1987.
- No. 10: Dilemmas of the High Achieving Chicana: The Double-Bind Factor in Male/Female Relationships. Judith T. González, 1987.
- No. 11: Chicano Urban Politics: The Role of the Political Entrepreneur. David E. Camacho, 1987.
- No. 12: Mexicanos and Chicanos: Examining Political Involvement and Interface in the U.S. Political System. John A. García, 1987.
- No. 13: Phenotypic Discrimination and Income Differences Among Mexican Americans. Edward E. Telles and Edward Murguía, 1988.
- No. 14: Hispanic Business in Tucson Since 1854. Melissa Amado, 1988.
- No. 15: An Exploratory Study of Bi-National News in Mexican and American Border Area Newspapers, 1977 to 1988. Thomas Gelsinon, 1990.
- No. 16: *Tierra No Mas Incógnita: The Atlas of Mexican American History*. Antonio Ríos-Bustamante, 1990.

- No. 17: *El Orgullo De Ser: Mexican American/Latino Applied History Programs, Exhibitions and Museums.* Antonio Ríos-Bustamante, 1990.
- No. 18: *Motivators for Colon Cancer Prevention Among Elderly Mexican Americans.* Judith T. González, 1990.
- No. 19: *Predictors of Breast Self-Examination Among Mexican American Women: A Path Analytic Model.* Judith T. González, 1990.
- No. 20: *U.S. Immigration Authorities and Victims of Human and Civil Rights Abuses: The Border Interaction Project Study of South Tucson, Arizona, and South Texas.* Robert E. Koulis, Manuel Escobedo, Raquel Rubio-Goldsmith, and John Robert Warren, 1994.
- No. 21: *National Origin Based Variations of Latino Voter Turnout in 1988: Findings from the Latino National Political Survey.* John R. Arvizu, 1994.
- No. 22: *Selections from A Frontier Documentary: Mexican Tucson, 1821-1846.* Kieran McCarty, 1994.
- No. 23: *Utilizing the Informal Economy: The Case of Chicago's Maxwell Street Market.* Steven Balkin, Alfonso Morales, and Joseph Persky, 1994.
- No. 24: *José Rangel Cantú: South Texas' Fiery Radio Warrior.* Carlos Larralde, 1995.
- No. 25: *Beyond Access to Health Care: Institutional and Cultural Barriers Experienced by Mexican Americans in a Southwestern Community.* Antonio L. Estrada, 1996.
- No. 26: *The Education of Immigrant Children: The Impact of Age at Arrival.* Arturo González, 1998.
- No. 27: *Mexican American Women and Social Change: The Founding of the Community Service Organization in Los Angeles, An Oral History.* Linda M. Apodaca, 1999.
- No. 28: *The Influence of Cultural Values On Self-Efficacy in Reducing HIV Risk Behaviors.* Antonio L. Estrada, Barbara D. Estrada, and Gilbert Quintero, 1999.
- No. 29: *LULAC and Veterans Organize for Civil Rights in Tempe and Phoenix, 1940-1947.* Christine Marín, 2001.
- No. 30: *Of Information Highways and Toxic Byways: Women and Environmental Protest in a Northern Mexican City.* Anna Ochoa O'Leary, 2002.
- No. 31: *Social Exchange Practices among Mexican-Origin Women in Nogales, Arizona: Prospects for Education Acquisition.* Anna Ochoa O'Leary, 2004.
- No. 32: *Flexible Labor and Underinvestment in Women's Education on the U.S-Mexico Border.* Anna Ochoa O'Leary, Gloria Ciria Valdez-Gardea, and Norma González, 2005.
- No. 33: *Viva Emiliano Zapata! Viva Benito Juárez! Helping Mexican and Chicano Middle School Students Develop a Chicano Consciousness via Critical Pedagogy and Latino/Latina Critical Race Theory.* Martha Casas, 2006.
- No. 34: *Mujeres en el Cruce: Mapping Family Separation/Reunification at a Time of Border (In)Security.* Anna Ochoa O'Leary, 2007.