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INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Problem

The Michigan Legislature, through its enactment of Public Act 294, 1974 has mandated bilingual instruction for students of limited English-speaking ability (L.E.S.A.). Any local school district enrolling a minimum of twenty students of limited English-speaking ability (of the same language classification) in grades K-12 is required to establish a full-time bilingual education program for these students (Public Act 294, 1974).

Since the passage of Public Act 294, the State of Michigan has made progress in serving students of limited English-speaking ability. A review of this progress illustrates that in the 1975-76 school year, 12,689 L.E.S.A. students were identified. However, the number of L.E.S.A. students served was unknown. In the 1976-77 school year, 18,288 L.E.S.A. students were identified and 10,692 of these students were provided bilingual instruction. In the 1977-78 school year, 31,709 L.E.S.A. students were identified and 19,089 were served (see Table I) (M.D.E., B.E.O., Fall, 1978). Of the figures presented in Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L.E.S.A. Students Identified and Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.E.S.A. Students Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.E.S.A. Students Served</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I, the largest language classification group (L.C.G.) identified was Spanish, which constituted 60% of the total L.E.S.A. students.

The second largest L.C.G. was Arabic, which constituted 10% of the total L.E.S.A. students (M.E.D., B.E.O., Fall, 1978).

In his State of the State Message and Executive Budget Recommendations to the Legislature in 1978, Governor William G. Milliken declared that (M.D.E., B.E.O., Fall, 1978):

Bilingual education in Michigan has improved in the past few years. Since it was mandated by Public Act 294 in 1974, the number of local education programs has grown from 14 to more than 60. These programs serve nearly 19,000 students.

Bilingual education is a high priority and I will continue my support.

In his budget recommendations, Governor Milliken recommended that funding for bilingual education programs be increased from the $3 million allocated in 1977-78 to $4 million allocated in 1978-79.

Through the assistance of the Bilingual Education Office (B.E.O.) at the state level, Michigan school districts demonstrated dramatic growth in bilingual programming from 1975 to the present. Another factor responsible for the growth of bilingual programming in Michigan was the increase in state aid for these programs. As a result, the 14 districts which provided bilingual instruction in 1975-76 (primarily under federal funding) grew to 57 in 1976-77 and 65 in 1977-78 due to the addition of state appropriations to the previous federal funding available. The language classification groups served also grew from 2 in 1975-76, to 13 in 1976-77, to 23 in 1977-78 (see Table II).
Table II

L.E.S.A. Students and L.C.G.'s Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975-76</th>
<th>1976-77</th>
<th>1977-78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Districts Serving L.E.S.A. Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Classification Groups Served</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 31,709 L.E.S.A. students identified in 1977-78 (see Table I), only 21,601 of these students were identified in school districts which were mandated by Public Act 294 to establish bilingual education programs. Thus, only 21,601 L.E.S.A. students were identified in school districts which had 20 or more L.E.S.A. students in the same language classification group. Of these 21,601 L.E.S.A. students, 19,089 were served. Thus, twelve percent or 2,512 L.E.S.A. students in a language classification group of twenty or more were not served. Although these children were enrolled primarily in districts which operated bilingual programs, these programs did not serve all the eligible students. However, the percentage of L.E.S.A. students served has increased from 72% in 1976-77 to 88% in 1977-78, and school districts are expected to serve even more eligible students as they improve their resources and expertise. In addition, the number of L.E.S.A. students identified in Table I represented both school districts with twenty or more L.E.S.A. students in a particular L.C.G. and districts with less than twenty. Table II also included both types of school districts serving L.E.S.A. students (M.D.E., B.E.O., Fall, 1978).

Essential to the quality and success of bilingual education in
Michigan is the availability of teachers trained in bilingual instruction as well as in the traditional teacher-training methodologies. Currently, there is a shortage of trained bilingual education teachers. These certified teachers with bilingual endorsements numbered only 84 in 1977-78 as reported by their employing districts. A total of 207 teachers without bilingual endorsements were issued State Teaching Permits in 1977-78 as a temporary solution to the lack of trained bilingual education teachers. Through these permits, these teachers were able to provide bilingual instruction while simultaneously pursuing the necessary course work to meet the requirements for a bilingual education endorsement to their previously acquired teaching certificate. In addition, 330 bilingual teacher aides and para-professionals comprised the instructional force for bilingual education (M.D.E., B.E.O., Fall, 1978).

The Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education projects the number of endorsed bilingual education teachers necessary to serve the L.E.S.A. students in Michigan at approximately 1,208. This figure was computed at the average State of Michigan ratio of one teacher per 23.7 students. However, subtracting the 84 endorsed bilingual education teachers who were available in 1977 from the 1,208 teachers who were identified as necessary to provide bilingual instruction for all the L.E.S.A. students in Michigan, the deficit of 1,124 bilingual education teachers becomes readily apparent (M.D.E., B.E.O., November, 1977).

Currently, fifteen institutions of higher education have been approved by the State Board of Education to offer programs leading
to bilingual education endorsement. However, the 1,124 teacher deficit dramatically indicates the immediate need to train more bilingual education teachers. Thus, the current bilingual education teacher-training programs in Michigan need to be expanded in order to train the large number of teachers needed to offer bilingual instruction for all the L.E.S.A. students in Michigan (M.D.E., B.E.O., November, 1977).

Bilingual teachers, in accordance with P.A. 294, are required to receive specialized training if they are to teach in Michigan's public schools. This act assigns to the State Board of Education certain responsibilities to ensure that bilingual teachers receive this specialized training:

Section 395 (2) of Public Act (P.A.) 294 states: Exercising its authority under section 10 of Act No. 287 of Public Acts of 1964, being section 388.1010 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, the state board of education shall promulgate rules governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors in the public schools of this state. The teacher shall meet the requirements of sections 851 and 852 of this act and shall be proficient in both the oral and written skills of the language for which he is endorsed.

Although P.A. 294 mandates that rules be established by the State Board of Education (S.B.E.) governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors, a review of the literature substantiates that guidelines rather than rules have been established. These rules are described in the document entitled, Bilingual Education Teacher Certification, Fall, 1975 (see Appendix B). This document was developed in order to supplement the teacher certification codes which address the certification of all teachers in the
state of Michigan. An assumption was made with the Fall, 1975 docu-
ment which indicated that this document, along with the already exis-
tant Teacher Certification Code, would be sufficient to certify and
endorse bilingual education teachers in the state of Michigan. Sever-
al bilingual education practitioners and concerned citizens disagreed
with this assumption and voiced a strong opposition toward its adoption.
Regardless of this opposition, the State Board of Education adopted
the Fall, 1975 rules. However, as a result of this opposition, an
advisory committee to the State Board of Education, La Raza Citizens'
Advisory Committee, reviewed the Fall, 1975 guidelines and the Teacher
Certification Code and arrived at the conclusion that these two docu-
ments were not adequate to certify and endorse bilingual education
teachers and that rules designed to specifically address the area
of bilingual teacher-training be developed. Consequently, the Biling-
gual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education along
with various teachers, administrators, parents, and the La Raza Citizi-
ens' Advisory Committee and the Bilingual Education Advisory Council,
developed a new document entitled, Administrative Rules Governing the
Endorsement of Qualified Bilingual Instructors (see Appendix C). How-
ever, this document has been pending approval by the State Board of
Education for more than two years!

In conclusion, Public Act 294 assigns the State Board of Education
the responsibility to establish rules governing the endorsement of
teachers as qualified bilingual instructors in the public schools
of this state. However, each college and university has the autonomy
to interpret these rules differently and to implement them differently.
Thus, the need to know what the characteristics are of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state arises. This information is essential for planning, evaluation, and conceptual development in the area of bilingual teacher education.

In addition, a limited amount of research seems to be available in regard to bilingual education teacher-training programs in this country, and essentially no research is currently available regarding bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan. Thus, was the purpose of this study, to address this void.

Statement of the Problem

The preceding discussion introduced two questions: What are the characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state of Michigan, and what are the commonalities and differences of these programs?

Conceptual Framework

Bilingual instruction (P.A. 294, 1974) is defined as the use of two languages, one of which is English, as the media of instruction for speaking, reading, writing, or comprehension. Bilingual instruction is an educational procedure using the tools of bilingual education. Bilingual education teacher-training refers to the process by which the teacher acquires the skills necessary for bilingual instruction. Children of limited English-speaking ability (L.E.S.A.) are defined as children who have, or reasonably may be expected to have, difficulty performing ordinary class work in English because their native
tongue (language) is a language other than English or because they come from a home or environment where the primary language used is a language other than English.

Bilingual education programs can be classified according to two broad approaches: (1) maintenance, and (2) transitional. The maintenance type of bilingual education program encourages the improvement of skills in the target language (English) as well as, the enhancement of the primary language. The transitional approach to bilingual education emphasizes solely the improvement of skills in the target language. Both approaches encourage the evolvement of the student through various stages of bilingual instruction, from a L.E.S.A. student in a bilingual classroom to a student who, after acquiring the necessary language skills in the target language to be successful, is able to return to the regular classroom. The primary difference between the two approaches is that the maintenance approach emphasizes competency in two languages, while the transitional emphasizes competency solely in the target language, English. Both approaches are voluntary programs and both are geared primarily to assist the L.E.S.A. student. This information is provided in order to attempt to eliminate the fear and misconception that bilingual instruction programs are compulsory for either L.E.S.A. or non-L.E.S.A. students (see Appendix A).

Definitions of bilingual education vary from state to state. However, there seems to be a general concensus among educators that bilingual education is designed to serve L.E.S.A. students. These students are identified as students who need supplementary instruction in two languages in order to acquire the basic skills taught in school.
This instruction, in part, is provided in the native or primary language of the student. The assumption is that a L.E.S.A. student should not be deprived of the opportunity to learn (during the period necessary to acquire the basic skills in the English language in order for learning to take place) merely because the teacher can communicate only in one language. Learning should be facilitated through the use of the native or primary language simultaneously with the learning of the target language, English.

Bilingual education is sometimes mistakenly referred to as bicultural education. Although the two terms are often used interchangeably, they are by no means synonymous. Bicultural education refers to education resulting from bicultural instruction, which is defined as instruction in the history and culture of the country, territory, or geographic area associated with the language spoken by L.E.S.A. children (P.A. 294, 1974). Bicultural education is strongly recommended as an accompanying component of bilingual education, but it is not mandated by P.A. 294, 1974. The history and culture of the United States is not excluded in bicultural education but is presented with the history and culture of non-English speakers.

This study tends to encourage the clarification and the expansion of knowledge regarding bilingual teacher education. This study will promote further research on bilingual education teacher-training programs in the areas of: relationships among important variables, theory development, evaluations, and comparative analyses of programs. Thus, this study can be considered as the depiction phase of a program of research studies (Guba and Clark, 1967) in that it lays the groundwork for future studies.
Definitions

Bilingual Education - The use of bilingual instruction as the means to assist youngsters to acquire the basic skills provided through elementary and secondary education (P.A. 294, 1974).

Bilingual Instruction - The use of two languages, one of which is English, as the means of instruction in elementary and secondary education. Emphasis is placed in the basic-skills areas of speaking, reading, writing and comprehension with part of the instruction being in the students' native or primary language (P.A. 294, 1974).

Native Language (tongue) - The first language learned by a child, usually the language spoken in the home.

Primary Language - The language an individual is most proficient in regarding the areas of speaking, reading, writing and comprehension.

Students of Limited English-Speaking Ability - Students who have, or reasonably may be expected to have, difficulty performing ordinary classwork in English because their native language is other than English or because they come from a home or environment where the primary language used is other than English (P.A. 294, 1974).

Target Language - The language which is to be taught.

Objectives

The purpose of this study was to develop a description of the bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state of Michigan and to analyze them for commonalities and differences. This study was being conducted as a depiction study in order to increase the knowledge of and expand the comprehension of bilingual education teacher-training programs. Consequently, it would serve as the groundwork for future studies. Through this study and future
studies, it was anticipated that knowledge would increase and misconceptions and apprehension toward bilingual teacher education would lessen.

In an effort to respond to the primary question posed as "the problem" (What are the characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in Michigan, and what commonalities and differences exist?), this study would approach the various facets of "the problem" by answering the following subsidiary questions:

1. What is a descriptive framework that can be used to prepare a standard description of each bilingual teacher education program in Michigan?

2. What are the current program descriptions reported through the use of this framework?

3. Which bilingual education teacher-training programs have similar characteristics?

4. Which have different characteristics?

5. How can the programs with similar characteristics be categorized?

6. How can the programs with different characteristics be categorized?

7. What characteristics, if any, do all these programs have in common?
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents an extensive search of studies and materials related to bilingual education teacher-training programs. These studies and materials are organized in terms of: (1) the history of bilingual education in the United States, (2) a rationale for bilingual education, (3) bilingual education teacher-training programs in the United States, (4) the history of bilingual education in Michigan, and (5) bilingual education teacher-training programs in Michigan.

The History of Bilingual Education in the United States

Bilingual education seems to have been prevalent in the United States during two distinct periods. The first occurred from 1840 to 1920; the second began in 1963 and continued to the present. According to Andersson, a form of bilingual education originated in Cincinnati in 1840. Andersson (1969) stated:

Cincinnati was one of the many communities in which the majority of a large minority of the population was German-speaking German immigrants, arriving in waves during the nineteenth century, who often found our common schools inferior to those they had known in Germany. As a result, they established private and parochial German schools, which for some decades competed successfully with the public schools despite the fact that German parents had to pay tuition as well as school taxes. In this same year (1840) Cincinnati introduced German instruction in the grades as an optional subject and may thus be credited with having initiated bilingual schooling in the United States.

Although bilingual education during this time was considered
necessary, these initial years of bilingual instruction failed to produce an exemplary curriculum model and the necessary leadership to continue these efforts. However, the primary factors preventing the continuation of these initial bilingual programs were the resistance to their presence and the lack of credibility by the non-participants. Andersson (1969) stated:

All too often the bilingual program rested on the political pressure of the German element in a community instead of reflecting a shared conviction by English-speaking and German-speaking alike that all children stood to benefit from instruction in two languages. Frequently, the English-speaking citizens were merely tolerant, not really convinced of the educational benefits of two languages, and willing only if the cost remained moderate. The school board administrators tolerated a program as long as an efficient supervisor relieved them of the necessity of thinking about it. In a word, the bilingual program (often only a language program) was rarely integrated into either the philosophy or the practice of the school or the society. There was no clear resolution of the question of melting-pot versus cultural pluralism. Culture was understood in its elitist sense: involving knowledge of grammar, correctness in language usage, a somewhat exclusive emphasis on literature and the arts.

During the period from 1920 to 1963, bilingual education, which involves instruction in two languages, virtually disappeared. In 1952 however, an interest began to surface regarding foreign language instruction. The U. S. Commissioner of Education, Earl J. McGrath, proposed that an instructional technique referred to as Foreign Language in the Elementary School (F.L.E.S.) be implemented on a voluntary basis in the fourth and fifth grades. F.L.E.S. was to be taught for only ten to twenty minutes a day. Regardless of the time limitation, F.L.E.S. grew in popularity and contributed towards pedagogical advances. Interest in foreign languages was also stimulated through
the assistance of the Army Specialized Training Program of Monterey, California (Andersson, 1969).

In addition, several other factors were beginning to impact simultaneously resulting in a renewed interest in foreign language instruction. Among these factors were: World War II emphasis on the importance of knowing more than one language or a language other than English, the military's insistence on relating the learning of foreign languages to the national interest, the launching of the space ship Sputnik by the Russians, the theoretical and practical contributions of linguistic scientists, and the formation of a collective consciousness by language teachers. All these factors led to the adoption of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. According to Andersson, this act was developed to attempt to remedy some of the defects in our educational system which had been dramatized by World War II (1969).

In 1963, bilingual education once again appeared in the United States. This took place in Coral Way Elementary School, Dade County, Miami, Florida. Supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation, a bilingual education program was initiated in grades 1, 2, and 3. The students enrolled in the program consisted of 50 percent dominant English-speakers and 50 percent dominant Spanish-speaking Cuban children (Andersson, 1969).

The United Consolidated Independent School District in Webb County (near Laredo, Texas) also initiated a locally supported bilingual program in 1964. This program was conducted in all first-grade classes for English-speaking and Spanish-speaking children in this school district.
In 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as Public Law 89-10. This act, as amended by Public Law 90-247, created national legislation for bilingual education. In 1967, Title VII of this law, which became known as the "Bilingual Education Act", was introduced. This bill proposed to remedy the present practices of miseducation of children who had a primary language other than English and appropriated funds for the operation of programs to serve the needs of children with limited English-speaking ability (Andersson, 1969).

On January 2, 1968, President Johnson signed this bill into law as the Bilingual Education Act. The President stated (Andersson, 1969):

Thousands of children of Latin descent, young Indians, and others will get a better start in school...What this law means, is that we are now giving every child in America a better chance to touch his outermost limits - to reach the farthest edge of his talents and his dreams. We have begun a campaign to unlock the full potential of every boy and girl regardless of his race or his religion or his father's income.

On April 13, 1970, the Bilingual Education Act was amended as Public Law 91-230. As amended, it comprised four pages of the Compilation of Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Legislation, printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor. Public Law 91-230 could be summarized into two primary items affecting bilingual education: (1) the provisions of the act itself and (2) the Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees. The revised Bilingual Education Act begins with a Declaration of Policy (Andersson and Boyer, 1970):
In recognition of the special educational needs of large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States, Congress hereby declares it to be policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs. For the purposes of this title, "children of limited English-speaking ability" means children who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English.

Andersson contended that this statement of purpose polarized the positions of the assimilationists and the linguistic and cultural pluralists. Further elaborations on the Declaration of Policy stated:

It is intended that children participating in this program will develop greater competence in English, become more proficient in their dominant language, and profit from increased educational opportunity. Though the Title VII, E.S.E.A. program affirms the primary importance of English, it also recognizes that the use of the children's mother tongue in school can have a beneficial effect upon their education. Instructional use of the mother tongue can help to prevent retardation in school performance until sufficient command of English is attained. Moreover, the development of literacy in the mother tongue as well as in English should result in more broadly educated adults.

The Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees defined bilingual education which was important since the act itself neglected to do this. Because the bilingual education concept is so new and the definition is so general, several conflicting interpretations of this definition developed in the field. This in turn led to a great deal of skepticism, dissension, and confusion. The Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees (1971) defined bilingual education as:

The use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction for the same pupil population in a well-organized program which encompasses
part or all of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue. A complete program develops and maintains the children's self-esteem and a legitimate pride in both cultures.

Although the Bilingual Education Act was signed into law by President Johnson in 1968, it was not funded until 1970. In the first year of funding, 76 programs were initiated out of the 315 proposals received. Included in these 76 programs were 68 programs involving native Spanish-speakers (Andersson, 1972).

In 1974, Public Law 93-380 was signed into law. This law extended and amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by providing funds not only for local bilingual education programs but also for auxiliary and supplementary community activities, adult education programs, preschool programs preparatory and supplementary to bilingual education programs, teacher-training programs, and programs for planning and technical assistance. Section 723 provided for the training of personnel; such as teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, teacher aides, parents and counselors, for the encouraging of reform, innovation, and improvement of graduate education, and also for the recruitment and training of graduate students through fellowships. This federal support of bilingual education generated a significant amount of legislation regarding bilingual education at the state level (Blanco, 1978).

According to Geffert et al. (1975), bilingual education at the state level in 1975 included:

1. 12 states which required the use of English instruction
2. 14 states which made no provision for bilingual education
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16 states which had permissive bilingual education statutes
6 states which had permissive and mandatory statutes
2 states which had mandatory statutes of regulations

In retrospect, the question arises, what led to the enormous support for bilingual education? As mentioned previously, the necessity of knowing more than one language was dramatized by several factors including the Supreme Court decision of 1954 regarding desegregation. However, one of the most significant events which led to the tremendous support for bilingual education by Congress was the landmark decision of Lau vs. Nichols and the recognition that not only segregation but also poverty and linguistic deficiency have been contributing factors to this nation's educational shortcomings.

The Supreme Court of the United States in its landmark decision, Lau vs. Nichols, declared that (Supreme Court of the United States, U. S. Court of Appeals, January 21, 1974):

The failure of the San Francisco school system to provide English language instruction to approximately 1800 students of Chinese ancestry who do not speak English denies them a meaningful opportunity to participate in the public education program and thus violates Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bans discrimination based on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.


The purpose of this document was to determine compliance by schools
and introduce procedures to identify students of limited English-speaking ability. Thus, the curriculum which this federal legislation and this court decision recommended was transitional bilingual education. The bilingual education model which the federal government supported regarded the learning of English as its primary goal and the use of non-English languages as only a necessary and dispensable vehicle. In addition, federal bilingual legislation addressed primarily students of limited English-speaking ability and only made a cursory statement about participation by English dominant or English monolingual children (P.L. 93-380, 1974).

John and Horner (1971) stated that the bilingual education program in Las Cruces, New Mexico was considered as one of the strongest Title VII programs initiated in the early days of bilingual education. John and Horner described this program as having a pre- and in-service teacher-training program developed in cooperation with the New Mexico State University and supervised by an imaginative and committed coordinator. Enrollment as in many new programs was voluntary. In addition, the parents could choose to enroll their children in English-only or bilingual classrooms in the same school. The most outstanding feature of this program was that it ranged from kindergarten to the sixth grade as opposed to many other programs which only included the grades of kindergarten to the third grade.

A study conducted by Professor Douglas Muller (1973) from New Mexico State University illustrated that in the area of academic subjects, such as reading, language, and arithmetic, children in the second and third grades, who had been instructed in English, progressed
much faster than bilingual children. However, by the sixth grade, the opposite was true in that bilingual children "overtook" those instructed in English only. In addition, children educated in bilingual classrooms did better in their academic disciplines (as measured by the California Achievement Test) as well as in their proficiency in the English language and the Spanish language.

Lavallee (1973) stated that the conclusions of the study conducted by Professor Muller added credibility to bilingual education. However, many factors were prevalent in the Las Cruces setting which together resulted in a situation in which children's gains could be effectively measured by standardized tests. Similar findings may not emerge in other settings due to the absence of one or more of these factors or the conditions may not lend themselves to effective measurement by standardized tests. John and Souberman (1977) stated, however, that the importance of this particular evaluation was in the warning that it offered against short-term evaluative efforts. Thus, John and Souberman concluded that there were few major efforts at evaluation of Title VII programs regarding bilingual education because even those researchers who were deeply committed to an evaluation design found themselves in a situation where it was difficult to make comparisons between different classrooms in the same school, not to mention the difficulties inherent in comparing programs in varied locations.

Engle (1975) summarized the methodological problems which confronted the researcher in bilingual education when she stated:

The difficulty of separating the effects of the language, of initial reading, the language of
instruction, the ethnicity of the teacher, and the political sociolinguistic settings of the experiments is evidenced by the fact that few have been successful in isolating any of the factors.

In addition, Engle also stated that evaluation studies differ greatly in the length of time they allow children before final assessment and that there was a serious lack of longitudinal evaluations covering more than a one or two year time span.

Another means of evaluation of bilingual education programs was the use of observational methods. However, independent evaluators, who sometimes used these methods, reported little or no relationship between program objectives stated on paper and the changing realities of bilingual classrooms. John and Souberman (1977) stated that a process-oriented evaluation was costly and was often considered "un-scientific". However, they stated that without it it was very difficult to discover whether an absence of gains in the performance of the students in bilingual classrooms was the failure of bilingual education or the failure of the genuine implementation of bilingual education on the part of a particular program.

In conclusion, the existence of bilingual programs can only be perpetrated if they cease to be based primarily on federal funding and viewed from the narrow perspective of short-term evaluators. This concern may possibly be addressed by the increasing support for multicultural education from state and local governments, from universities and from the recent court decisions which have suggested a comprehensive and pluralistic approach to bilingual education.
A Rationale for Bilingual Education

Although there is no consensus as to the total number of languages in the world, approximations from four to seven thousand have been given. In addition, according to Ferguson, Houghton and Wells (1977), most of the nations of the world are multilingual and millions of children have their schooling in two or more languages. Bilingual education has been important in the development of society and culture since the earliest days of civilization. Rarely, throughout history, has a nation been able to flourish without recognizing the importance of bilingualism or multilingualism. Ferguson, Houghton and Wells stated that currently, many nations of the world continue to use bilingual and multilingual education. For example, in India over 150 different languages are spoken, in South America 500 are spoken, in Africa 1000 are spoken, and in the Soviet Union 120 are spoken.

Ellis and Ure (1969) stated that in many communities this difference in language is accepted, and it may even be highly valued. However, in other communities, this language difference may be represented or may be seen as unnecessary, a psychological obstacle, or even as an act of oppression.

Since the United States is comprised of several language classifications groups, the review of the literature also included an investigation as to how these groups became prevalent in this country. According to Fishman (1966), non-English languages of the continental United States are commonly classified into three groups: (1) indigenous languages, (2) colonial languages, and (3) immigrant languages. The number of indigenous languages currently found in this country
(Native Americans) is estimated to be approximately the same as when European colonization began. However, of the nearly 300 separate Native American languages and dialects which still exist, only approximately forty percent have more than 100 speakers.

Fishman (1966) stated that of the colonial languages spoken by the 16th, 17th, and 18th century colonizers, only English, Spanish, French, and German have continued to be spoken in the 19th and 20th Centuries. Russian, Swedish, and Dutch in essence did not survive. The current use of colonial languages is a result of their re-introduction with immigrant status. Fishman stated that of these languages, Spanish has the greatest number of speakers in this country. The ancestry of most Spanish speakers in the United States is not European but Mexican-Indian. To this large indigenous Spanish-speaking population can be added large numbers of immigrants from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba and other quota-free Spanish-American countries. Thus, the Spanish language prevalent in this country can be referred to in both a colonial and an immigrant sense.

According to Fishman (1966), any consideration of language maintenance must recognize the immigrant languages since these are the most numerous and their speakers have been exposed to the assimilative forces of American life for the shortest period of time. However, regardless of this fact, a certain degree of assimilation has taken place due to the attractiveness of the United States' mass-culture, the destruction of immigrant folkways under the impact of industrialization and urbanization, the openness and ampleness of the reward system in this country, through public education and
social mobility of our population (which encourages the adoption of a lingua franca), and other equally recent and common cultural factors including the stress on youth in this country and the outdating of adult values and patterns.

John and Souberman (1977) stated that for over a century the public schools of the United States have been committed to a duality of functions; the imparting of educational skills, and the socializing of children in a manner which reflects national objectives. Through the schools, and to some extent through the military, a complex situation evolves which consists of tremendous physical and cultural differences. In this situation, children are drawn from communities of varying cultural and linguistic backgrounds and are taught to learn in a single language, to commit themselves to a similar set of values, to develop overlapping tastes and to have hopes and dreams consistent with the "American way of life". A thorough examination of this socialization process by John and Souberman (1977) resulted in viewing educational institutions as both the cause and solution to serious social tensions. The long-standing policy of schools which sought to implement the melting-pot theory threatened the survival of native cultures and of languages other than the national language. This awareness has resulted in increasing political demands for the creation of equal educational opportunities by those groups in society who have begun to see the traditional school as the enemy of non-white and poor children.

These concerns are paralleled by statistics which show that children from non-English-speaking communities have the least number of
years of schooling and the most limited access to higher education and professional jobs, even lower than that of American Blacks (Casso, 1977). These communities have also resorted to political action and legal solutions similar to the Brown vs. the Board of Education, United States Supreme Court decision (1954).

Thousands of children every year in the United States first encounter English as a foreign language when they enroll in school. English, for the most part, is the only "acceptable" language used in our public school system. We, in fact, do not live in a "melting pot" society but in a society where different languages, attitudes and beliefs have coexisted for centuries. Thus, the antiquated belief that only English should be used as a medium of instruction in the United States has left thousands of children illiterate in their native language and English as well. This, in turn, has resulted in low academic achievement by these students. Consequently, if the goals of education are to be realized for children of limited English-speaking ability, the English-dominant educational system must learn to accept their existing linguistic and cultural patterns as strengths to build upon, rather than as handicaps to successful learning (Saville and Troike, 1974).

According to Saville and Troike (1974), a child does not begin learning upon enrollment in school. The education of a child begins during infancy, and thus much of the sound system and grammatical structure of the native language of a child has been mastered by the time he or she is five years old. By this age, the language of the child is well established and reflects a set of values related specifically to a particular language group. Consequently, the language
of the child has become related to a certain way of feeling, thinking and acting.

Past methods in monolingual English education have often proved ineffective with children who speak other languages natively, and more and more of these children are beginning school every year. For these youngsters, learning to read in English usually is frustrating and unsuccessful. On the other hand, when a child is ready to read his/her native language and is not taught to do so, the school misses a valuable opportunity.

An axiom of bilingual education is that the best medium for teaching is through the use of the primary language of the student. The use of the primary language for classroom instruction allows the education of the child to continue uninterrupted from the home to the school setting. This approach to instruction permits immediate progress in concept building rather than postponing development until a new language has been acquired (Saville and Troike, 1974).

In a statement by Gaardner to Senator Yarborough's Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education, Gaardner (1967) stated:

Children who enter school with less competence in English than monolingual English-speaking children will probably become retarded in their school work to the extent of their deficiency in English, if English is the sole medium of instruction. On the other hand, the bilingual child's conceptual development and acquisition of other experiences and information could proceed at a normal rate if the mother tongue were used as an alternate medium of instruction.

Gaardner's proposition that the mother tongue (native language) is the best instrument for learning has been substantiated through various studies. These studies verify that children progress more rapidly
Modiano (1968) related that in Chiapas, Mexico an experimental group of children was taught to read in their native Indian language. When the children had mastered the ability to read in their native Indian language, they entered the first grade where all the instruction which followed was implemented in the national language, Spanish. Test results showed that those Indian children who had first been taught to read in their native language read Spanish better and with greater comprehension than those children who had received instruction only in Spanish.

Several other studies have shown that children who have been taught to read in their native language first, become better readers in the language traditionally used in the school than control groups who do not have the advantage of using the native language initially. Among these studies are: John (1969) in Sweden, Orata (1953) in the Phillipines, and Macnamara (1966) in Ireland. Furthermore, psychological studies such as those conducted by Lambert and Peal (1962) illustrate that when groups of bilingual and monolingual children are matched for the socioeconomic status of their parents, the bilinguals perform at least as well on I.Q. tests and have the added advantage of knowing a second language.

A child who begins the educational experience with frustration or failure may never catch up since a low self-image often develops through this frustration and failure and this in turn usually leads to a lack of motivation and unsatisfactory performance. These traits are often interrelated handicaps to a child whose initial instruction
is in a foreign language. These, in addition, may be compounded by a low expectation of learning capacity on the part of the child, his/her parents, teachers and administrators. For example, Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) reported that teachers' expectations influence student achievement to a significant degree in that teachers who undervalue students do not provide them with an equal opportunity to learn.

Andersson and Boyer (1970) stated that another significant proposition of bilingual education is that the self-image and the sense of dignity of families who speak a language other than English must be preserved and strengthened. They stated that the use of the native language of a child in the school helps to create a strong and mutually reinforcing relationship between the home and the school. On the other hand, if the school rejects the native language of the child, it can be expected that this action could seriously and adversely affect this child's concept of his/her parents, home, and self esteem.

Whenever the positive aspects of bilingual education are mentioned, another concept is usually mentioned. This concept is bicultural education. Several authorities regarding bilingual education are of the opinion that bilingual education cannot be truly effective unless combined with bicultural education. Jaramillo (1972) stated:

It is time that we all understand, if we do not already, that bilingual education without consideration of the cultural component is obsolete. It can be argued successfully that knowledge of two or more languages is an asset to intellectual development. Certainly bilingualism assists one's power of perception by giving one access to two or more languages and in that way substantially increases the number of ideas to which one has access. But the additional tools for perception to which a bilingual person has access are not nearly as powerful as those of a person who is not only bilingual but bicultural as well.
Jaramillo (1972) also offered a second strong argument for the use of bicultural education in that it can lead to an increased tolerance through the ability to view behavior and experiences in terms of differing points of view rather than as right or wrong. This attitude, it was assumed, would lead to a decrease in cultural conflict in the society of the United States by assisting in the elimination of stereotypes which have had a serious effect on the self-concept of members of all minority groups.

Regarding the question of the desirability of bilingualism, one must recognize the fact that acceptance or rejection is based on an individual's background, experience, and frame of reference. As a result, Andersson (1972) stated that for the person who is knowledgeable of only one language and whose experience involves association solely or primarily with monolinguals such as himself or herself, it is typical to regard another language as a complication, or a nuisance, or something foreign. Such a person, according to Andersson, usually prefers the eventual elimination of all but one language which would be used to serve both official and general purposes. On the other hand are the approximately nineteen million native speakers of a non-English language, who together with most social scientists who have studied the question of bilingualism, are in favor of bilingualism. Thus, is the reason why Gaardner (1970) and other authorities in bilingual education suggest that the answer for Americans who continue to speak a language other than English is the adoption of what is referred to as diglossia. Diglossia refers to the stable co-existence of two languages and refers to the social recognition and approval
(hence support) of the use of two languages.

In regard to the desirability of bilingualism for the individual child, research has produced an abundance of contradictory findings. One of the best analyses regarding this question was done by the Working Committee II under the chairmanship of Bruce Gaardner for the 1965 Northeast Conference (Gaardner et al., 1965). This committee summarized the contradictory research findings and stated that the majority of the investigators felt that bilingualism had a detrimental effect on intelligence. A few studies, however, found evidence suggesting that bilingualism may have favorable intellectual consequences.

The committee cited the following studies against bilingualism: Darcy (1946), Levinson (1959), Johnson (1953, and Spoerl (1944). However, the Gaardner Committee also pointed out two procedural faults in these studies. Thus, in support of bilingualism it stated: (1) the bilingual students selected as subjects were from "lower class" homes and therefore would be intellectually deficient, and (2) the bilingual subjects were not equally fluent in the two languages resulting in their having difficulty in manipulating ideas rapidly or in forming concepts in their second language and thus, not being an accurate measure of their intelligence.

Studies in bilingual education regarding scholastic achievement have usually involved a comparison of bilingual children and unilingual children. Some studies, such as Levinson (1959), have concluded that certain bilingual education programs may result in a loss in levels of achievement while other studies, such as Lambert and
Tucker (1972), have suggested no loss.

Some of the resistance to bilingual education, according to Saville and Troike (1974), is related to bilingual teachers. These teachers are often the products of monolingual English school systems. They are successful products, and may feel that children now in school should follow their model. In addition, innovative programs are expensive and demanding. Thus, bilingual education programs are not considered as the "easy way" for teachers and administrators.

Ortego (1973) also addressed the need to innovate the traditional and rigid instruction techniques prevalent in the schools today and to adjust more to the needs of the children. He stated that many children of Spanish-speaking parents (and other language classification groups, for that matter) do not enter the public schools with either linguistic, experiential, psychocultural or socioeconomic equivalence to their English-speaking contemporaries. These children often are exposed to learning experiences which are introduced precipitously and are too often taught by inadequately trained and frequently pessimistic teachers. In addition, these teachers are often required by their supervisors to move along according to arbitrary timetables that are frequently inappropriate even for affluent English-speaking students.

Ortego (1973) related that teachers often have more interest in the progress of the culturally and linguistically handicapped foreigners than in the progress of our own culturally and linguistically handicapped American minorities. In addition, he stated that one of the most fundamental and persistent educational problems underlying learning dysfunction involves the role of the school in a
democratic society and its responsibilities as an institution both to society and to the individual. The schools as public institutions have for generations failed to meet these obligations.

Ortego (1973) stated that educational statistics on Mexican-Americans are shocking. For example, their dropout rate is more than twice the national average and estimates of the average number of school years completed by Mexican-Americans (7.1 years) are significantly below figures of Anglo children (12.1 years) and Black children (9.0 years). A 1964 survey revealed that in Texas 39 percent of the Mexican-Americans had less than a fifth-grade education, and Mexican-Americans twenty-five years of age and older had as little as 4.8 years of schooling. In addition, almost half of the Mexican-Americans in Texas were essentially still functional illiterates. In California, 50 percent of the Spanish-speaking students dropped out of school by the time they reached the eighth grade.

Ortego (1973) also suggested that teachers acquire the skills to demonstrate more understanding and empathy toward a student of limited English-speaking ability rather than more punishment or discipline. He stated that L.E.S.A. students are often forbidden and even punished for using their first or native language even though it usually is the only means by which they can communicate. In addition, many teachers are either forbidden or refuse to communicate in the children's first language. According to Ortego, this instructional technique often evolves from the quaint American custom that whatever is "good" must always be taken in complete, heavy doses, regularly, massively and early, until the desirable change takes place.
As a result, all children, in spite of their unique environments and backgrounds, are coerced to become totally English-speaking from the minute they enter the school system regardless of the consequences to the child.

Ortego (1973) related that:

This form of education is not "equal" but merely "equivalent". The notion that the school's responsibility to the individual begins and ends with providing a common curriculum for all children regardless of special abilities and needs and that it is the individual's responsibility to rise up from the masses of the poor, the oppressed, the disadvantaged and make the most of such an opportunity, reflects a style that is neither in keeping with the rights of children for equal educational opportunities, nor for an equal opportunity in a democratic society, nor in keeping with the basic tenets of the responsibility of government and its institutions to meet the needs of all its peoples.

Extensive articles have been written by Black and Chicano psychologists and educators about the issues of testing and in regards to the manner in which I.Q. tests are used against children from various ethnic and racial communities. When tests are administered to Black children with instructions that are similar to their own styles of verbal interaction, as well as their idioms, these children perform better than when the same tests are given to them with standard instructions (Moreno, 1970). Thus, another problematic area which is related to bilingual education is that of testing, especially I.Q. tests. Moreno pointed out that these tests have been developed for and standardized on an entirely English-speaking population in that they reflect the cultural values and language of the white (Anglo) middle-class in the United States. These tests are not representative of the various ethnic, racial and language minorities prevalent
in this country. The worst abuse of "Anglo" tests, according to Moreno, is the fact that they are often used as the deciding factor as to whether a child should be in an educable mentally retarded (E.M.R.) class even though the problem may not be intelligence at all but language-related.

Ortego (1973) established that in California schools a clear disproportion of special classes for the educable mentally retarded were composed of Mexican-American children. Ortego stated that there was national evidence that the biased, Anglo-oriented I.Q. tests had negative effects upon Chicano children. For example, the San Diego County schools reported their average I.Q. scores by district (1969-70) and it was found that approximately 5 percent of all students and 13 percent of the Chicano students scored below 75 percent and were labeled mentally retarded.

Opposition to bilingual education has also involved parents. John and Souberman (1977) have related that parental concern regarding the introduction of bilingual education in low-income schools can, in part, be attributed to the fact that for generations L.E.S.A. children have been forced to use only English in the classroom. This has led to negative attitudes among many people toward their own native language and an emphasis upon the importance of competence in English as a basic vehicle for economic success and security in this society.

Another reason for parental concern with bilingual instruction stems from the belief that it is merely a more subtle form of tracking for their children than the now well documented practice of placing large numbers of Spanish-speaking children in E.M.R. (educable mentally
retarded) classes (Casso, 1977). As a result, many parents are understandably doubtful about any programmatic effort to separate their children from those of more affluent communities since it may be one more practice which could continue to deny their children the right to a meaningful and intellectually rewarding education.

Since the educational needs of L.E.S.A. children are multifaceted, John (1970) was of the opinion that bilingual education would benefit these children only if some of the other factors affecting education were addressed as well. He stated that an educational solution by itself is not enough in that a concerted effort to minimize differences in educational opportunities available to children suffering from extreme poverty and seriously deteriorated living conditions must also recognize the negative impact these conditions have on the learning ability of a child. Thus, bilingual instruction must often be coupled with other programs which address the other factors which affect learning. Among these programs are ones which give careful attention to supplementary nutrition, smaller classes and other innovative approaches to learning and teaching.

Jaramillo (1972) has found that another drawback to bilingual education is the lack of research in this area. Consequently, although teachers in bilingual education have many ideas about behavior that they would like to implement in their classes, there is little research in this area to support their intuitions. In addition, without quantitative data to support bilingual education, administrators are very reluctant to establish new programs or modify old ones.

Another aspect of bilingual education which has become quite
a controversial topic is the strong argument that bilingualism can be of benefit to all children. Lambert and Peal (1962) conducted a study of French and English-speaking bilinguals in Montreal which strongly supported this argument. This study revealed that when an opportunity for equal, normal literacy development in two languages was presented, bilingual 19-year-olds were found to be markedly superior to monolinguals on verbal and non-verbal tests of intelligence. According to Lambert and Peal, these "balanced" bilinguals seemed to demonstrate greater mental flexibility, superior concept formation and a more advanced set of mental attitudes. Thus, in support of these findings, Jaramillo (1972) stated that bilingual education must be considered a legitimate educational program for everyone and should not be viewed as a remedial, compensatory, special education nor an antipoverty program. On the contrary, this new concept in education must begin to be viewed as an integral part of the United States' educational system.

To summarize, there is a strong unwillingness to accept the fact that the public schools have failed in the formal education of many children whose primary language is other than English. According to Casso (1976), it is estimated that 225,000 psychologically sound children have been misplaced in E.M.R. classes because of language and culture differences. In addition, these children have often been the victims of: early-grade retention, overageness, reading slowness, and a disproportionately high drop-out rate. Traditionally, the schools have held the students and parents responsible for this failure, but recently this responsibility has begun to shift to the public schools.
As a result, the evidence of failure to educate these youngsters has necessitated an alternative educational strategy—bilingual education.

The multiethnic and multilingual society prevalent in the United States is an indisputable fact. This country professes to believe in cultural pluralism, but in reality cultural conformity and not cultural pluralism is emphasized. Individuals whose language, color, or culture is different from the majority are degraded and shunned. This attitude has pressured the culturally different groups to acculturate and assimilate (Burma, 1968). A bilingual education program addresses this problem by encouraging students from the dominant language to learn about students from various language minority groups and vice-versa. This interaction often encourages the different cultures in a society to coexist and cooperate. The United States is no exception (Burma, 1968).

The realization of the "American dream" need not destroy individual internal differences which are a tremendous source of potential human wealth. The maintenance of diversity and the encouragement of free pluralistic development of languages and cultures, far from destroying national unity, may very well become one of its greatest strengths (Boyer, 1965).

Bilingual Education Teacher-Training Programs in the United States

A perspective on bilingual education in the United States would not be complete without an analysis of the teachers who are directly responsible for implementing these programs. Mackey (1972) stated that the success or failure of a bilingual school depends to a large
extent on the competence of its teachers in the areas of: language, language behavior, professionalism, morale, and teaching methods. In a bilingual school, language competence provides for both models and media and as a result, is expected to be of an exemplary manner. In regard to language behavior, he stated that it makes a difference whether the teacher used the home language or the second language exclusively in teaching, or both, and the degrees of usage and timing. Mackey also added that competence can be determined by the teacher's: years of schooling, years of experience, time spent in retraining, development of special skills, acquisition of professional diplomas, teaching versatility, experience in bilingual education, placement (in regard to teaching the grades for which one is certified), team teaching experience, and the amount of language training the individual has. Mackey stated that the success of a bilingual program is greatly dependent on the morale that a bilingual education teacher has and that this is often determined by the status the position holds. The morale of the bilingual teacher is also influenced by: the degree of support provided by the school board, the school administration, the parents and community, and, just as significantly, by the relationship between the teacher, the students and the parents. These factors, which affect morale, can in turn be influenced by the teaching methodology which a teacher employs.

As a result, one can readily recognize the need for the development of certain special competencies in bilingual education teachers beyond those developed through the traditional teacher preparation programs. There is a great deal of research which verifies that
traditional teacher preparation is not sufficient to provide teachers with the special skills necessary to work with culturally and linguistically different children. Aragon and Ulibarri (1971), Carter (1970), Valencia (1969), and Manuel (1930) have all acknowledged the lack of and the crucial need for special preparation for bilingual education teachers.

Casso (1976) stated that one of the main reasons for the lack of bilingual teachers in the United States is due to the fact that the bilingual education movement in this country has developed so rapidly. As a result, teacher-training institutions have not had sufficient time to develop the programs necessary to meet the current demands for personnel. Charles Leyba (1974), Director of Project M.A.E.S.T.R.O. at California State University, indicated the extent of this concern when he stated that there is an estimated need for over 35,000 bilingual teachers in the United States. The Civil Rights Commission (1975) made further reference to the lack of bilingual education teachers nationally when they stated:

Because of the scarcity of trained and certified bilingual-bicultural teachers, many bilingual-bicultural programs have assumed the responsibility for designing and implementing their own teacher-training programs.

Consequently, it seems obvious that school districts cannot and will not wait for teacher-training institutions to prepare the necessary personnel before they begin to implement bilingual education programs. The need for bilingual education programs at the local level is immediate and thus, they cannot wait 2-4 years for trained teachers to help implement these programs.
In order to determine the extent of bilingual teacher-training programs in the United States, a nationwide survey was conducted by Carillo (1977) during the fall of 1973. This survey was conducted at the National Bilingual Bicultural Institute and was cosponsored by the National Education Task Force de la Raza. Carrillo stated that an important aspect of this survey was the fact that its 220 respondents included a professional cross-section of administrators, project coordinators, teachers, university professors, community members and students from 25 different states.

Initially, the survey identified those states having a State Program Director for Bilingual Education and those states having special certification requirements for bilingual teachers. Through this research, existing university and college programs designed for the preparation of bilingual education teachers were also identified. Having obtained a remarkable 100 percent response to the initial inquiry, Carrillo established that eleven states had a State Program Director for Bilingual Education (individuals classified as foreign language consultants were not included). In addition, he determined that nine states had state consultants, specialists, supervisors or coordinators. Carrillo also found that seven states reported having special certification or a special type of criteria for bilingual education teachers (see Table III).

A number of higher education institutions were identified by Carrillo as having active programs (as opposed to programs only in the planning stage of development) in the preparation of teachers for bilingual-bicultural education. However, only those...
### Table III

**Bilingual Education Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Program Director</th>
<th>*Other</th>
<th>Teacher-Training Certification/Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other included state: consultants, specialists, supervisors or coordinators.

Institutions which revealed a certain "level of sophistication" in preparing bilingual-bicultural education teachers were included by Carrillo. Carrillo determined this "level of sophistication" by examining the rationale of the program, the course content, and the nature of the field experience offered to the student. A further explanation of the content, focus, and depth of these programs is presented in Table IV.

Of the nineteen higher education institutions included in Table IV, sixteen listed language as a necessary requirement. However, the program descriptions were not specific as to the prerequisite language skills. Statements include items such as: language mastery, competence in English and a foreign language, satisfactory degree of proficiency, and a knowledge and understanding of the native language (other than English). Ten institutions did not specify prerequisite language skills. The implication seemed to be that candidates selecting
the bilingual-bicultural preparation curriculum would be native
speakers and therefore would have the necessary oral-aural skills.
Carrillo stated that the institutions which did indicate language
skills as a prerequisite were not clear as to the evaluation of lan-
guage proficiency. Fourteen institutions made no provision for eval-
uation of language proficiency and the five which did, used oral
examinations, advisor judgement, foreign language department judg-
ment or a placement test. Descriptions of the tests were not avail-
able but strong emphasis was given to educational foundations courses
and methods courses regarding L.E.S.A. students. The areas of culture,
history and sociocultural awareness were given strong priority as
were the the areas of psychology, philosophy, anthropology, political
science, fine arts and T.E.S.O.L. methodology. The two areas given
the least emphasis involved the implementation of the teaching skills
acquired and the area of school-community relations.

Casso (1976) recognized the need for preservice and in-service
bilingual education teacher-training and stated that the response
by teacher-training institutions has been slow even though a decade
has passed since the renaissance of bilingual education began. Sev-
eral reasons for this slowness, according to Casso are:

1) The country finds itself for the first time in its
history with a great surplus of regular teachers,
those who have been prepared to teach only the mono-
lingual/monocultural child/student.

2) The country and individual states are spending the
greatest amount of educational dollars in their his-
tory. This spending, coupled with the great economic
recession, demand for economic and educational account-
ability, and the national surplus of 200,000 teachers,
has caused state legislatures to be more cautious in
allocating more tax dollars to the preparation of teach-
ers in general, notwithstanding the need for bilingual/
Table IV

Survey of Bilingual-Bicultural Teacher-Training Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Preparation of Teachers in the Areas of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams St. College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG, in Bil. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral lang. Mastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Col. St. College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Major Bil. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowl. &amp; Underst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish spoken in Mexico &amp; Southwest (U.S.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connecticut

| Institution:  |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| Univ. of Harvard |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| Degree:       |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| M.A. & 6 Year Prog. |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| Lang. Prereq.: |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| *Instrument:  |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |

| Institution:  |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| Univ. of Conn. |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| Degree:       |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| Courses in Bil. Ed. |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| Lang. Prereq.: |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
| *Instrument:  |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |
Table IV
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Preparation of Teachers in the Areas of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan**</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Central Mich. Univ.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Major Teaching the Spanish-Speaking Lang. Prereq.: *Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: St. Univ. of New York</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Hunter College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: C.C.N.Y.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Bil. Studies Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Manhattan Comm. College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Bil. Studies Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     *

Instrument:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Preparation of Teachers in the Areas of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York (Continued)</td>
<td>L  H  C  P  SC  PH  A  PS  FA  LI  T  EF  M  PT  CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Brooklyn College</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Bil. Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Hostos Comm. College</td>
<td>X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Bil. Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: N. M. Highlands Univ.</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: M.A. Bil. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Univ. of N. M.</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: Minor in Bil. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Rhode Island College</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: M.A. Bil. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.: Satisfactory Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table IV
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Preparation of Teachers in the Areas of:</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Pan American Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: UG Major</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Texas Womens Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: B.A. &amp; Certif. in Elem. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.: Proficiency in Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: St. Edward's Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: B.S. Elem. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.: Lang. Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument: Placement Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution: Univ. of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: M.A. Bil. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.: Proficiency in Spanish &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Instrument: Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table IV
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Preparation of Teachers in the Areas of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution: Univ. of Texas at Austin</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PH</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>EF</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lang. Prereq.: Proficiency in Spanish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instrument to measure prerequisite skills.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L - Language</th>
<th>H - History</th>
<th>C - Culture</th>
<th>P - Psychology</th>
<th>SC - Socio-Culture</th>
<th>PH - Philosophy</th>
<th>A - Anthropology</th>
<th>PS - Political Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA - Fine Arts</td>
<td>LI - Linguistics</td>
<td>T - T.E.S.O.L. (teaching of English to speakers of other languages)</td>
<td>EF - Education Foundations Courses</td>
<td>M - Methods</td>
<td>PT - Practicum</td>
<td>CM - Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bicultural teachers in particular.

3) There is a lack of recorded data on the progress, successes, and advantages of bilingual education programs to convince state legislatures of the benefits of such programs, which would justify drastic changes and utilization of new state funds.

4) The issue of the melting pot versus cultural pluralism philosophy applies critically to the response of teacher-training institutions. It is the author's opinion that most administrators and teachers holding positions of leadership were trained in the melting pot school of thought. Therefore, those in charge of teacher-training institutions may not be philosophically and ideologically committed to bilingual/bicultural education programs.

5) Where deans of teacher-training institutions are committed to bilingual/bicultural education, significant numbers of department chairpersons (such as elementary, secondary, early childhood, reading, curriculum and instruction) do not have the same philosophical commitment to (or worse, their priorities do not include) teaching-training for bilingual/bicultural education.

6) Teacher-training in institutions of higher education has not been coordinated with the teacher-training needs of client state or local school districts. This lack of coordination means that different priorities are served, which contributes to the surplus of one set of teachers while at the same time exacerbating the shortage of bilingual/bicultural teachers. Reading specialists, curriculum developers, materials developers, educational psychologists, science teachers, and early childhood specialists are badly needed.

7) Some college of education department chairpersons perceive teacher-training in bilingual/bicultural education as only a language program and attempt to shift the burden for teacher-training onto the language departments.

8) There seems to be an apparent unwillingness, reticence, incapacity, and fear among university departments to work collaboratively, interdisciplinarily, and interdepartmentally to develop a comprehensive bilingual education teacher-training program in cooperation with the needs of local school districts.

Regarding the identification of special competencies required by bilingual education teachers, information was compiled through
an extensive review of the literature. However, one of the most valuable resources in this area was Carrillo (1977). Although Carrillo's primary interest was the largest language classification group, Spanish, many of his findings apply to other language classification groups as well.

Carrillo (1977) compiled his information through four primary sources: 1) a review of the literature regarding bilingual-bicultural teacher preparation, 2) attendance of five very significant bilingual-bicultural related conferences, 3) a survey of existing university teacher preparation programs previously mentioned in Table IV, and 4) information made available from the Institute for Cultural Pluralism at San Diego State University.

Carrillo (1977) stated that one of the initial results of these four investigations was the identification of four broad areas of expertise which were considered as essential for bilingual-bicultural education programs. These areas included: language, culture, professional education, and school-community relations.

In the area of language, Carrillo stated that the literature frequently referred to the importance of using the student's home language in the school, both as a medium of communication and as a medium of instruction. Smith (1968) stated that knowledge of the language would be an asset in enabling the teacher to establish a rapport with the students and in serving as a bridge for clarifying concepts and making explanations. Kayser (1969) interpreted language competence for teachers as a thorough familiarity with the structures of the home language and the target language and the ability to select
and construct materials for the teaching of subject matter in both languages. He was of the opinion that the teacher must be able to teach habits of one language or the other.

As Carrillo (1977) summarized the results of a number of bilingual-bicultural education related conferences, he found that the need for bilingual-bicultural education programs was strongly emphasized. He stated that the conference participants were of the consensus that merely being a bilingual did not necessarily mean that a teacher had knowledge or could exhibit teaching skills in a bilingual instructional program. Carrillo summarized the linguistic competencies considered by the conference participants as essential for bilingual education teachers as:

1) A knowledge of the student's home dialect.

2) An ability to communicate in Spanish on a second level— that of classroom commands and directions.

3) An ability to communicate at the instructional level.

4) An ability to communicate at a professional level.

5) The ability to predict and understand student's language problems due to interference between two languages.

6) The general ability to speak, read, and write Spanish with grammatical accuracy and style.

In addition, Carrillo (1977) stated that it was the general consensus of the conference participants that in-service training programs were necessary in schools attempting to establish bilingual education programs where bilingual education teachers were not available. The participants stated that graduates from the usual secondary education programs lacked the skills to execute effectively the teaching
of content in two languages.

Carrillo (1977) stated that the range of course offerings to develop language competence varied from no courses, perhaps relying on courses offered in Modern Foreign Language Departments, to six courses (see Table IV). Most of the courses were designed for students who already had oral communicative skills and thus emphasized vocabulary development for the teaching of subject content, composition, basic native language phonology and comparative English/non-English linguistics.

In regard to language, Table V illustrates that 90.5 percent of the respondents to the survey gave the requirement of bilingual ability for bilingual education teachers a high priority.

Culture was the second broad area of expertise considered as essential in bilingual education teacher-training programs. In analyzing the impact of culture on education, Ainsworth (1969) stated that the teacher was the product of his/her culture, professional background, and academic background. These in turn have produced misconceptions that underlie many classroom practices and which have impaired teacher effectiveness when dealing with the culturally different student.

In addition, Carrillo (1977) has interpreted school policies as having damaging psychological consequences on students with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. He stated that the areas of teacher and administrator personnel preparation are areas where changes must be made. Carrillo (1977) related that:

The preparation programs for teachers of Mexican-Americans should include detailed knowledge of both Anglo and Mexican-American cultures, knowledge
of the dynamics of transculturation, knowledge of how cultural processes operate in the cognitive and affective development of children and "sensitivity-training" that will free the teacher from cultural ethnocentrism on the one hand and allow acceptance of Mexican-American culture on the other. It is not enough to know about the culture; it must be felt.

Through the information acquired at the various conferences previously mentioned as well as through his own personal experience, Carrillo (1977) stated that the cultural knowledge which a teacher should possess can be divided into three categories:

1) The artistic manifestation of the culture including art, music, dance, architecture, and crafts.

2) The socioanthropological facet of culture including history, geography, economics, philosophy, linguistics, religion, ethics, and general socialization patterns.

3) The local cultural attributes the students bring to the classroom.

In reference to Table IV, Carrillo stated that the number of courses for cultural preparation ranged from one course to seven courses. The priorities for cultural training which were to be addressed by these courses were very similar to those identified by the various conference participants.

Table V indicates that 95 percent of the survey respondents felt that a high priority should be given to the teacher's knowledge of children's cultural environment. This survey thus verified the priority in teacher preparation for bilingual education programs in terms of teacher's knowledge of children and an appreciation of the cultural environment in the preparation for teaching in bilingual-bicultural programs.
Table V
Bilingual-Bicultural Teacher-Trainee Competencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Bilingual Ability</th>
<th>Knowledge of Children's Cultural Environment</th>
<th>Knowledge of Bilingual-Bicultural Teaching Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Number Responding</td>
<td>Percentage Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Degree of priority given to bilingual ability, knowledge of children's cultural environment, and knowledge of bilingual-bicultural teaching strategies as competencies for bilingual-bicultural teacher-trainees by educators at the National Bilingual-Bicultural Institute (1973).

Another important area in bilingual education teacher-training is professional education. Current literature on the professional education of bilingual teachers revealed that special competency is needed in the areas of (Carrillo, 1977):

1) Human development
2) Learning theory
3) Techniques of instruction
4) Development of culturally relevant curriculum

Human development, as it relates to bilingual education, involves the learning theory that children should be given the opportunity to become constructively involved in developing their own personal effectiveness, self-confidence, and an awareness and understanding of the causes and effects in interpersonal relations. A program based on principles of human development skillfully utilizes the basic drives of children to achieve mastery and gain approval. Generally speaking, it is a strategy designed to improve communication between the teacher and the student and to encourage a two-way flow of information between students. However, human development is one of the most important and yet one of the most ignored areas in the education of students of different cultures and languages (Carrillo, 1977).

Professional education also emphasizes the aspect of techniques of instruction especially in regard to bilingual education. For example, Ramirez (1970) recognized the need for bilingual education teachers to use strategies which would make the educational system more culturally democratic by making it more responsive to incentive-motivational, human relational, and cognitive styles of students.

Carter (1970) found that many teachers lacked technical skills in teaching and that they were ill-prepared to use modern approaches
to teaching English as a second language. In addition, they rarely used technical equipment to its fullest potential, and they did not have access to new and innovative materials in their teaching.

Carrillo (1977) acknowledged the lack of adequate teacher preparation for the teaching of Spanish in the classroom. He stated that, due to the large variance in language ability among Mexican-Americans, the bilingual teacher must have a large reserve of language teaching skills to adapt for each classroom situation and each individual student's needs.

The fourth important aspect of professional development relates to the utilization of a culturally relevant curriculum. In regard to this aspect, Carrillo (1977) stated:

> There is a need for much curricular and instructional experimentation in educational programs for Mexican-American students. The special needs of Mexican-American students call for more than "thinking" knowledge of curriculum and instructional development; they call for "feeling" knowledge as well.

In the selection of reading materials, it is essential that teachers be prepared to cope with the individual needs and interests of each student. Van Dougen (1972) stated that an emphasis in individual needs and interests for each student provided the opportunity to focus upon groups of students for whom reading instruction has not necessarily sparked an interest, has not been meaningful, and has not provided opportunities for successful growth in skills, thinking and attitudes.

Carrillo (1977) included the practical experience component of teacher-training as a part of the culturally relevant curriculum section of professional development. His reasoning being that, if the
practical experience component involves the placement of the teacher trainee in a bilingual setting, then this activity could greatly assist in making the curriculum more culturally relevant. Jaramillo (1972) recognized that field training should include the placement of teachers in schools where they could practice what they have learned in their general studies and professional education. He stated that teacher trainers must find ways to guarantee public school administrative support for the implementation of innovative techniques and find ways to place prospective teachers in schools with programs that they have been trained for.

Carrillo (1977) concluded that the participants in the bilingual-bicultural education conferences supported the competencies previously stated in the literature as did the survey respondents included in Table IV and Table V. An analysis of Table V indicates that 85 percent of the respondents felt that the skills in the teaching process should be given a high priority in the preparation of teachers for bilingual programs.

School community relations has become an increasingly important area in education. Carrillo (1977) stated that there is a growing dissatisfaction with the exclusion of the community from the educational process. An awareness seems to have been generated among Mexican-Americans, Native Americans, Blacks, Orientals and Middle-Class Whites as well. All these segments of the community are demanding a voice and a legitimate role in the education of their children. Carrillo added that schools must now be prepared to deal with community feelings especially where a change or innovation such as
bilingual education is involved. Parents and community members are no longer willing to accept major changes in educational activities without some interaction with the schools. Their particular needs and concerns must be addressed or they will begin to challenge the educational systems which they have supported or tolerated in the past.

On the other hand, Carrillo (1977) has also recognized that, although emphasis on the need for community involvement has been stressed in the literature, and supported by many bilingual-bicultural teachers, in reality this involvement has been minimal. Thus, Carrillo added that an effective area which shows potential for encouraging the performance of low income and minority group children is the improved self-concept resulting from active parental participation. Carrillo is of the opinion that in order to maximize this potential, change is needed both in the schools and in the relationship between the school and the community.

Ramirez (1970), another strong advocate of school and community relations, recommended the use of parents in the instructional phase of learning. Ramirez encouraged the contribution of resource materials for herititage curriculum by parents and the solicitation of their help in the actual teaching of other aspects of the curriculum as well.

Carrillo (1977) stated that the conference participants strongly supported the development of bilingual education teacher competencies in working with the community, although they often included them in the culture area rather than separately. In addition, Carrillo stated
that the survey of the university programs (Table IV) clearly illustrated that colleges and universities have not seriously approached the training of bilingual education teachers especially in regard to learning about the community and in developing the skills needed to involve the community in the education of their children.

In conclusion, a good summary of the necessary qualifications for bilingual-bicultural education teachers has been compiled by the Center for Applied Linguistics (1976). This compilation included in its set of qualifications eight major areas: 1) language proficiency, 2) linguistics, 3) culture, 4) instructional methods, 5) curriculum utilization and adaptation, 6) assessment (general, language, content, and self), 7) school-community relations, and 8) supervised teaching. A full description of these qualifications can be found in Appendix D.

In addition, as stated previously, the renaissance of bilingual education in this country has developed rapidly while the development of bilingual education teacher-training has been rather slow. The end result has been a tremendous need to increase the number of bilingual education teacher-training institutions in order to meet our present education needs. However, the number of participating institutions has begun to increase. For example, the book entitled, *Teacher Education Programs for Bilingual Education in U.S. Colleges and Universities: 1975-76*, illustrated that there are currently 259 bilingual education teacher-training institutions functioning in thirty different states throughout the United States (see Appendix E). This is significantly more than the nineteen listed by Carrillo in 1973.
In regard to the implementation of bilingual education teacher-training programs, Casso (1976) found that most bilingual education programs stress the use of an interdisciplinary training approach which includes: education, history, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and English as a second language. However, there are very few models in the literature to describe how this training is to take place. Casso also stated that the selection of trainees for bilingual teacher-training programs does not seem to be carefully planned. In addition, Adler (1968) pointed out that the candidate cannot just be a native speaker in order to be considered a bilingual education teacher. He/she must have additional qualifications. In order to establish what these other qualifications should include, Casso (1976) prepared a personal and professional checklist suggesting various criteria for the selection of teachers for bilingual-bicultural education (see Appendix F).

Finally, Casso (1976) stated that many teachers already involved in bilingual education lack the necessary skills to be effective. He added that most teachers in bilingual education programs today have been trained only in languages and not in other content areas. Ochoa (1973) added that the success of bilingual-bicultural education has been slow because of the extreme lack of bilingual-bicultural trained and endorsed teachers. He stated that most of the teachers in these programs are either not certified to teach in these programs and/or are seriously lacking in the skills to teach in these programs and thus rely heavily on the aides and other paraprofessionals. A consequence of this situation is that quite frequently teachers, many
of whom are not of a particular language minority group, have felt helpless and frustrated, not because of a lack of integrity as educators, but because they lacked the conceptual resources, tools, and pedagogical skill to help the culturally and linguistically different child. Thus, because of ignorance, they have perpetuated a system that actively destroys a large portion of our population, a portion which could have the potential to make not only positive but valuable contributions to our society.

The History of Bilingual Education in Michigan

Bilingual education, when analyzed historically on a national basis, illustrated that it has commonalities regarding basic concepts and rationale as well as differences. In order to become fully cognizant of these differences or idiosyncrasies, a more thorough and specific analysis is needed. Thus, is the reason for the review of the history of bilingual education as it specifically relates to the State of Michigan.

In order to thoroughly understand bilingual education as it exists in Michigan, one must first be aware of the various events which led to its current status. The court case of Lau vs. Nichols (Supreme Court of the United States, 1974) was one of the primary initiating factors for the passage of Public Act 294 and the establishment of bilingual education in Michigan as well as throughout the United States (M.D.E., 1977). This class action suit charged the San Francisco Unified School District with failure to provide all non-English-speaking students with a meaningful opportunity to participate in the public
educational system by not providing special instruction for Chinese students in order to equalize their educational opportunity. This suit, which was initiated by non-English-speaking Chinese students against the San Francisco School District, alleged that, out of 2,856 Chinese-American students, only 1000 were being given additional courses in English, even though they all needed special help. The plaintiffs contended that their rights had been violated under the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and provisions of the California Education Code. The District Court of California denied relief and the case was appealed to the United States Supreme Court (Supreme Court of the United States, 1974).

The United States Supreme Court upheld the views that in the State of California, English was to be the basic language of instruction. However, it stated that bilingual education was authorized as long as it would not interfere with systematic, sequential, and regular instruction in English. The Supreme Court further decided that service and treatment in education are not equal merely because all students are provided with the same facilities, books, teachers and curriculum. Students who do not understand English are, by intent or oversight, effectively "foreclosed" from a meaningful education. The Supreme Court further concluded that no law can impose, or presuppose, that all children who enter an English dominant school will indeed have already acquired these skills. The Supreme Court ruled that there had been a denial of education opportunity under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and directed that a remedy be
fashioned (Supreme Court of the United States, 1974).

The Supreme Court decision regarding the case of Lau vs. Nichols led to other court cases involving the need for bilingual education. Among these cases are: Arreola vs. Board of Education (California), Diana vs. State Board of Education (California), Serna vs. Portales (New Mexico), and Keyes vs. Denver City Schools (Colorado). These cases set the tone for the passage of federal and state legislation in support of bilingual education.

In 1965, federal legislation, known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (E.S.E.A.) was established. E.S.E.A. of 1965, as amended, provided under Title VII educational services specifically for bilingual education. This act stressed the importance of conserving the nation's language resources and advancing the education of all students, regardless of their language. Title VII has funded demonstration bilingual education projects throughout the United States including Michigan. In Michigan the demonstration projects are located in the cities of: Grand Rapids, Saginaw, Pontiac, Detroit, Dearborn, Muskegon and Lansing (M.D.E., 1977).

Bilingual education has become an important aspect of education in the State of Michigan and consequently was included in the policy statement prepared by the Michigan Department of Education for the State of Michigan. This policy statement, entitled "The Common Goals of Michigan Education: (1971), listed twenty-two common goals for the state of Michigan. Bilingual education was addressed in Goal Number Two, under the section entitled "Democracy and Equal Opportunity". Goal Number Two stated (M.D.E., 1977):
Goal 2 - Education of the Non-English Speaking Person

Michigan education must recognize and respect the need for special academic and administrative measures in schools serving students whose native tongue is one other than English. These students should be encouraged and assisted to develop their skills in their native language while they are acquiring proficiency in English. For example, the methodologies of foreign language instruction might be used to enable these students to gain the required fluency. Where there is a substantial population of non-English speaking students, bilingual programs should be provided in order that the students may develop their bilingual skills and enhance their educational experience rather than be forced into the position of a disadvantaged student. Such programs should extend to the provision of instructional techniques which facilitate a student's educational development regardless of his out-of-school experience with non-standard English.

Multicultural education needs were addressed under two other goals: (1) Citizenship and Morality, and under (2) Student Learning (M.D.E., 1977):

Goal 2 - Citizenship and Morality

Michigan education must assure the development of mature and responsible citizens, with the full sense of social awareness and moral and ethical values needed in a heterogeneous society. It must encourage critical but constructive thinking and responsible involvement, with consideration for the rights of all, in the resolution of the problems of our society. It must create within the school system an atmosphere of social justice, responsibility, and equality which will enable students to carry a positive and constructive attitude about human differences and similarities into their working or community relationships in later life. The schools should provide various learning experiences involving students from different racial, religious, economic and ethnic groups; accordingly, Michigan education should move toward integrated schools which provide an optimum environment for quality education.

Goal 8 - Student Learning

...Michigan education must provide for each individual an understanding of the value systems, cultures, customs,
and histories of his own heritage as well as of others.

"Goal 2 - Education of the Non-English Speaking Person", clearly established the Michigan Department of Education's concern for and desire that Michigan's public schools provide programs for non-English speaking students which would enable them to acquire fluency in English and thus enhance their chances for success in school. The statement also calls for the development of programs that will not encourage a decrease in the students' skills regarding their native language.

"Goal 2 - Citizenship and Morality" and "Goal 8 - Student Learning" requested the provision of educational experiences which respect the multicultural and pluralistic composition of American society.

In October of 1974, the Michigan Legislature enacted Public Act 294 (see Appendix A) which required any school district enrolling 20 or more students of a given language classification with limited English-speaking ability to establish a program of bilingual instruction. Section 395 and 396 of the act specified the responsibilities of the State Board of Education and the Michigan Department of Education in the implementation of bilingual instruction programs. Among these responsibilities are:

1) ...develop and administer a program of in-service training for bilingual instruction programs and... promulgate rules governing the conduct of and participation in the in-service training programs - Section 395 (1).

2) ...promulgate rules governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors in the public schools of this state and require that the teacher...shall be proficient in both the oral and written skills of the language for which he (she) is endorsed - Section 395 (2).
3) ...approve an examination or testing mechanism suitable for evaluating the proficiency in English language skills of a child of limited English-speaking ability - Section 395 (3).

In addition, through P.A. 294, the Michigan Department of Education was required to:

1) Advise and assist school districts in complying with and implementing sections 390 to 396.

2) Study, review, and evaluate textbooks and instructional materials, resources and media for use in bilingual instructional programs.

3) Compile data relative to the theory and practice of bilingual instruction and pedagogy.

4) Encourage experimentation and innovation in bilingual education.

5) Recommend in-service training programs, curriculum development, and testing mechanisms to the State Board of Education.

The current position of the State Board of Education is to fully support Public Act 294 and to ensure that this act is fully implemented. It considers P. A. 294 as both constitutional and statutory. More specifically, the State Board of Education stated that efforts in bilingual education should be directed basically in two ways (M.D.E., 1977):

1) Every effort needs to be expended to implement fully the current provisions of Act 294 to ensure that no child's success in public school is unduly inhibited because he or she is a child of limited English-speaking ability.

2) Every effort needs to be expended to ensure that all children are provided opportunities to gain an understanding of their own culture as well as cultures of others.

In accord with Public Act 294, the purpose and intent of bilingual education in Michigan is to provide a means of instruction specifically
suited to address the educational needs of students with a language background other than English. However, the State Board of Education also recognized that bilingual education can also be a valuable means of providing instruction for any student who wishes to develop or preserve fluency in more than one language and knowledge of more than one culture (M.D.E., 1977).

The State Board of Education also stated that bilingual education is not a mandatory method of instructing every child in the public schools nor is it intended to lead to the establishment of a nation with official dual languages or dual cultures. However, the S.B.E. did recognize that the United States is a multilingual, multicultural nation whose common language is English and that bilingual education merely enhances and promotes the opportunity for children to participate fully in the educational system by providing instruction which respects and utilizes the particular language and cultural backgrounds of the individual students (M.D.E., 1977).

In addition, the State Board of Education developed several statements regarding bilingual education which demonstrated its commitment to implement: 1) the various items included in the Common Goals of Michigan Education document, 2) the several mandates of the United States Constitution, and 3) the law of the State of Michigan - Public Act 294 (1974). These statements, which were presented as guides for action in the area of bilingual education, include the following (M.D.E., 1977):

1) **STUDENTS RECEIVING BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED AND ASSISTED TO DEVELOP SKILLS IN THEIR NATIVE LANGUAGE WHILE THEY ARE ACQUIRING PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH.**
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A bilingual instruction program recognizes the value of knowing two languages and being able to function in two or more cultures and provides a structure for accomplishing this goal.

2) STUDENTS RECEIVING BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION SHOULD ACHIEVE AT A RATE COMENSURATE WITH THEIR OWN AGE, ABILITY, AND GRADE LEVEL IN ALL SCHOOL SUBJECT AREAS.

A bilingual instruction program recognizes each student's ability to learn, and provides for instruction in the language and learning mode that is best understood by the student. Thus, bilingual instruction attempts to maximize a child's learning potential and actual achievement. Academic credit must be given for academic work accomplished in a bilingual instruction program. Where grades are assigned in any given subject, the teacher who has major responsibilities for that subject should assign the grades.

3) STUDENTS RECEIVING BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION SHOULD DEMONSTRATE GROWTH IN SELF-ESTEEM.

A bilingual instruction program is premised on the belief that every student needs to feel proud of him/herself, his/her family, and his/her racial or ethnic background. Bilingual instruction proposes that bilingualism and multiculturalism are assets, and that these components should be integrated into the regular school curriculum. It provides an opportunity for all students in a school to appreciate the cultural diversity of their own community.

4) STUDENTS RECEIVING BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITH A COORDINATED AND INTEGRATED LEARNING ENVIRONMENT THROUGH EFFECTIVE ARTICULATION WITH THE GENERAL SCHOOL PROGRAM.

A bilingual instruction program must be an integrated part of the total school curriculum, instead of being an isolated or peripheral component. Bilingual education provides an opportunity for all students to appreciate the cultural diversity of their own community. Because the limited English-speaking student will spend a significant portion of his/her school experience in the general school program, it is essential that all school staff members (building principal, classroom teachers, counselors, school social workers) show evidence of a
commitment to the philosophy of bilingual education through involvement in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program.

5) ALL TEACHERS AND STAFF MEMBERS OF SCHOOLS OFFERING BILINGUAL EDUCATION SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN A COMPREHENSIVE INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM.

A bilingual instruction program seeks to ensure, through an inservice training program, that each person who plays a role in the development of the student (including building principal, bilingual teachers and aides, regular classroom teachers) will have the knowledge and skills to enhance the student’s success in school.

To achieve this end, a district offering bilingual instruction should: 1) develop a local inservice plan for the entire school faculty in the education of limited English-speaking students, and 2) provide opportunities for bilingual teachers, aides, and coordinators to participate in local and statewide workshops and other training sessions.

The local inservice plan should include a preservice orientation for new bilingual staff members, on-going inservice for aides and other para-professionals, and inservice opportunities for all teachers who work with children whose skill in speaking English is limited. If team teaching is proposed, the inservice plan should describe how the teacher participants will receive appropriate training in the use of this technique.

6) PARENTS AND OTHER COMMUNITY MEMBERS SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION OF BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS.

It has been demonstrated that parents will support those programs which they have helped to plan, implement, and evaluate. In a bilingual instruction program, parents are recognized as excellent resource persons with positive contributions to make in the development of educational programs which are needed by their own children.

As set forth in Section 394 of P.A. 294 (1974) a local advisory committee is required; such a committee should participate in:

(1) developing and implementing the bilingual instruction proposal;
(2) identifying and recommending candidates for bilingual staff positions;
(3) evaluating programs;
(4) establishing procedures through which parents' complaints and criticisms can receive prompt consideration;
(5) promoting bilingual instruction in the community;
(6) mobilizing community resources in support of bilingual instruction.

In addition to the participation of selected parents on the advisory group, opportunity should be provided for all parents to become involved in a bilingual program in two distinct ways: (1) as aides or resource persons in the classroom, and (2) as observers in the classroom.

(7) AT THE BEGINNING OF EVERY SCHOOL YEAR, LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD SUBMIT TO THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION A REPORT DESCRIBING THE LOCAL DISTRICT'S PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC ACT 294, 1974, CONSISTENT WITH GUIDELINES DEVELOPED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

...Bilingual education should become much more than a supplementary program. It should become an integral part of a program of quality education. It should offer an opportunity to achieve a balance between the assimilationist posture traditionally assumed in American public educational institutions and the right of individuals and groups to maintain and enhance their particular identities within a pluralistic society.

The Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education is in the process of developing a needs assessment instrument that can be used statewide to identify those youngsters who are in need of bilingual education programs. Several testing instruments are recommended by the Bilingual Education Office at this time. However, the identification process, in general, is rather complex and due to this complexity, it is best to think of it in terms of a continuum. On one end of the continuum are the youngsters who are most visibly and obviously of limited English-speaking ability. These
children are usually those who have recently come to this country from a non-English-speaking country. Except in the case of these recent arrivals, most children (including those whose parents may speak a language other than English exclusively at home) are able to communicate in English to some extent at least. At the other extreme of the continuum are those youngsters whose native language is one other than English, but who also have considerable skill in English, so that they are experiencing little or no difficulty in their school studies in terms of language interference problems. Thus, the Bilingual Education Office has guidelines for the selection process and various instruments which it recommends for use in the local school districts. However, the selection of an instrument and the development of an identification process is the responsibility of the local school district (M.D.E., 1977).

During the 1977-78 school year, twenty-three language classification groups were served in the local school districts throughout the state of Michigan. Of these twenty-three L.C.G.'s, Spanish by far, was the largest served. In the 1977-78 school year, the L.C.G. of Spanish was served in 35 cities in the state of Michigan (M.D.E., 1977) (see Appendix G).

Funding for bilingual education in the state of Michigan has increased significantly in the past four years. In 1974 and 1975, no state funds were available for bilingual education in Michigan, so the various programs throughout the state relied mainly on federal funding. In the 1976-77 school year, the Michigan Legislature appropriated $850,000 for bilingual education. These monies provided
services for 10,692 students at $79.49 per student. In the 1977-78 school year, the legislature appropriated $3,000,000 for bilingual education. These monies were distributed to school districts on the basis of 19,089 students who were receiving bilingual instruction. Payments of $157.00 per student receiving bilingual instruction were made to these school districts. In the 1978-79 school year, the legislature increased the appropriations to $4,000,000 for bilingual education resulting in a per pupil allocation of approximately $200. In September of 1978, the State Board of Education received the 1979-80 state aid recommendations. These recommendations included an increase from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000 in state funding for bilingual education programs (M.D.E., 1978).

Another source of funding for bilingual education in the state of Michigan, as mentioned previously, have been federal grants. The State Board of Education has applied for federal grants for several years under the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and through the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Although the S.B.E. applied unsuccessfully for a grant in the school year 1975-76, it was successful in obtaining a grant for $154,939 in 1976-77 and for $254,416 in 1977-78. In the 1978-79 school year, $2,000,000 have been appropriated to the state of Michigan in Federal grants. This $2,000,000 in federal monies when combined with the $4,000,000 appropriated by the Michigan Legislature results in a total of $6,000,000 available for bilingual education in the state of Michigan for school year 1978-79 (M.D.E., 1978).

In conclusion, as stated in this section of Chapter II regarding
"The History of Bilingual Education in Michigan", there are several basic differences between Michigan's bilingual education law - Public Act 294 and the federal government's law - Title VII E.S.E.A. The primary difference is that Public Act 294 mandates bilingual instruction while Title VII E.S.E.A. is mainly a provision for funding. Rather than requiring the various states to institute bilingual education programs, the federal government strongly recommends their implementation. On the other hand, the federal government's Title VII E.S.E.A. is more emphatic and directive in regard to the implementation of bicultural education than Public Act 294 which merely suggests that it may be used as a component or in conjunction with bilingual education. As a result, Public Act 294 has been strongly criticized because of its weak and indecisive position regarding bicultural education.

Bilingual Education Teacher-Training Programs in Michigan

Since the passage of Public Act 294 of 1974, there has been a tremendous need for endorsed bilingual teachers in the state of Michigan. The legislature of the state of Michigan recognized this need when they included the following statement in P.A. 294:

Exercising its authority under section 10 of Act No. 287 of the Public Acts of 1964, being section 388.1010 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, the State Board of Education shall promulgate rules governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors in the public schools of this state. The teacher shall meet the requirements of sections 851 and 852 of this act and shall be proficient in both the oral and written skills of the language of which he (she) is endorsed.

As a result of this mandate by Public Act 294 to the State Board of Education, the Michigan Department of Education developed a set
of guidelines for certificate endorsements of bilingual teachers and a permit system for employment in bilingual programs of qualified individuals not eligible for these endorsements. The first set of documents was entitled *Bilingual Teacher Certification Fall, 1975* (see Appendix B). These 1975 guidelines set forth criteria for the approval of teacher preparation programs leading to bilingual endorsement. The 1975 guidelines included the following three components as requirements: 1) methodology, 2) culture, 3) foreign language. Fifteen colleges and universities subsequently submitted proposals for the establishment of bilingual education teacher-training programs within the requirements of the 1975 guidelines and acquired approval from the State Board of Education (see Table VI).

However, as stated by Dr. John Porter (1978), the inadequacy of these 1975 guidelines has been recognized by various educators, administrators, and community members. Both the Bilingual Education Advisory Council and the La Raza Advisory Committee have recommended that the State Board of Education review the 1975 guidelines and approve rules governing bilingual endorsement. Among the concerns regarding the 1975 guidelines and the subsequent endorsement programs, are the following:

1) Criteria for the judgment of bilingual teacher competencies have not been applied consistently among the colleges and universities.

2) Current endorsement programs do not provide adequate training for bilingual teachers to work with parents and community members, a skill area considered essential to bilingual education.

3) The present K-12 endorsement pattern has been characterized by teachers, administrators, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Adrian College</td>
<td>9) Mary Grove College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Albion College</td>
<td>10) Mercy College of Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Alma College</td>
<td>11) Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Andrews University</td>
<td>12) Oakland University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Central Michigan University</td>
<td>13) Saginaw Valley State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>14) University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Grand Valley State College</td>
<td>15) Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Hillsdale College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Bilingual Education Office staff as too general because presently endorsed teachers offer instruction at all levels regardless of initial certification.

4) Colleges and universities in the state of Michigan offer endorsement only in Spanish, Arabic, Chaldean, Korean, French, German, and "Other". Programs are not available to produce qualified bilingual teachers in many languages served by bilingual programs.

In addition, there is a current shortage of bilingual education endorsed teachers. This is dramatically illustrated by the fact that most L.E.S.A students are receiving bilingual instruction from non-endorsed teachers. In the Fall of 1977, the local school districts, which operated bilingual education programs, reported employing only 84 endorsed bilingual teachers and 207 non-endorsed teachers with emergency permits issued by the Michigan Department of Education. Thus, during the 1977-78 school year, 291 teachers offered bilingual instruction to 19,089 L.E.S.A. students at a statewide ratio of 1 teacher to 66 students (M.D.E., 1978).

As a result of dissatisfaction with the 1975 teacher preparation guidelines, the State Board of Education, in cooperation with: the Bilingual Education Advisory Council, bilingual professionals, professors of bilingual education, students enrolled in endorsement programs, and parents whose children were enrolled in bilingual programs, proposed a document entitled Administrative Rules Governing the Endorsement of Qualified Bilingual Instructors (see Appendix C). These proposed rules of 1978 are pending approval by the State Board of Education (M.D.E., 1978).

These two documents (the 1975 guidelines and the proposed rules
of 1978), although appearing to be somewhat similar, entail some very significant differences. One of the primary differences is that the first document is a set of guidelines which infers recommendations while the second document is a set of rules indicating mandated instructions (which is more in accord with P.A. 294).

Another important difference between these two documents is that the 1975 guidelines merely recommend that endorsements for bilingual education teachers be granted for the entire K-12 level. The proposed rules of 1978, on the other hand, differ in that they are more specific and thus state:

General Provisions 4

Endorsement as a bilingual teacher shall be granted at the K-12 level. The bilingual endorsement will authorize public and private school assignments in grades K-12 and shall be a specific addition to elementary and secondary teacher certificates. When the bilingual endorsement is made on an elementary certificate, the teacher will be authorized to teach all subjects in a bilingual capacity in grades K-8 and to teach in a bilingual capacity in only his/her major and minor areas in grade 9. When the bilingual endorsement is made on a secondary certificate, the teacher will be authorized to teach in a bilingual capacity in the areas of his/her major and minor in grades 7-12. The assignment of classroom teachers shall be restricted as described above. However, teachers may function in an advisory capacity as follows: A person holding an elementary certificate with a K-12 bilingual endorsement may serve in an advisory capacity to staff at the secondary level. A person holding a secondary certificate with a K-12 bilingual endorsement may serve in an advisory capacity to staff at the elementary level. Since the bilingual endorsement authorizes instructional or consultant activities in grades K-12, the preparation program must develop the appropriate knowledge and skills to cover both elementary and secondary assignments.

Two additional items which seem to differ between these two documents
involve language proficiency and the equivalency option. The proposed rules differ from the 1975 guidelines in that the proposed rules require proficiency in both English and the endorsed language while the 1975 guidelines only require proficiency in the endorsed language. In addition, the proposed rules extend the equivalency option found in the 1975 guidelines and thus allow candidates who have taught successfully for two or more years in a bilingual program to waive the directed teacher requirement (M.D.E., 1978).

As mentioned previously, since the passage of Public Act 294 in 1974, the number of children of limited English-speaking ability receiving bilingual instruction has increased significantly and consequently, the need for endorsed bilingual teachers has also increased significantly. In order to quantify the number of endorsed bilingual teachers needed, several factors must be known and assumed (M.D.E., 1978).

1) The number of students of limited English-speaking ability for which a program of bilingual education must be offered must be known. These data are reported by local school districts to the Michigan Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office on Form OS-4621. These forms are received on an annual basis (see Table VII).

2) A ratio of 3:1 of students of limited English-speaking ability to students who are not of limited English-speaking ability must be added to insure that no segregation of students exists (see Table VIII).

3) Some local school districts have elected to provide bilingual education to students of limited English-speaking ability even though 20 students of that language background are not in membership in the district. The need for bilingual education teachers in these districts must also be taken into account.
4) A student teacher ratio of 23.7:1 has been identified as the statewide average by the Michigan Department of Education (see Table IX).

Table VII illustrates the number of students of limited English-speaking ability as reported by local school districts. Included in these figures are students who constitute a language classification group of twenty or more in a particular school district, as mandated by Public Act 294. The category of "Other Languages" in Tables VII, VIII, and IX includes a composite of various language classification groups for which less than three school districts reported 20 or more L.E.S.A. students present of the same L.C.G. In addition, certain local school districts have elected to provide bilingual education programs for a total of 713 L.E.S.A. students who constitute groups of less than 20 in any certain L.C.G. Regardless of the fact that bilingual instruction is only strongly recommended by P.A. 294 (rather than mandated) for these particular school districts, the need for bilingual education teachers in these districts must still be taken into account (see Tables, VII and IX) (M.D.E., 1978).

As shown in Table IX, the number of endorsed bilingual teachers needed in Michigan as of school year 1977-78 is 1,208. During this school year, school districts reported employing 84 teachers who hold bilingual endorsements. If these 84 endorsed teachers are subtracted from the 1,208 bilingual teachers needed, the net total of endorsed bilingual education teachers needed in the state of Michigan is 1,124. However, local school districts have also applied for 207 emergency permits in order to allow non-endorsed teachers to teach in bilingual education programs. These teachers must take six semester hours of
Table VII

L.E.S.A. Students in Districts With 20 or More

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>2285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldean</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojibway</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>14702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other Languages</td>
<td>2443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>22175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Various L.C.G.'s for which less than three school districts reported twenty or more L.E.S.A. students present of the same L.C.G.

Source: M.D.E., 1978
Table VIII

L.E.S.A. and Non-L.E.S.A. Students (3:1 Ratio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>2856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldean</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojibway</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>18388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>3054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Students not covered by P.A. 294</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 28610

*Less than twenty L.E.S.A. students in the same L.C.G. present in a particular school district. Programs for these students are strongly recommended by P.A. 294 but are not mandated.

Source: M.D.E., 1978
Table IX
Number of Endorsed Bilingual Education Teachers Needed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldean</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojibway</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students not covered by P.A. 294</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 1208

*To serve L.E.S.A. and non-L.E.S.A. students as shown in Table VIII. This number is calculated at a teacher-pupil ratio of 23.7:1.

Source: M.D.E., 1978
college credit during the year in order for their permit to be renewed. If these 207 teachers, who acquired an emergency permit, eventually complete their requirements for bilingual endorsement, they would reduce the number of bilingual education endorsed teachers needed to 917 (M.D.E., 1978).

In conclusion, the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education (1978) has stated that the current resources of institutions of higher education need to be expanded in order to train the large number of teachers needed to offer bilingual education in Michigan. As stated previously, 1,124 endorsed bilingual education teachers are needed in the state of Michigan immediately in order to service the 28,610 L.E.S.A. students. These students cannot afford to wait two to four years until a sufficient number of endorsed teachers are available to provide them the educational opportunities to which they currently are entitled.

In order to address this urgent need for endorsed bilingual education teachers, Porter (1978) has identified several potential personnel resource areas:

1) Presently certified teachers who have the necessary language proficiency. Emergency permits are provided to allow these teachers to offer bilingual instruction while they pursue endorsement.

2) Bilingual teachers who have experience teaching in other states or countries. Application for equivalency certification are reviewed on a case by case basis.

3) College and secondary students can be encouraged to enroll in endorsement programs. Students can be made aware of career opportunities in bilingual education.
4) Presently employed teachers can be re-trained through professional development and in-service programs to allow them to obtain the necessary language proficiency and other requirements for bilingual endorsement.

5) Career ladder opportunities can be made available to allow presently employed bilingual teacher aides to obtain certification and endorsement.

6) Incentive opportunities can be given to bilingual teachers in the form of additional compensation received for added responsibilities.

Through these combined efforts, it is hoped that the quality and quantity of bilingual education teachers will increase and consequently, the quality and quantity of bilingual instruction programs will improve and increase accordingly.
DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The design and methods used in conducting this dissertation are described under the following four headings: 1) review of the problem, 2) the sample, 3) design and data collection, and 4) data analysis.

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to develop a description of the bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state of Michigan and to analyze them for commonalities and differences. Although Public Act 294 (1974) assigned the State Board of Education the responsibility to establish rules governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors in the public schools of this state, each college and university has the autonomy to interpret and implement these rules differently. As a result, there was a need to analyze the characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state. This information is essential for planning, evaluation, and conceptual development in the area of bilingual teacher education. In addition, research seems to be rather limited in regard to bilingual teacher-training programs in this country and essentially no research is currently available regarding programs in the state of Michigan. Thus, the purpose of this study was to address this void.

The Sample

The sample group consisted of one director from each of the
bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan for a total of fifteen directors. This sample group was also the survey population. The survey population was used as the sample group because the size was manageable and in an effort to increase the validity of the study.

The number of bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan was established by acquiring a list of these programs from the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education. It should be noted that the researcher was a member of the La Raza Advisory Committee to the State Board of Education during the initial stages of the study. This committee was very influential in acquiring the passage of House Bill 4750 which later became Public Act 294. It should also be noted that the researcher was a member of the Bilingual Education Advisory Council to the Michigan Department of Education during the study as well.

The fifteen bilingual education teacher-training programs, identified through the Bilingual Education Office, were listed. They included eight public institutions, and seven private institutions, as well as seven universities and eight colleges (see Table X).

From the 14 questionnaires which were completed and returned, various data regarding the sample group were acquired. For example, questionnaire items 42, 43, and 44 stated that there were 8 public institutions and 6 private. In addition, the enrollment of these institutions and the breakdown, according to the year in which each program was established and implemented, was as follows:
### Table X

**Bilingual Education Teacher-Training Programs in Michigan***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>College of Education Adrian College</td>
<td>Adrian, MI 49221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>Department of Education Albion College</td>
<td>Albion, MI 49224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>College of Education Alma College</td>
<td>Alma, MI 48801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences Department of English Andrews University Berrien Springs, MI 49104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>Department of Ele. Education Central Michigan University Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bilingual-Bicultural Teacher Education Program</td>
<td>College of Education Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, MI 48197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>Department of Education Grand Valley State College Grand Rapids, MI 49503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>College of Education Hillsdale College Hillsdale, MI 49242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>Foreign Language Dept. Mary Grove College Detroit, MI 48221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>Department of Education Mercy College of Detroit Detroit, MI 48219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Letters Dept. of Ele. Education Michigan State University East Lansing, MI 48824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>School of Education Oakland University Rochester, MI 48063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Bilingual Education Center</td>
<td>School of Education Saginaw Valley State College University Center, MI 49710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>School of Education University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI 48109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Bilingual Program</td>
<td>College of Education Wayne State University Detroit, MI 48202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Listed alphabetically by institution.

** Program pending implementation.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Additional data indicated that the number of students enrolled in these programs ranged from 2 to 132. The number of L.C.G. members (of the same language(s) endorsed by their particular program) enrolled in the programs ranged from 0 to 132. The number of undergraduate students enrolled in these programs ranged from 0 to 40. The number of graduate students enrolled ranged from 0 to 84. The range of L.C.G. members who had completed the program requirements was from 0 to 50. The number of undergraduates who had completed the program requirements ranged from 0 to 19, while the graduate students ranged from 0 to 50. The range of the enrollees who had left the programs prior to the completion of the program requirements was from 0 to 20. In regard to employment, 0 to 7 full-time staff members were employed in the programs and 0 to 3 were L.C.G. members of the same language(s) endorsed by their particular program. Zero to 20 part-time staff members were employed in the programs and 0 to 7 were L.C.G. members of the same language(s) endorsed by their particular program. Special state permits, available for instruction in bilingual education programs, by staff members who do not have a bilingual endorsement, were not used in any of the programs. In conclusion, 2 full-time staff members and 2 part-time staff members had
bilingual education endorsements on their teacher certificates (see Table XI).

Design and Data Collection

In collecting the empirical data for this survey study, the descriptive method of research was employed. In addition, the Cuba and Clark (1967) concept of depiction studies was also employed in that this study was to be the basis for future studies as well as to provide significant data.

The study proposed to analyze bilingual education teacher-training programs by stating seven objectives and six research hypotheses. In order to address these hypotheses and thus satisfy the objectives, a questionnaire was devised and mailed to the entire population.

The survey instrument consisted of technical and demographic questions. The first 41 questions of the instrument utilized dichotomous questions (yes or no). The second portion of the instrument, questions 42 through 60, utilized interval questions (numbers). These questions were specifically designed to provide the data necessary to address the following six hypotheses:

1) Characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs can be grouped according to commonalities.

2) Characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs can be grouped according to differences.

3) There is a difference in the language proficiency components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.
### Table XI
Program and Institutional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Items as Numbered in the Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Pub</td>
<td>22 5 15 7 16 19 20 1 1 1 20 7 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Pub</td>
<td>55 UK 35 15 UK UK UK UK UK UK UK UK UK UK UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Pub</td>
<td>132 132 20 84 47 7 24 8 4 3 1 1 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Pub</td>
<td>45 25 27 18 7 1 14 11 3 2 3 2 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Pub</td>
<td>40 12 34 6 5 19 2 4 7 0 1 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Pub</td>
<td>15 12 7 8 31 15 16 4 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Pub</td>
<td>90 1 40 50 1 0 25 9 1 1 2 1 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.Pub</td>
<td>55 30 20 35 10 0 10 8 3 2 4 4 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Prv</td>
<td>5 3 4 1 1 2 1 1 7 3 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Prv</td>
<td>10 3 0 10 50 0 50 20 2 1 4 1 0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.Prv</td>
<td>5 0 5 0 0 6 0 0 0 0 12 2 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.Prv</td>
<td>7 1 7 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.Prv</td>
<td>2 0 2 0 1 1 0 0 6 2 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.Prv</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 4 1 2 1 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **Pub** represents public institutions
- **Prv** represents private institutions
- **UK** represents the unknown responses

Questionnaire items 43 & 44 were not included in this table in order to ensure the confidentiality of the respondents.
4) There is a difference in the methodology components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

5) There is a difference in the cultural components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

6) There is a difference in the practical experience components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

In order to address these research hypotheses, several assumptions were made in this study. As previously stated, each institution of higher education has the autonomy to interpret the guidelines governing the endorsement of teachers as certified bilingual instructors in the public schools of the state of Michigan. As a result, it was assumed that each institution could interpret and implement these guidelines differently. This, in turn, led to the assumption that the various bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state of Michigan differ.

It was further assumed that the definitions provided in this study and the standard descriptive framework (instrument) used were sufficient to describe the various characteristics of bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan. In conclusion, it was assumed that the methods of data collection used in this study were as free from bias as possible.

A draft of the prospectus for this study was presented to the Dissertation Seminar Class in June, 1977. Comments and suggestions both for the prospectus and the questionnaire were considered and either implemented or disregarded. The prospectus was then submitted
to the Doctoral Committee and approval was granted in September, 1977. The instrument was submitted to two offices of the Michigan Department of Education, the Bilingual Education Office and the Latino Education Office, in order to test its content validity. The revised form was then submitted as a pilot study to thirty bilingual education teacher-training programs in six different states. Of the thirty questionnaires dispersed, eighteen were completed and returned for a sixty percent response. Further changes were made to the instrument after the pilot study and prior to approval by the Human Subjects Review Committee. Among the changes implemented was the reduction in questionnaire items from 65 to 60. These changes consisted of the elimination of repetitious and superfluous questions and the combining of questions where possible. In addition, various questions were rewritten in order to enhance clarity at the suggestion of the Doctoral Committee membership. In November, 1978, the instrument was ready for implementation.

The instrument was mailed, with a letter of introduction, to each director of the fifteen bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state on December 11, 1978. The letter of introduction explained the survey and its importance and encouraged the sample group members to return the questionnaire as soon as possible. Also included in the letter of introduction was a statement ensuring the confidentiality of the respondent and the address and telephone number of the researcher in order to provide clarification and assistance if necessary. A pre-addressed, postage paid, return envelope was provided for each director to use in returning the questionnaire.
Because of the size of the population, it was essential that each director be encouraged to respond to the questionnaire. Thus, two weeks following the initial mailing, a follow-up telephone call was made to each program director encouraging them to complete the questionnaire. It was necessary to contact all the directors, even though several questionnaires had already been returned, because neither a code nor an identification method was used with the instrument in order to protect the confidentiality of the respondent as mentioned in the letter of introduction. In addition, it was felt that the assurance of confidentiality would maximize the number of questionnaires completed and returned. The second and third telephone follow-ups were made following the third and fifth weeks respectively. After the six week deadline, a letter was sent to all the directors thanking them for their participation and a pre-addressed, postage paid, postcard was enclosed for the directors to return if they desired a copy of the results of the study.

At the end of the first week, three questionnaires had been completed and returned. By the end of the second week, seven questionnaires had been completed and returned. Following the first follow-up telephone call, two additional questionnaires were completed and returned and by the end of the third week, eleven questionnaires had been completed and returned. In addition, a twelfth questionnaire had been returned, but it had not been completed since the bilingual education teacher-training program at this institution was pending implementation. The second follow-up telephone call failed to produce any additional questionnaires and as a result, the deadline for
the collection of data was extended from four to six weeks and an additional follow-up telephone call was added. The extension of the deadline became necessary because the data collection period included the Christmas and New Year's Day holidays when many of the directors were either on vacation or were not available. The two week addition proved to be beneficial in that three additional questionnaires were acquired for a total of fourteen questionnaires completed and fifteen returned. The total time allotted for distribution and data collection was from December 11th to January 21st, and the total response rate was 100 percent.

Data Analysis

The questionnaire contained sixty questions to be answered by all respondents. All of the questions required a single answer and dealt with facts. There were no opinion type questions. The questions covered two broad areas: 1) program elements and 2) program and institutional characteristics. The program elements area was subdivided into the following sections: 1) language proficiency component, 2) methodology component, 3) cultural component, 4) practical experience component, 5) endorsements to existing certificates, and 6) general. The program elements area included questions 1 through 41. The program and institutional characteristics area was not subdivided into sections but was presented as a total unit. This area included questions 42 through 60.

There was a total of fifteen questionnaires distributed. Of this total, fifteen questionnaires were returned. However, as stated
previously, one questionnaire was returned without responding to the questions, since the program at this institution was pending implementation. The data analyzed in this study were from the information received from the completed questionnaires unless specifically stated otherwise.

Data collected from the questionnaires were expressed quantitatively in that the findings of the data were presented in the number of responses received (frequency) and in the percentage of responses. These frequency counts and percentages were used to summarize the data. The data were then categorized according to commonalities and differences.

Certain responses were measured for applicability through measures of central tendency and variability. The measures of central tendency used to determine the representativeness of the interval data were means and medians. The heterogeneity of the data was determined through the use of measures of dispersion (standard deviation and maximum value and minimum value computations).

In addition, in order to analyze the data, the research hypotheses were paired with the corresponding objectives for the study (see Table XII). Secondly, the research hypotheses were matched with the various questionnaire questions which were developed in order to address the research hypotheses (see Table XIII). Thirdly, each research hypothesis was addressed individually in order to establish verification or non-verification.

The Guttman Scale was selected as a method of measuring the concepts and variables found in the various items of the questionnaire.
Table XII

Matching of Objectives With Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Research Hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Descriptive Framework)</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Program Descriptions)</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Programs - Similar Characteristics)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Programs - Different Characteristics)</td>
<td>2 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Categorizing Programs of Similar Characteristics)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Categorizing Programs of Different Characteristics)</td>
<td>2 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Common Characteristics of All Programs)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XIII

Matching of Research Hypotheses With Questionnaire Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Hypotheses</th>
<th>Questionnaire Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Commonality Grouping)</td>
<td>1 - 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Differences Grouping)</td>
<td>1 - 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Language Proficiency Differences)</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Methodology Differences)</td>
<td>3 - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Cultural Differences)</td>
<td>17 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Practical Experience Differences)</td>
<td>26 - 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Guttman Scale was utilized, as opposed to other scales such as the Thurstone and the Likert Scales, because it was designed to measure whether a number of items forms a cumulative scale. Operationally, this means that the items must be ordered in terms of difficulty and response consistency. Smith et al. (1976) stated that:

Unlike the Thurstone and the Likert Scale score, the Guttman Scale score has direct meaning. A Guttman Scale score is a direct indication of the over-all response pattern. In addition, the Guttman procedure provides a means of analyzing the inter-relationship between items and it rejects those which do not appear to be related to the underlying concept. This property of selecting only those items which form a single dimension is referred to as unidimensionality. Both of these properties are empirically determined on the basis of the subject's responses.

The coefficient of reproducibility measures the scale's over-all acceptability. It is in fact a measure of the predictability of response patterns. The coefficient of reproducibility is defined as follows: \( CR = 1.00 - (e/r) \). When the coefficient is low, it is generally assumed that the scale is not dimensional. Thus, the Guttman procedure provides a means of testing the cumulativeness and unidimensionality of a series of items and is not a means of selecting only appropriate items (although the latter is sometimes the case).

In evaluating a scale, research must acknowledge variation in responses. A scale comprised of items with no variation is not an adequate measure. Research must take into account the patterns of errors. The procedure, in other words, must seek consistency and organization which sometimes is lacking. Furthermore, research must note that a given scale may be unidimensional for one group of subjects but not for another. This is because unidimensionality is a function of the response patterns not a measure of procedures (Smith et al., 1976).
In conclusion, the Guttman Scale was utilized, as opposed to another method of analysis, because it appeared to meet the three major evaluative criteria for scale assessment: item construction criteria, response set criteria, and psychometric criteria better than other scales. Meeting these criteria demonstrated the validity and reliability of the scale used. This was especially important in this study because the data that were being analyzed were in a new and developing area—bilingual education teacher-training programs and little research has been done in this area. Consequently, standards and credibility have not yet been established.
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study is to develop a description of the bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state of Michigan and to analyze these programs for commonalities and differences. As a result, the data received through responses to a questionnaire were divided into two major areas for analysis: 1) commonalities, and 2) differences of the various programs. These two areas were in turn subdivided into six research hypotheses. These research hypotheses were paired with the seven objectives of the study (see Table XII) and the various questionnaire questions which were developed in order to verify these research hypotheses (see Table XIII).

In an effort to explain the state of the art of bilingual education teacher-training programs, the data were first analyzed as demographic information regarding the sponsoring institutions and the teacher-training programs. This information included the questionnaire items referring to: institutional types, programmatic and institutional characteristics, general programmatic elements, and endorsements to existing teaching certificates. Secondly, the commonalities and differences of the various program elements were addressed. Thirdly, the specific components of the teacher-training programs were analyzed as to their various programmatic elements and their prevalence in the field.

Tables were constructed to visually present the data. Frequency distributions, percentages of responses, ranges of responses, and Guttman Scales were presented for quantitative analysis.
Demographic Data

As stated previously, all fifteen directors responded to the questionnaire, however, one director did not complete the questionnaire since this particular program was pending implementation. Thus, the data analysis consisted of a population of fourteen bilingual education teacher-training programs rather than the fifteen originally identified through the Michigan Department of Education - Bilingual Education Office.

In regard to institutional types, there were 8 public institutions and 6 private which offered bilingual education teacher-training programs. The institutions ranged in enrollment size accordingly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Institutions</th>
<th>Private Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to programmatic and institutional characteristics, the following demographic data were found (Table XIV):

The programs were established in the following manner:

1 in 1973  
1 in 1974  
6 in 1975  
6 in 1976

The number of students enrolled in these programs ranged from 2 to 132.

The number of L.C.G. members (of the same language(s) endorsed by their particular program) enrolled in the programs ranged from
The number of undergraduate students enrolled in these programs ranged from 0 to 40.

The number of graduate students enrolled ranged from 0 to 84.

The range of L.C.G. members who had completed the program requirements was from 0 to 50.

The number of undergraduates who had completed the program requirements ranged from 0 to 19 while the graduate students ranged from 0 to 50.

The range of enrollees, who had left the programs prior to the completion of the program requirements, was from 0 to 20.

In regard to employment, 0 to 7 full-time staff members were employed in the programs, and 0 to 3 were L.C.G. members of the same language(s) endorsed by their particular program. Zero to 20 part-time staff members were employed in the programs and 0 to 7 were L.C.G. members of the same language(s) endorsed by their particular program.

Special state permits, available for instruction in bilingual education programs by staff members who do not have a bilingual endorsement, were not used in any of the programs.

In conclusion, 2 full-time staff members and 2 part-time staff members had bilingual education endorsements on their teaching certificates.

In regard to the general programmatic elements of bilingual education teacher-training programs prevalent in the field, the following data were found (Table XV):

All of the programs stated that they functioned in cooperation with local school districts offering bilingual education programs.
Table XIV
Demographic Data:
Program and Institutional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Response Category Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (Publ)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38,000-40,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (Publ)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,700-17,500</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (Publ)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000-7,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (Priv)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,750-2,500</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (Priv)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>850-1,120</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1973 &amp; 1974</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-22</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90-132</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12-30</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15-40</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35-84</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0-16</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0-16</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20-50</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Items</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Response Category</td>
<td>Response Category Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0-11</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 &amp; 58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 &amp; 58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 &amp; 60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 &amp; 60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 &amp; 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14
Table XV

Demographic Data:
Frequency and Percentage Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Yes&quot; &quot;No&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Yes&quot; &quot;No&quot;</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsements to Existing Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>14  0</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>14  0</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>14  0</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>13  1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>8   6</td>
<td>57% 43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>14  0</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>12  2</td>
<td>86% 14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4   10</td>
<td>29% 71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3   11</td>
<td>21% 79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2   12</td>
<td>14% 86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14
Twelve of the 14 programs included a 24 semester hour (or an equivalent term hour) minimum requirement for teacher-trainees seeking a bilingual education endorsement for an initial teaching certificate.

Four of the 14 programs included a masters degree program in bilingual education.

Three of the 14 programs included a specialist degree program in bilingual education.

Two of the 14 programs included a doctorate degree program in bilingual education.

In regard to the area of endorsements to existing teaching certificates, the prevalence of these program elements in the field was as follows (Table XV):

All the programs stated that they provided:

1. The necessary requirements for obtaining a bilingual education endorsement to an existing teaching certificate.

2. The same components for a bilingual education endorsement to an existing teaching certificate as was provided for an initial teaching certificate.

3. An assessment process for competency in the endorsed language.

Thirteen of the 14 programs provided an 18 semester hour (or equivalent term hour) minimum requirement for this area.

Eight of the 14 programs provided an assessment process for competency in English.

Commonality Grouping

In order to develop a typology of the program elements of the
bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state, the responses to the questionnaire items were analyzed in regard to the frequency of "yes" responses (commonalities) and the frequency of "no" responses (differences) received for each program element. The analysis of the "yes" responses, which were classified as commonalities, was used to address the first research hypothesis which stated that the:

Characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs can be grouped according to commonalities.

Data regarding the commonality of the program elements of the fourteen bilingual education teacher-training programs were presented (see Table XVI). The data were ranked according to the frequency and percentage of "yes" responses or the degree of commonality. The elements with the greatest commonality (high frequency and percentage response rates) were selected first. These elements fell within the frequency response range of 13 to 14 "yes" responses for a range of 93% to 100%. The elements included in the medium frequency and percentage response rates fell within the range of 10 to 12 "yes" responses for a range of 71% to 86%. The elements included in the low frequency and percentage response rates fell within the frequency response range of 5 to 9 "yes" responses for a range of 36% to 64%.

The fifteen elements included in the high frequency and percentage category were the following:

1. An assessment procedure for competency in the endorsed language.

2. Knowledge development in linguistics.

3. Knowledge development of the philosophy of bilingual education.
Table XVI
Frequency and Percentage Response Rates of the Program Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Response Category &quot;Yes&quot; &quot;No&quot;</th>
<th>Response Category Percentages &quot;Yes&quot; &quot;No&quot;</th>
<th>Percentage Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Proficiency Component</td>
<td>14 0</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 5</td>
<td>64% 36%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology Component</td>
<td>14 0</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11 3</td>
<td>79% 21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11 3</td>
<td>79% 21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>71% 29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>71% 29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>57% 43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>57% 43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>57% 43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>43% 57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Component</td>
<td>14 0</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>14 0</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12 2</td>
<td>86% 14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12 2</td>
<td>86% 14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12 2</td>
<td>86% 14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Experience Component</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td>93% 7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>71% 29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>8 6</td>
<td>57% 43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>43% 57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5 9</td>
<td>36% 64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14

5. Knowledge development of teacher attitude toward bilingual education students.


10. Knowledge development of societal attitudes toward bilingual education.

11. Knowledge development of parental attitudes toward bilingual education.


15. Practical experience in a bilingual education program of a local school.

The eight elements included in the medium frequency and percentage category were the following:

1. Knowledge development of the relationship between the community and bilingual education.

2. Knowledge development of the bilingual child's dominant society role.


4. Knowledge development in instruction in two languages (English and the endorsed language).
5. Knowledge development in the use of bilingual instruction in all subject matter areas.

6. Minimum requirement of 9 semester hours in teacher methodology.

7. Knowledge development in working with a teacher aide(s).

8. Practical experience in the appropriate grade level of certification.

The eight elements included in the low frequency and percentage category were the following:

1. An assessment procedure for competency in English.

2. Preparation at the K-9 elementary grade level.

3. Preparation at the K-12 grade level.


5. Minimum requirement of 6 semester hours in a practical experience.

6. Preparation at the 7-12 secondary grade level.

7. Practical experience with L.C.G. students in a tutorial program.

8. Practical experience with the L.C.G. community.

Difference Grouping

As previously stated, in an effort to develop a typology of the program elements of bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state, the responses to the questionnaire items were also analyzed in regard to the frequency of "no" responses (differences) received for each program element. The analysis of the "no" responses, which were classified as differences, was used to address the second research hypothesis which stated that the:
Characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs can be grouped according to differences.

Data regarding the differences of the program elements of the fourteen bilingual education teacher-training programs were presented (see Table XVI). The data were ranked according to the frequency and percentage of "no" responses or the degree of differences. The elements with the greatest difference (high frequency and percentage response rates) were selected first. These elements fell within the frequency response range of 5 to 9 "no" responses for a range of 36% to 64%. The elements included in the medium frequency and percentage response rates fell within the range of 2 to 4 "no" responses for a range of 14% to 29%. The elements included in the low frequency and percentage responses fell within the frequency response range of 0 to 1 "no" responses for a range of 0% to 7%.

The eight elements included in the high frequency and percentage category were the following:

1. Practical experience with the L.C.G. community.
2. Practical experience with L.C.G. students in a tutorial program.
3. Preparation at the 7-12 secondary grade level.
4. Minimum requirement of 6 semester hours in a practical experience.
6. Preparation at the K-12 grade level.
7. Preparation at the K-9 elementary grade level.

The eight elements included in the medium frequency and percentage...
category were the following:

1. Practical experience in the appropriate grade level of certification.

2. Knowledge development in working with a teacher aide(s).

3. Minimum requirement of 9 semester hours in teacher methodology.

4. Knowledge development in the use of bilingual instruction in all subject matter areas.

5. Knowledge development in instruction in two languages (English and the endorsed language).


7. Knowledge development of the bilingual child's dominant society role.

8. Knowledge development of the relationship between the community and bilingual education.

The fifteen elements included in the low frequency and percentage category were the following:

1. Practical experience in a bilingual education program of a local school.

2. Provision of a practical experience component.


5. Knowledge development of the parental attitudes toward bilingual education.


11. Knowledge development of teacher attitudes toward bilingual education students.


13. Knowledge development of the philosophy of bilingual education.


15. An assessment procedure for competency in the endorsed language.

Language Proficiency Components

As stated previously, the specific components of the teacher-training programs were also analyzed as to the various programmatic elements for each particular component and their prevalence in the field. Data regarding the program elements of the fourteen bilingual education teacher-training programs were grouped according to program components. The data for each program component were then rank-ordered according to frequency and percentage response rates and were presented in Table XVI.

The language proficiency component consisted of two program elements. These two program elements were ranked according to the frequency and percentage of "yes" responses or the degree of commonality. The program element with the greatest degree of commonality involved an assessment procedure for competency in the endorsed language. This element received the maximum response rate of 14 "yes" responses.
for a percentage rate of 100%. Consequently, all fourteen programs were found to be similar in regard to the prevalence of this particular element.

Second in degree of commonality was the program element involving an assessment procedure for competency in English. This element was found to be prevalent in 9 programs and not prevalent in 5 programs. The 5 programs, which did not include this element, either did not address this need or addressed it in a different manner than an assessment procedure (an oral or written examination or a combination of both). As a result, they differed from the programs which did include this element and consequently, verified the third research hypothesis which stated that:

There is a difference in the language proficiency components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

Methodology Components

Data regarding the methodology components of the fourteen bilingual education teacher-training programs were presented in Table XVI. These data involved the frequency and percentage response rates of 14 different program elements. The frequency and percentage response rates regarding commonality ranged from 14 "yes" responses to 6 "yes" responses and from 100% "yes" responses to 43% "yes" responses. The frequency and percentage response rates regarding differences ranged from 8 "no" responses to 0 "no" responses and from 57% "no" responses to 0% "no" responses. Consequently, a difference in the prevalence of programmatic elements was found in twelve of the fourteen program
elements in that only two elements in this component were found to be prevalent in all the teacher-training programs. This difference verified the fourth research hypothesis which stated that:

There is a difference in the methodology components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

The following elements were included in the methodology components section of Table XVI and are presented in the same rank order:

4. Knowledge development of the philosophy of bilingual education.
8. Knowledge development in the instruction of L.E.S.A. students in comprehension.
10. Knowledge development in the use of bilingual instruction in all subject matter areas.
11. Minimum requirement of 9 semester hours in teacher methodology.
12. Knowledge development in working with a teacher aide(s).
13. Preparation at the K-9 elementary grade level.
14. Preparation at the K-12 grade level.
16. Preparation at the 7-12 secondary grade level.
Cultural Components

Data regarding the cultural components of the fourteen bilingual education teacher-training programs were presented in Table XVI. These data involved the frequency and percentage response rates of 9 different program elements. The frequency and percentage response rates regarding commonality ranged from 14 "yes" responses to 12 "yes" responses and from 100% "yes" responses to 86% "yes" responses. The frequency response rates regarding differences ranged from 2 "no" responses to 0 "no" responses and from 14% "no" responses to 0% "no" responses. Consequently, a difference in the prevalence of programmatic elements was found in seven of the nine program elements in that only two elements in this component were found to be prevalent in all the teacher-training programs. Although this difference in most cases was minor, the fact that a difference was found in seven of the nine programs verified the fifth research hypothesis which stated that:

There is a difference in the cultural components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

The following elements were included in the cultural components section of Table XVI and are presented in the same rank order:

17. Knowledge development in family structures of bilingual children.

18. Knowledge development of teacher attitudes toward bilingual education students.

20. Knowledge development of parental attitudes toward bilingual education.


22. Knowledge development of the relationship between bilingual children and measures of intelligence.

23. Knowledge development of the relationship between the community and bilingual education.

24. Knowledge development of the bilingual child's dominant society role.

25. Knowledge development of the bilingual child's L.C.G. member role.

Practical Experience Components

Data regarding the practical experience components of the fourteen bilingual education teacher-training programs were presented in Table XVI. These data involved the frequency and percentage response rates of 6 different program elements. The frequency and percentage response rates regarding commonality ranged from 13 "yes" responses to 5 "yes" responses and from 93% "yes" responses to 36% "yes" responses. The frequency and percentage response rates regarding differences ranged from 9 "no" responses to 1 "no" response and from 64% "no" responses to 7% "no" responses. Consequently, a difference in the prevalence of programmatic elements was found in all of the program elements in that none of the elements in this component were found to be prevalent in all the teacher-training programs. This difference verified the sixth research hypothesis which stated that:

There is a difference in the practical experience
components of the various bilingual education
teacher-training programs in the state of
Michigan.

The following elements were included in the practical exper-
ience components section of Table XVI and are presented in the same
rank order:


27. Practical experience in a bilingual education
program of a local school.

28. Practical experience in the appropriate grade
level of certification.

29. Minimum requirement of 6 semester hours in a
practical experience.

30. Practical experience with L.C.G. students in a
tutorial program.

31. Practical experience with the L.C.G. community.

Guttman Scale

Data regarding the methodology, cultural, and practical exper-
ience components were further analyzed through the computation of
Guttman Scales in order to rank the program elements of each compo-
nent in terms of difficulty and response consistency, and thus,
determine if the various items formed a cumulative scale.

The Guttman Scale scores indicated the overall response pattern
of each of these three components and, as a result, provided a means
of analyzing the interrelationships of the elements of the fourteen
programs within each of these three components. In addition, the
Guttman Scales ranked the program elements in descending order
(from left to right) according to their prevalence in the field.
The elements with the greatest prevalence were listed on the left side of the scale and the elements with the least prevalence were listed on the right. This degree of prevalence in the field seemed to demonstrate the various programs' preference in regard to those elements which were considered essential or core elements and those considered as optional.

Two computations were made for each of the three components. The first computation listed the program elements as they were found in the field. The second computation presented the same data with the errors identified by asterisks. These errors referred to the deviation of the actual responses from the ideal (perfect) Guttman Scale pattern. Since, in actual practice, data seldom fit the ideal Guttman Scale pattern exactly, correcting for errors are computations which are made to compensate for this deviation. Tests of reproducibility were also computed for each of the three components' Guttman Scales in order to measure the degree of deviation between the actual response pattern and the ideal Guttman Scale. These tests of reproducibility were thus, a measure of the error involved in predicting a response pattern.

Tests of reproducibility are commonly referred to as coefficients of reproducibility and are computed through the following formula: $CR = 1.00 - (e/r)$. The minimum standard for acceptable error was proposed by Guttman as a coefficient of reproducibility of .85 although .90 seems to be the most commonly used standard (Smith et al., 1976). Coefficients of reproducibility were computed for the Guttman Scales of each of the three components and were compared with the minimum standard for
a Guttman Scale in order to determine the acceptability of each of these scales.

The Guttman Scale for the methodology component included the following program elements in their descending order from left to right (see Table XVII):

10. Knowledge development of the philosophy of bilingual education.
8. Knowledge development in the instruction of L.E.S.A. students in comprehension.
4. Knowledge development in instruction in two languages (English and the endorsed language).
14. Knowledge development in the use of bilingual instruction in all subject matter areas.
3. Minimum requirement of 9 semester hours in teacher methodology.
15. Knowledge development in working with a teacher aide(s).
11. Preparation at the K-9 elementary grade level.
13. Preparation at the K-12 grade level.
12. Preparation at the 7-12 secondary grade level.

The program elements of this component were grouped according to the elements which had the highest prevalence in the field and
Table XVII

Guttman Scale: Methodology Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items (3-16)</th>
<th>Program Scale Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 10 5 6 7 8 4 14 3 15 11 13 16 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>+ + 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>* + 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>* + 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>+ + 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>+ + 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>+ + 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>- * 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>- + 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+ + + + + + * * + - + + + +</td>
<td>* + + 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+ + * * * * - - + + + + + +</td>
<td>+ * + + 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+ + + + + + - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>+ - - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14

+ represents "yes" responses to the questionnaire items.
- represents "no" responses to the questionnaire items.
* represents errors.
which seemed to demonstrate the various programs' preference in regard to those elements which were considered essential or core elements. The program elements with the least prevalence in the field were also grouped and classified as those elements which seemed to be optional (less essential). The elements identified as essential or as core elements were those which received a frequency response rate of 14 to 10 "yes" responses. These core elements included the following: 9, 10, 5, 6, 7, 8, 4, 3, and 15. The optional elements were identified as those elements which received a frequency response rate of 9 to 0 "yes" responses. These optional elements included the following: 11, 13, 16, and 12.

In addition, in order to measure the overall acceptability of the Guttman Scale computed for the methodology component, a coefficient of reproducibility was computed for the program elements:

\[
CR = 1.00 - \frac{e}{r}
\]

As stated previously, Guttman established a minimum standard of .85 as an acceptable error level for coefficients of reproducibility and as a result, the Guttman Scale, when compared with this standard, demonstrated that it was acceptable and that the qualities of cumulativeness, consistency and unidimensionality were confirmed.

The Guttman Scale for the cultural component included the following program elements in their descending order from left to right (see Table XVIII):

23. Knowledge development of teacher attitudes toward bilingual education students.

17. Knowledge development of societal attitudes toward bilingual education.

18. Knowledge development of parental attitudes toward bilingual education.


22. Knowledge development of the relationship between bilingual children and measures of intelligence.

20. Knowledge development of the relationship between the community and bilingual education.

24. Knowledge development of the bilingual child's dominant society role.

25. Knowledge development of the bilingual child's L.C.G. member role.

The program elements of this component were also grouped according to the elements which had the highest prevalence in the field and which seemed to demonstrate the various programs' preference in regard to those elements which were considered essential or core elements. The program elements with the least prevalence in the field were also grouped and classified as those elements which seemed to be optional (less essential). The elements identified as essential or as core elements were those which received a frequency response rate of 14 to 10 "yes" responses (the same breaking points were used for all three components). These core elements included the following: 19, 23, 17, 18, 21, 22, 20, 24, and 25.

Since these core elements included all the elements in the cultural component, no program elements were identified as optional.

In addition, in order to measure the overall acceptability of...
Table XVIII
Guttman Scale: Cultural Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items (17-25)</th>
<th>Program Scale Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14

+ represents "yes" responses to the questionnaire items.
- represents "no" responses to the questionnaire items.
* represents errors.
Table XIX
Guttman Scale: Practical Experience Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items (26-31)</th>
<th>Program Scale Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14

* represents "yes" responses to the questionnaire items.
- represents "no" responses to the questionnaire items.
* represents errors.
the Guttman Scale computed for the cultural component, a coefficient of reproducibility was computed for the program elements:

\[
CR = 1.00 - \frac{e}{r} \\
CR = 1.00 - 3 \\
CR = .97
\]

The Guttman Scale for the cultural component, when compared with the minimum standard of .85 as the acceptable error level for coefficients of reproducibility, demonstrated that it was acceptable and that the qualities of cumulativeness, consistency and unidimensionality were confirmed.

The Guttman Scale for the practical experience component included the following program elements in their descending order from left to right (see Table XIX):

28. Practical experience in a bilingual education program of a local school.
29. Practical experience in the appropriate grade level of certification.
27. Minimum requirement of 6 semester hours in a practical experience.
31. Practical experience with L.C.G. students in a tutorial program.
30. Practical experience with the L.C.G. community.

The program elements of this component were also grouped according to the elements which had the highest prevalence in the field and which seemed to demonstrate the various programs' preference in regard to those elements which were considered essential or core elements. The program elements with the least prevalence in the field were also grouped and classified as those elements which
seemed optional (less essential). The elements identified as essential or core elements were those which received a frequency response rate of 14 to 10 "yes" responses. These core elements included the following: 26, 28, and 29. The optional elements were identified as those elements which received a frequency response rate of 9 to 0 "yes" responses. These optional elements included the following: 27, 31, and 30.

In addition, in order to measure the overall acceptability of the Guttman Scale computed for the practical experience component, a coefficient of reproducibility was computed for the program elements:

\[
CR = 1.00 - (e/r)
\]
\[
CR = 1.00 - 4
\]
\[
CR = .96
\]

The Guttman Scale for the practical experience component, when compared with the minimum standard of .85 as the acceptable error level for coefficients of reproducibility, demonstrated that it was acceptable and that the qualities of cumulativeness, consistency and unidimensionality were confirmed.

In summary, the Guttman Scale ranked the program elements of the methodology, cultural, and practical experience components in terms of difficulty and response consistency and thus, determined that the various program elements formed a cumulative scale. The Guttman Scale scores indicated the overall response pattern of each of these three components and as a result, provided a means for analyzing the interrelationships of the elements of the fourteen programs in regard to each of these three components. The Guttman Scales also
ranked the program elements in descending order (from left to right) according to their prevalence in the field. The elements with the greatest prevalence were listed on the left side of the scale and the elements with the least prevalence were listed on the right. This degree of prevalence in the field seemed to demonstrate the various programs' preference in regard to those elements which were considered essential or core elements and those considered optional.

In addition, a Spearman Rank Order Correlation was computed on the program scale scores of each Guttman Scale addressing two components at a time (methodology and practical experience), (methodology and cultural), and (practical experience and cultural). The correlation between each pair was positive in that: a moderately high correlation of +.62 was obtained between the methodology and the practical experience components, a moderate correlation of +.51 was obtained between the methodology and cultural components, and a low correlation of +.27 was obtained between the practical experience and the cultural components. In all cases, the positive correlations indicated an evolutionary development, i.e., programs which were less developed on one component tended to be less developed on another; conversely, programs which were highly developed on one component tended to be highly developed on another. The moderately high correlations, involving the methodology and practical experience components, can be explained by the fact that a certain degree of development seemed to be taking place in regard to these two components. This development was responsible for the non-inclusion in the fourteen programs of all of the elements which comprised these two components.
As a result, a variation in the rankings was present. The lower correlation, involving the cultural component, can be explained by the fact that ten of the fourteen teacher-training programs included all of the elements of the cultural component in their programs and, therefore, there was little variation in the rankings.

In conclusion, the findings of this study were reported in the preceding chapter. An analysis of the demographic data was provided in order to explain the state of the art regarding bilingual education teacher-training programs in Michigan. This information included the questionnaire items referring to: institutional types, programmatic and institutional characteristics, general programmatic elements, and endorsements to existing teaching certificates. Secondly, the commonalities and differences of the various program elements were addressed and verified. Thirdly, the specific components of the teacher-training programs were analyzed for commonalities and differences and the respective hypotheses were verified. Tables were constructed to visually present the data, and frequency distributions, percentages of responses, ranges of responses, and Guttman Scales were presented for quantitative analysis. As a result, the preceding chapter has analyzed the data as were found in the field. The subsequent chapter will describe these findings and report inferences and conclusions from these findings.
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will: (1) provide the reader with a brief review and summary of the purpose and design of the study, (2) discuss the findings in relation to the research questions posed and in regard to the Michigan Department of Education guidelines for the certification of bilingual education teachers, (3) draw conclusions and make inferences from the findings, and (4) make recommendations for the utilization of this study and for further research and development in the area of bilingual teacher education.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to develop a description of the bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state of Michigan and to analyze them for commonalities and differences. Public Act 294 (1974) assigned the State Board of Education the responsibility to establish rules governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors in the public schools of this state. However, each college and university has the autonomy to interpret and implement these rules differently. As a result, there was a need to analyze the characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state. This information is essential for planning, evaluation, and conceptual development in the area of bilingual teacher education. In addition, research seems to be rather limited in regard to bilingual education teacher-training programs in this country and essentially no research
is currently available regarding programs in the state of Michigan. Thus, the purpose of this study was to address this void.

A review of some of the pertinent literature revealed that the study of bilingual education should begin with its introduction into the United States. The inception of bilingual education took place during two distinct periods, 1820 to 1920 and 1963 to the present. Although bilingual education from 1820 to 1920 was essential, these initial years failed to produce an exemplary curriculum model and the necessary leadership to continue these efforts. The primary factors preventing the continuation of these initial bilingual programs were the lack of credibility in these programs by non-participants, and consequently, the resistance to their presence.

The renewed interest in bilingual education in 1963 was greatly assisted by the enactment of national legislation for bilingual education in 1965. This legislation was referred to as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In 1967, Title VII of this act, known as the Bilingual Education Act, was introduced and on January 2, 1968, President Johnson signed this bill into law.

Another significant event which led to the tremendous support for bilingual education was the landmark decision of Lau vs. Nichols. This 1974 Supreme Court decision recognized that not only segregation but also poverty and linguistic deficiency have been contributing factors to this nation's educational shortcomings.

In regard to the development of a rationale for bilingual education, a thorough examination of the American socialization process resulted in viewing educational institutions as both the cause and
the solution to serious social tensions. This awareness in turn resulted in increasing political demands for the creation of equal education opportunities. These concerns were paralleled by statistics which showed that children from non-English-speaking communities have the least number of years of schooling and the most limited access to higher education and professional jobs. Additionally, an estimated 225,000 psychologically sound children have been misplaced in educable mentally retarded (E.M.R.) classes because of language and culture differences. These children also have often been the victims of: early grade retention, overageness, reading slowness, and a disproportionately high drop-out rate. Traditionally, the schools have held the students and parents responsible for this failure. As a result, the evidence of failure to educate these youngsters has necessitated an alternative educational strategy--bilingual education.

A perspective on bilingual education in the United States would not be complete without an analysis of the teachers who are directly responsible for implementing these programs. This analysis revealed a serious lack of trained bilingual education teachers. In 1975, the need for bilingual education teachers in the United States was estimated to be over 35,000, and this figure seems to have increased over the years as more and more L.E.S.A. children are identified. The reasons for the slow response by teacher-training institutions in addressing this need were also analyzed as were the necessary competencies of a bilingual education teacher.

The history of bilingual education was reviewed as it related to the national legislation previously mentioned and the Lau vs.
Nichols Supreme Court decision (1974). Public Act 294 (1974), which made bilingual education mandatory in the state of Michigan, was reviewed as well as the policy statement prepared by the Michigan Department of Education entitled "The Common Goals of Michigan Education" (1971).

The need for endorsed bilingual education teachers in the state of Michigan was also expressed; 1,208 bilingual education teachers were needed as of school year 1977-78. The dissatisfaction with the 1975 teacher preparation guidelines was also stated as was the eventual development of the proposed rules of 1978 which are pending approval by the State Board of Education.

A summary of the design of the study is provided in the following statements. Descriptive data for the study were obtained through a questionnaire. This questionnaire was revised several times and pilot tested with thirty bilingual education teacher-training programs in six different states. Of the thirty questionnaires dispersed, eighteen were completed and returned for a sixty percent response. Further changes were made to the instrument after the pilot study and prior to approval by the Human Subjects Review Committee.

The final version of the questionnaire was mailed, with a letter of introduction, to each director of the fifteen bilingual education teacher-training programs in Michigan on December 11, 1978. The questionnaire contained sixty questions which required a single answer and dealt solely with facts. Two broad areas were covered by the questionnaire: (1) program elements and (2) program and institutional characteristics. The program elements area was subdivided into
the following sections: (1) language proficiency component, (2) methodology component, (3) cultural component, (4) practical experience component, (5) endorsements to existing certificates, and (6) general. The program elements area included questions 1 through 41. The program and institutional characteristics area was not subdivided into sections but was presented as a total unit. This area included questions 42 through 60.

From a total of fifteen questionnaires distributed, fifteen were returned for a 100% response. However, one questionnaire was returned with no responses to the questions since the program at this institution was pending implementation.

Data collected from the questionnaires were expressed quantitatively in that the findings of the data were presented in the number of responses received (frequency) and in the percentage of responses. These frequency counts and percentages were used to summarize the data. The data were then categorized according to commonalities and differences.

In order to analyze the data, the research hypotheses were paired with the corresponding objectives for the study (see Table XII). These research hypotheses were then matched with the various questionnaire questions which were developed in order to address the research hypotheses (see Table XIII). Each research hypothesis was addressed individually in order to establish verification or non-verification.

In an effort to explain the state of the art of bilingual education teacher-training programs, the data were first analyzed as
demographic information regarding the sponsoring institutions and the teacher-training programs. This information included the questionnaire items referring to: institutional types, programmatic and institution characteristics, general programmatic elements, and endorsements to existing teaching certificates. Secondly, the commonalities and differences of the various program elements were addressed. Thirdly, the specific components of the teacher-training programs were analyzed as to their various programmatic elements and their prevalence in the field.

Tables were constructed to visually present the data. Frequency distributions, percentages of responses, ranges of responses, and Guttman Scales were presented for quantitative analysis.

Findings and Conclusions

Findings

Due to the nature of the data compiled and analysis procedures used in this study, the findings will be discussed in the context of: (1) the first two research questions and their relationship to the data, and (2) the last four research questions and their relationship to the data and the Michigan Department of Education guidelines for the certification of bilingual education teachers.

Research hypothesis one. In order to fulfill the purpose of this dissertation, it was necessary to develop a description of the bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state of Michigan and to analyze these programs in regard to commonalities
and differences. As a result, the data received through questionnaire responses to the language proficiency, methodology, cultural, and practical experience components were divided into two major areas of analysis: (1) commonalities, and (2) differences of the fourteen programs. These responses to the three components were in turn analyzed according to the frequency of "yes" responses (commonalities) and the frequency of "no" responses (differences) received for each program element. The analysis of the "yes" responses, which were classified as commonalities, was used to verify the first research hypothesis which stated that the:

Characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs can be grouped according to commonalities.

Research hypothesis two. In an effort to develop a typology regarding the program elements of bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state, the responses to the questionnaire items were also analyzed in regard to the frequency of "no" responses (differences) received for each program element. The analysis of the "no" responses, which were classified as differences, was used to verify the second research hypothesis which stated that the:

Characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs can be grouped according to differences.

Program components. The four components: language proficiency, methodology, culture, and practical experience were analyzed in greater detail, in addition to the previously described commonality and difference grouping, because of the primary importance of these
components to a bilingual education teacher-training program. These components included the essential core elements of a bilingual teacher education program and thus warranted closer inspection. Initially, the description of each of the four components was presented as described in the Michigan Department of Education guidelines entitled *Bilingual Teacher Certification, Fall, 1975*. These descriptions were provided in order to inform the reader as to the recommendations of the Michigan Department of Education regarding each of these program components. These recommendations were analyzed as to their presence in the field of practice. This was accomplished through an analysis of the program elements for each of the four components and their prevalence in the field. Consequently, data regarding the program elements of the fourteen bilingual teacher education programs were grouped according to components, and the data for each component were then rank-ordered according to frequency and percentage response rates.

**Research hypothesis three.** The guidelines of the Michigan Department of Education defined the foreign language component (language proficiency component) as (see Appendix B):

> An essential ingredient for a bilingual preparation program since the act requires that bilingual teachers be proficient in both the oral and written skills in the language for which they are endorsed. This training component, therefore, must include an assessment procedure to determine the trainee's proficiency, and flexible options leading to skill development in the use of a non-English language.

The language proficiency component consisted of two program elements. These two program elements were ranked according to the
frequency and percentage of "yes" responses or the degree of commonality. The program element with the greatest number of "yes" responses involved an assessment procedure for competency in the endorsed language. All fourteen programs were found to be similar in regard to the prevalence of this particular element.

Second in the frequency of "yes" responses was the program element involving an assessment procedure for competency in English. This element was found to be prevalent in 9 programs and not prevalent in 5 programs. The 5 programs, which did not include this element, either did not address this need or addressed it in a different manner than an assessment procedure (an oral or written examination of proficiency or a combination of both). As a result, they differed from the programs which did include this element and consequently, verified the third research hypothesis which stated that:

There is a difference in the language proficiency components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

The analyzed data also verified the presence of the foreign language component in the field as defined in the Michigan Department of Education guidelines.

Research hypothesis four. The guidelines of the Michigan Department of Education defined the methodology component as (see Appendix B):

An essential ingredient for a bilingual preparation program designed to develop trainee skills in teaching English to children of limited English-speaking ability. This will include, but not be limited to, teacher knowledge and skills necessary for the development of pupil skills in speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension when English
is a second language for such pupils. It shall also include work in linguistics appropriate to the preparation of bilingual teachers.

The methodology component consisted of data involving the frequency and percentage rates of 14 different program elements. A difference in the prevalence of program elements was found in twelve of the fourteen program elements in that only two elements in this component were found to be prevalent in all the teacher-training programs. This difference verified the fourth research hypothesis which stated that:

There is a difference in the methodology components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

The analyzed data also verified the presence of the methodology component in the field as defined in the Michigan Department of Education guidelines.

Research hypothesis five. The guidelines of the Michigan Department of Education defined the cultural component as (see Appendix B):

An essential ingredient for a bilingual preparation program specific to the non-English specialization area for which the teacher is seeking an endorsement (which) shall include instruction in the immediate history and the culture of the geographic areas associated with the non-English language referred to...The objective of this component is to enable the teacher to understand the culture and the environment of the child of limited English ability.

The cultural component consisted of data involving the frequency and percentage response rates of 9 different program elements. A difference in the prevalence of program elements was found in seven
of the nine program elements in that only two elements in this component were found to be prevalent in all the teacher-training programs. Although this difference in most cases was minor, the fact that a difference was found in seven of the nine programs verified the fifth research hypothesis which stated that:

There is a difference in the cultural components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

The analyzed data also verified the presence of the cultural component in the field as defined in the Michigan Department of Education guidelines.

Research hypothesis six. The guidelines of the Michigan Department of Education defined the directed teaching component (practical experience component) as (see Appendix B):

An essential ingredient for a bilingual preparation program in that programs designed to prepare candidates for initial certification should include a directed teaching component for such persons. Such directed teaching experiences should occur in currently operating bilingual public school programs. This new program characteristic is not proposed as a requirement for programs leading to an endorsement of an existing certificate.

The practical experience component consisted of data involving the frequency and percentage response rates of 6 different program elements. A difference in the prevalence of program elements was found in all of the program elements in that none of the elements in this component were found to be prevalent in all the teacher-training programs. This difference verified the sixth research hypothesis which stated that:

There is a difference in the practical experience components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state
of Michigan.

The analyzed data also verified the presence of the practical experience component in the field as defined in the Michigan Department of Education guidelines.

The purpose of this dissertation was to develop a description of the bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the state of Michigan and to analyze these programs according to commonalities and differences.

As a result, measures of central tendency and dispersion were computed for the analysis of program and institutional demographic data. These data were presented in Table XX. The means, medians, standard deviations, minimum values and maximum values were computed for questionnaire items 43 through 60. Upon inspection of these computations, a large discrepancy was found in regard to questionnaire items 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49. These findings were of value in that they demonstrated that the data presented for these items was skewed due to the dispersion of the responses received.

In addition, during the process of data analysis, a very prominent dichotomous grouping became evident. This dichotomous grouping consisted of the separation of the institutions which offered bilingual teacher-training programs into public and private institutions. This was accomplished through two procedures: (1) contingency tables, and (2) comparative means.

Contingency tables were computed for the nominal data in order to establish whether discrepancies existed between the public and private institutions (see Table XXI). The general and program
elements' data, which included questionnaire items 1-41, were analyzed.
Upon inspection, the majority of these items (2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20, 24, 25, 30, 31, 38, and 39) demonstrated that there was a large discrepancy between the two institutional types. The value of these findings related to the establishment of a difference in the program elements relating to public institutions offering bilingual teacher education programs and the private institutions offering these programs.

Comparative means were computed for the interval data in order to determine if discrepancies existed between the public and private institutions (see Table XXII). The demographic data, which included questionnaire items 45-60 were analyzed. Upon inspection, the majority of these items (45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 56) demonstrated that there was a large discrepancy between the two institutional types. The value of these findings, once again, related to the establishment of a difference in the demographic elements pertaining to public institutions offering bilingual teacher education programs and private institutions offering these programs.

Although a detailed analysis of the public and private institutions offering bilingual teacher-training programs was not the purpose of this study, the recognition of these findings was of importance in the development of a descriptive analysis of these teacher-training programs, and may be of interest for future studies in the area of bilingual teacher education.

Conclusions

Conclusions drawn from this study will be approached in the
### Table XX

**Program and Institutional Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>13,007.9</td>
<td>3,065.0</td>
<td>15,293.0</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14
Table XXI

Contingency Tables of Institutional Types and Program Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Types</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Types</td>
<td>Questionnaire Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td>Public 7 1 8</td>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 5 1 6</td>
<td>Private 6 0 6</td>
<td>Private 6 0 6</td>
<td>Private 4 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 1 14</td>
<td>13 1 14</td>
<td>14 0 14</td>
<td>12 2 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td>Public 5 3 8</td>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4 2 6</td>
<td>Private 5 1 6</td>
<td>Private 3 3 6</td>
<td>Private 5 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2 14</td>
<td>13 1 14</td>
<td>8 6 14</td>
<td>13 1 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 6 2 8</td>
<td>Public 4 4 8</td>
<td>Public 4 4 8</td>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4 2 6</td>
<td>Private 1 5 6</td>
<td>Private 2 4 6</td>
<td>Private 6 0 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4 14</td>
<td>5 9 14</td>
<td>6 8 14</td>
<td>14 0 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td>Public 7 1 8</td>
<td>Public 8 0 8</td>
<td>Public 4 4 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 6 0 6</td>
<td>Private 6 0 6</td>
<td>Private 6 0 6</td>
<td>Private 4 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 0 14</td>
<td>13 1 14</td>
<td>14 0 14</td>
<td>8 6 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 7 1 8</td>
<td>Public 4 4 8</td>
<td>Public 3 5 8</td>
<td>Public 2 6 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 5 1 6</td>
<td>Private 0 6 6</td>
<td>Private 0 6 6</td>
<td>Private 0 6 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2 14</td>
<td>4 10 14</td>
<td>3 11 14</td>
<td>2 12 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Types</td>
<td>Questionnaire Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXII

Comparative Means for Institutional Types and Program and Institutional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Institutional Types</th>
<th>Means*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Computed to the nearest tenth.
following manner: (1) demographic data, (2) the six research hypotheses, and (3) additional conclusions drawn.

Demographic data.

1. Fourteen bilingual education teacher-training programs were identified as currently functioning in the state of Michigan rather than the fifteen programs originally identified through the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education.

2. Eight public institutions and six private institutions offer bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan.

3. The public institutions vary in enrollment size from 40,000 students to 3,000 students.

4. The private institutions vary in enrollment size from 2,500 students to 850 students.

5. The programs were established in the following manner: one in 1973, one in 1974, six in 1975, and six in 1976.

6. Eighty-six percent of the programs reported a student enrollment of 90-132 students. The value of these findings pertained to the lack of trained bilingual education teachers.

7. Eighty-six percent of the programs reported an L.C.G. member (of the language(s) endorsed by the particular program) enrollment range of 0-30 students while one program (7%) reported an L.C.G. enrollment of 132 students and another program reported that its enrollment figure was unknown. The L.C.G. member enrollment was identified because this group is
important in regard to the use of this resource of expertise and in the use of L.C.G. members as models.

8. Fifty percent of the programs reported a range of 15-42 undergraduate students enrolled while the other 50% reported a range of 0-7 students. This group represented the teacher trainees seeking initial certification, as well as a bilingual endorsement. The importance of these findings related to the serious lack of trained bilingual education teachers and the immediate need for more trained teachers. Due to the urgency of this situation, the time necessary to train an individual becomes of paramount importance. The length of time necessary for undergraduate students to complete the program requirements is usually longer than the time necessary for a certified teacher, who is seeking an endorsement to an existing teaching certificate, to complete the requirements.

9. Seventy-nine percent of the programs reported a range of 0-18 graduate students enrolled, while 21% reported a range of 35-84 students. The value of these findings pertained to the fact that these students consisted primarily of certified teachers who were seeking an endorsement to an existing teaching certificate. Thus, the time and necessary coursework involved to train these teachers would be considerably less than that required for training undergraduate students.

10. Seventy-one percent of the programs reported a range of 0-16
L.C.G. members (as previously described) who had completed the program requirements while 21% reported a range of 31-50 L.C.G. members and one program (7%) reported that these data were unknown. The value of these findings, once again, pertained to the immediate need for trained bilingual education teachers and the importance of using members of this resource group as models.

11. Seventy-one percent of the programs reported a range of 0-7 undergraduate students who had completed the program requirements while 21% reported 15-19 students who had completed and one program (7%) reported that these data were unknown. The importance of these findings related to the need for more trained bilingual teachers and the time and necessary coursework involved.

12. Sixty-four percent of the programs reported a range of 0-16 graduate students who had completed the program requirements while 29% reported 20-50 students who had completed and one program (7%) reported that these data were unknown. The value of these findings related, once again, to the immediate need for trained bilingual education teachers and the time and necessary coursework involved.

13. Eighty-six percent of the programs reported a range of 0-11 enrollees who had left prior to the completion of the program requirements while one program (7%) reported 20 and another program (7%) reported that these data were unknown. These findings were of value in attempting to
analyze how adequately the current teacher-training programs are addressing the need for more trained teachers.

14. In regard to employment, 93% of the programs reported a range of 0-7 full-time staff members (teaching and non-teaching included) while one program (7%) reported that these data were unknown. Seventy-nine percent of the programs reported a range of 0-4 part-time staff members while 14% reported 12-20 and one program (7%) reported that these data were unknown. Ninety-three percent of the programs reported a range of 0-7 part-time staff members who were L.C.G. members (as previously described) while one program (7%) reported that these data were unknown. The importance of these findings pertained to the adequacy of the instructional staff provided and the quality of instruction provided.

15. Seventy-nine percent of the programs reported employing no full-time or part-time staff members who had a bilingual education endorsement on a teaching certificate while 14% reported that they had one such staff member and one program reported that these data were unknown. These findings raise serious questions as to the quality and accreditation of the bilingual education teacher-training programs currently functioning.

16. Zero percent of the programs reported employing any full-time or part-time staff members who had a special state permit for bilingual instruction while one program reported
that these data were unknown. Special state permits are available for instruction in bilingual education programs by staff members who do not have a bilingual education endorsement on a teaching certificate. Although developed for use in the public school system, their utility in higher education seems to be justified. These findings also were a poor reflection on the quality of instruction provided by bilingual teacher education programs.

17. As stated, the quality and quantity of faculty and staff resources were marginal in many of the programs, and only minimally acceptable in others. The assumption made in many of these programs seems to be that a mere recombination of current faculty resources will support a bilingual teacher education program. Such an assumption will inevitably lead to bilingual teacher education programs of marginal or unacceptable quality.

18. One hundred percent of the programs were designed to function in cooperation with local school districts offering bilingual education programs. The value of these findings pertained to the importance of developing programs which are relevant and which address the needs of the bilingual education programs in the local school districts.

19. Eighty-six percent of the programs were designed to provide a twenty-four semester hour (or equivalent term hour) minimum requirement for teacher trainees seeking an endorsement for an initial teaching certificate. The value of these findings related to the determination as to whether the
the programs seemed to agree as to what the minimum requirement should be for an adequately trained bilingual education teacher. In addition, the amount of consensus in the programs in the field demonstrated that the twenty-four semester hour requirement suggested in the Michigan Department of Education guidelines was, for the most part, being adhered to.

20. In regard to the area of advanced degrees, 29% of the programs were designed to provide all the necessary requirements for the completion of a masters degree in bilingual education, 21% for a specialist degree, and 14% for a doctorate degree. The importance of these findings related to the determination of the degree of development of the fourteen programs in the field.

21. One hundred percent of the programs were designed to provide the necessary requirements in order for a teacher to obtain the addition of a bilingual education endorsement to an existing teaching certificate. The importance of these findings related to the time and necessary coursework for increasing the number of trained teachers as previously stated.

22. One hundred percent of the programs were designed to provide the same components (language proficiency, methodology, cultural, and practical experience) for candidates seeking a bilingual education endorsement to an existing teaching certificate as provided for teacher trainees seeking an initial certificate. These findings demonstrated consistency
in the programs' identification of essential elements for teacher-training programs.

23. One hundred percent of the programs were designed to provide an assessment process (an oral or written examination or a combination of both) to determine the level of language proficiency in the language in which the teacher is seeking an endorsement to an existing teaching certificate. These findings, once again, demonstrated consistency in the programs' identification of the importance of competency in the endorsed language.

24. Ninety-three percent of the programs were designed to provide an eighteen semester hour (or equivalent term hour) minimum requirement for teachers seeking a bilingual endorsement to an existing teaching certificate. These findings illustrate a consensus in most of the programs in regard to what the minimum requirement should be for this area, and they verify compliance with the Michigan Department of Education guidelines for certification.

25. Fifty-seven percent of the programs were designed to provide an assessment process to determine the level of language proficiency in English of the teacher who is seeking a bilingual education endorsement to an existing teaching certificate. These findings demonstrated that almost half (43%) of the programs did not measure the competency in English of these teachers. An assumption may have been made that this was not necessary or was optional. The validity of
this assumption is questionable.

Research hypotheses.

26. The first research hypothesis stated that the characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs can be grouped according to commonalities. This hypothesis was verified. Grouping program elements according to commonalities has led to the following conclusions:

(1) These findings demonstrated that there is a consensus among the teacher-training programs as to the essential or core elements which must be included in a viable bilingual education teacher-training program. (2) These elements are the crucial items which the State Board of Education must take into consideration while deliberating on the adoption of the proposed rules governing the endorsement of qualified bilingual education teachers. (3) These elements must also be seriously considered if the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education is to develop a state model for bilingual education teacher-training. Thus, grouping these program elements according to commonalities and in a descending order of prevalence in the field is an excellent process for analyzing the various program elements in relation to the adoption of the proposed rules and the development of a state model for bilingual teacher education.

27. The second research hypothesis stated that the characteristics of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs can be grouped according to differences. This hypothesis
was verified. Grouping program elements according to differences has led to the following conclusions: (1) These findings demonstrate that there is a difference in the various program elements which were included in these bilingual teacher education programs, and that this difference can be categorized for analysis as to degree and type. (2) The "no" responses (which were classified as differences) demonstrate that the elements, which were identified by the program directors as optional or less essential for inclusion in a viable bilingual teacher education program, can be grouped. (3) Eighty-four percent of the bilingual teacher education programs responded differently as to the elements which they included in their programs. This percentage is sufficient to illustrate the inadequacy in the current guidelines for endorsement of qualified bilingual education teachers and the need to adopt rules to replace these guidelines. Since rules can mandate that quality teacher-training programs be established throughout the state, the adoption of rules would ensure enforceable criteria for quality teachers and teacher-training programs while guidelines merely make suggestions and recommendations. Thus, the adoption of the proposed rules for the certification of qualified bilingual instructors is essential to the quality of bilingual teacher education programs in the state of Michigan and the quality of the teachers they train. (4) Rules can be monitored and reviewed and if the rules are not
complied with, action can be taken to remedy the situation. This is not the case with guidelines. These differences in program elements must be seriously reviewed before a decision can be made as to the adoption of the proposed rules and the development of a state model for bilingual teacher education. Thus, grouping these elements according to differences and in a descending order of prevalence in the field is an excellent process for addressing the various problems and concerns regarding bilingual education teacher-training programs and for avoiding the pitfalls associated with the future development of bilingual teacher education.

28. The third research hypothesis stated that there is a difference in the language proficiency components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan. This hypothesis was verified. These findings are of value in that they demonstrate that the language proficiency requirement is inconsistently applied from one institution to another, and that there is no comparability across the state in regard to meeting the language proficiency requirement.

29. The fourth research hypothesis stated that there is a difference in the methodology components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan. This hypothesis was verified. These findings are of value in that they demonstrate that the methodology
30. The fifth research hypothesis stated that there is a difference in the cultural components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan. This hypothesis was verified. These findings are of value in that they demonstrate that the cultural component is inconsistently applied from one institution to another, and that there is no comparability across the state in regard to meeting the cultural component requirement.

31. The sixth research hypothesis stated that there is a difference in the practical experience components of the various bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan. This hypothesis was verified. These findings are of value in that they demonstrate that the practical experience component is inconsistently applied from one institution to another, and that there is no comparability across the state in regard to meeting the practical experience requirement.

Additional conclusions

32. A difference was found in regard to the demographic characteristics and the program elements found in public and private institutions. This was verified through the computation of contingency tables and comparative means. The
value of these findings relates to the possible inconsistency in the quality of teacher preparation programs offered by public and private institutions.

33. There was a wide variance regarding the inclusion of the various program elements in the fourteen bilingual teacher education programs, although they all presumably addressed the same guidelines. This was verified through the frequency and percentages reported for the data. The value in these findings relates, once again, to the quality of the teacher preparation programs.

34. The document entitled Bilingual Teacher Certification, Fall, 1975, regarding guidelines for the preparation of qualified instructors in bilingual education, does not meet the statutory requirements pertaining to the State Board of Education as stated in Public Act 294 (1974), in that this act charges the State Board of Education with the task of promulgating rules (not guidelines) for governing the endorsement of bilingual teachers (see Appendix A).

Recommendations

In accord with the preceding findings and conclusions, the following recommendations seem justified:

1. Increased efforts should be made by the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education and institutions of higher education to train greater numbers of bilingual education teachers.
2. Increased efforts should be made by the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education and institutions of higher education to improve the quality of bilingual education teachers, and the programs offering this teacher preparation.

3. Rules should be adopted by the State Board of Education and implemented by the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education governing the endorsement of bilingual education teachers. These rules should replace the current guidelines.

4. Upon the adoption of the rules previously stated, the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education should review the bilingual education teacher-training programs every two years in order to determine compliance with these rules.

5. Programs found not to be in compliance with these rules should be eliminated.

6. The data compiled through this study should be used to develop a state model for bilingual education teacher-training programs by the Bilingual Education Office of the Michigan Department of Education.

7. Future research should be encouraged to evolve from this study in order to enhance the development of quality bilingual education teacher-training programs.
Closing Statement

This study regarding the development of a descriptive analysis of bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan has been extremely stimulating for the investigator. Some findings confirmed preconceived ideas, while others were a surprise. The investigator has been active in the area of bilingual education for the past seven years in that he has served on the La Raza Advisory Committee to the State Board of Education for five years and is currently a member of the Bilingual Education Advisory Committee to the State Board of Education. Consequently, it is hoped that the findings and recommendations presented in this study will make a contribution toward the betterment of bilingual teacher education programs and in the lives of the thousands of bilingual children who so greatly need quality bilingual instruction.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Public Act 294 (1974)
The School Code of 1976
Sections 380.1151-380.1158 of the
Michigan Compiled Laws Annotated
Sections 15.41151-15.41158 of the
Michigan Statutes Annotated

380.1151 English as basic language of instruction; exceptions. (M.S.A. 75.41151)

Section 1151. (1) English shall be the basic language of instruction in the public and nonpublic schools of this state and in state institutions.

(2) Subsection (1) shall not be construed as applying to:

(a) Religious instruction in a nonpublic school given in a foreign language in addition to the regular course of study.

(b) A course of instruction in a foreign language in which the pupil acquires sufficient proficiency to be conversant in the foreign language.

(c) Bilingual instruction as defined in Section 1152 which will assist children of limited English-speaking ability to achieve reasonable efficiency in the English language.
380.1152 "Bilingual Instruction" "Children of limited English-speaking ability," and "in-service training" defined. (M.S.A. 15.41152)

Section 1152 As used in Section 1152 to 1158.

(a) "Bilingual instruction" means the use of 2 languages, 1 of which is English, as media of instruction for speaking, reading, writing, or comprehension. "Bilingual instruction" may include instruction in the history and culture of the country, territory, or geographic area associated with the language spoken by children of limited English-speaking ability who are enrolled in the program and in the history and culture of the United States.

(b) "Children of limited English-speaking ability" means children who have or reasonably may be expected to have difficulty performing ordinary classwork in English because their native tongue is a language other than English or because they come from a home or environment where the primary language used is a language other than English.

(c) "In-service training" means short-term or part-time training for administrators, teachers, teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or other education personnel engaged in bilingual instruction programs for children of limited English-speaking ability.

380.1153 Bilingual instruction program: establishment and operation; placement of children; tuition; transportation; establishment of intermediate bilingual instruction-support program; membership. (M.S.A. 15.41153)

Section 1153 (1) The board of a school district having an enrollment of 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability in a language classification in grades K to 12 shall establish and operate a bilingual instruction program for those children.

(2) The board may establish and operate a bilingual instruction program with respect to a language classification if the school district has fewer than 20 children of limited English-speaking ability.

(3) Children enrolled in a bilingual instruction program operated under this section may be placed in classes with other children of approximately the same age and grade level. If children of different age groups or grade levels are combined, the board shall insure that the instruction given each child is appropriate to the child's level of educational attainment.
(4) A child of limited English-speaking ability residing in a district which does not have an appropriate bilingual instruction program or which is not required to have a bilingual instruction program may enroll in a program in another school district. Tuition for the child shall be paid, and transportation shall be provided, by the school district in which the child resides.

(5) If fewer than 20 children of limited English-speaking ability in a language classification are enrolled in a school district, the intermediate school board shall determine whether the total number of these children residing in its constituent districts which do not operate bilingual instruction programs warrants the establishment of an intermediate bilingual instruction-support program. An intermediate school district operating or contracting for the operation of a bilingual program or service may carry children in membership in the same manner as a local school district and shall be entitled to its proportionate share of state funds available for the program. Membership shall be calculated under rules promulgated by the state board. The intermediate school board shall consider:

(a) Whether the cost of operating an intermediate bilingual instruction-support program is justified by the number of children at each grade level who would benefit from its establishment.

(b) Whether alternative methods of providing a bilingual instruction-support program, such as visiting teachers or part-time instruction, can be provided.

380.1154 Bilingual instruction program; full-time program; courses and subjects. [M.S.A. 15.41154]

Section 1154 The bilingual instruction program operated by a school district shall be a full-time program of bilingual instruction in:

(a) The courses and subjects required by this act.

(b) The courses and subjects required by the board for completion of the grade level in which the child is enrolled.

380.1155 Bilingual instruction program; notice and duration of enrollment; transfers. [M.S.A. 15.41155]

Section 1155 (1) Prior to the placement of a child of limited English-speaking ability in a bilingual instruction program, the board of the local school district in which the child resides shall notify, by registered mail, the child's parents or legal guardian that the child is being enrolled in a bilingual instruction program. The notice shall contain a simple, nontechnical description of the purposes, method, and content of the program and shall inform the parents or guardian that they have the right to visit bilingual instruction classes in which their child is enrolled.
(2) The notice shall be written in English and in the native language of the child of limited English-speaking ability.

(3) The notice shall inform the parents or guardian that they have the absolute right to refuse the placement or to withdraw their child from the program by giving written notice to the board of the local district in which the child resides.

(4) A child of limited English-speaking ability residing in a school district operating or participating in a bilingual instruction program pursuant to section 1153 shall be enrolled in the bilingual instruction program for 3 years or until the child achieves a level of proficiency in English language skills sufficient to receive an equal educational opportunity in the regular school program, whichever occurs first. A child of limited English-speaking ability shall not be transferred out of a bilingual instruction program prior to the child's third year of enrollment unless the parents or guardian of the child approves the transfer in writing or unless the child successfully completes an examination which in the determination of the state board, reflects a level of proficiency in English language skills appropriate to the child's grade level.

380.1156 Advisory Committee. [M.S.A. 15.41156]

Section 1156 The board of a school district operating a bilingual instruction program pursuant to Section 1153 shall establish an advisory committee to assist the board in evaluating and planning the bilingual instruction program. The advisory committee shall be comprised of representatives of parents of children enrolled in the program, bilingual instruction teachers and counselors, and members of the community. A majority of the members of the advisory committee shall be parents of children enrolled in the bilingual instruction program.

380.1157 In-service training program; rules; examination of testing mechanisms. [M.S.A. 15.41157]

Section 1157 (1) The state board, in cooperation with intermediate school districts and local school districts, shall develop and administer a program of in-service training for bilingual instruction programs. The state board shall promulgate rules governing the conduct of and participation in the in-service training programs.

(2) The state board shall promulgate rules governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors in the public schools of this state. The teacher shall meet the requirements of part 22 and shall be proficient in both the oral and written skills of the language for which the teacher is endorsed.

(3) The state board shall approve an examination or testing mechanism suitable for evaluating the proficiency in English language skills of a child of limited English-speaking ability.
380.1158 Duties of state board. (M.S.A. 15.41158)

Section 1158. The state board shall:

(a) Advise and assist school districts in complying with and implementing sections 1152 to 1158.

(b) Study, review, and evaluate textbooks and instructional materials, resources, and media for use in bilingual instructional programs.

(c) Compile data relative to the theory and practice of bilingual instruction and pedagogy.

(d) Encourage experimentation and innovation in bilingual education.

(e) Recommend curriculum development and testing mechanisms.

(f) Make an annual report relative to bilingual instruction programs to the legislature and the governor.
AN ACT to amend section 360 of Act No. 269 of the Public Acts of 1955, entitled as amended "An act to provide a system of public instruction and primary schools; to provide for the classification, organization, regulation and maintenance of schools and school districts; to prescribe their rights, powers, duties and privileges; to provide for registration of school districts, and to provide powers and duties with respect thereto; to provide for the levy and collection of taxes for borrowing of money and issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness; to provide for and prescribe the powers and duties of certain boards and officials; and to prescribe penalties," being section 340.360 of the Compiled Laws of 1970; and to add sections 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395 and 396.

The People of the State of Michigan enact:

Section 1. Section 360 of Act No. 269 of the Public Acts of 1955, being section 340.360 of the Compiled Laws of 1970, is amended and sections 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395 and 396 are added to read as follows:

Sec. 360. (1) English shall be the basic language of instruction in all the schools of this state, public, private, parochial, or in any state institution.
(2) Subsection (1) shall not be construed as applying to:
(a) Religious instruction in private or parochial schools given in any language in addition to the regular course of study.
(b) A course of instruction in a foreign language in which the students have acquired sufficient proficiency to be conversant in the foreign language.
(c) Bilingual instruction, as defined in section 390, which will assist children of limited English-speaking ability to achieve reasonable efficiency in the English language.

Sec. 390. As used in sections 390 to 396:
(a) "Bilingual instruction" means the use of 2 languages, 1 of which is English, as media of instruction for speaking, reading, writing, or comprehension. "Bilingual instruction" may include instruction in the history and culture of the country, territory, or geographic area associated with the language spoken by children of limited English-speaking ability who are enrolled in the program and in the history and culture of the United States.
(b) "Children of limited English-speaking ability" means children who have or reasonably may be expected to have difficulty performing ordinary class work in English because their native tongue is a language other than English or because they come from a home or environment where the primary language used is a language other than English.

(c) "Constituent school district" means a local school district located within and functioning as a part of an intermediate school district.

(d) "In-service training" means short-term or part-time training for administrators, teachers, teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or other education personnel engaged in bilingual instruction programs for children of limited English-speaking ability.

Sec. 391. (1) Beginning with the 1975-76 school year, the board of a school district having an enrollment of 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability in a language classification in grades K-12 shall establish and operate a bilingual instruction program for those children.

(2) The board may establish and operate a bilingual instruction program with respect to a language classification if the school district has fewer than 20 children of limited English-speaking ability.

(3) Children enrolled in a bilingual instruction program operated under this section may be placed in classes with other children of approximately the same age and grade level. If children of different age groups or grade levels are combined, the board of the school district shall insure that the instruction given each child is appropriate to his level of educational attainment.

(4) A child of limited English-speaking ability residing in a district which does not have an appropriate bilingual instruction program or which is not required to have a bilingual instruction program may enroll in a program in another school district. Tuition for the child shall be paid, and transportation shall be provided, by the school district in which the child resides.

(5) Where fewer than 20 children of limited English-speaking ability in a language classification are enrolled in a school district, the board of the intermediate school district shall determine whether the total number of such children residing in its constituent school districts which do not operate a bilingual instruction program warrants the establishment of an intermediate bilingual instruction-support program. An intermediate district operating or contracting for the operation of a bilingual program or service may carry children in membership in the same manner as local school districts and shall be entitled to its proportionate share of state funds available for the program. Membership shall be calculated pursuant to rules promulgated by the state board of education. The board of the intermediate school district shall consider:

(a) Whether the cost of operating an intermediate bilingual instruction-support program is justified by the number of children at each grade level who would benefit from its establishment.

(b) Whether alternative methods of providing a bilingual instruction-support program, such as visiting teachers or part-time instruction, can be provided.

Sec. 392. (1) The bilingual instruction program operated by a school district shall be a full-time program of bilingual instruction in:

(a) The courses and subjects required by this act.

(b) The courses and subjects required by the board for completion of the grade level in which the child is enrolled.

Sec. 393. (1) Prior to the placement of a child of limited English-speaking ability in a bilingual instruction program, the school district in which the child resides shall notify, by registered mail, the child's parents or legal guardian that the child is being enrolled in a bilingual instruction program. The notice shall contain a simple, nontechnical description of the purposes, method, and content of the program and shall inform the parents that they have the right to visit bilingual instruction classes in which their child is enrolled.

(2) The notice shall be written in English and in the native language of the child of limited English-speaking ability.

(3) The notice shall inform the parents that they have the absolute right to refuse the placement or to withdraw their child from the program by giving written notice to the school board of the local district in which the child resides.

(4) A child of limited English-speaking ability residing in a school district operating or participating in a bilingual instruction program pursuant to section 391 shall be enrolled in the bilingual instruction program for 3 years or until he achieves a level of proficiency in English language skills sufficient to receive an equal educational opportunity in the regular school program, whichever occurs first. A school district shall not transfer a child of limited English-speaking ability out of a bilingual instruction program prior to the
child's third year of enrollment unless the parents or guardian of the child approve the transfer in writing or unless the child successfully completes an examination which, in the determination of the state board of education, reflects a level of proficiency in English language skills appropriate to the child's grade level.

Sec. 394. A school district operating a bilingual instruction program pursuant to section 391 shall establish an advisory committee to assist the board in evaluating and planning the bilingual instruction program. The advisory committee shall be comprised of representatives of parents of children enrolled in the program, bilingual instruction teachers and counselors, and members of the community. A majority of the members of the advisory committee shall be parents of children enrolled in the bilingual instruction program.

Sec. 395. (1) The state board of education, in cooperation with intermediate and local school districts, shall develop and administer a program of in-service training for bilingual instruction programs. The state board of education shall promulgate rules governing the conduct of and participation in the in-service training programs.

(2) Exercising its authority under section 10 of Act No. 287 of the Public Acts of 1964, being section 388.1010 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, the state board of education shall promulgate rules governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors in the public schools of this state. The teacher shall meet the requirements of sections 851 and 852 of this act and shall be proficient in both the oral and written skills of the language for which he is endorsed.

(3) The state board of education shall approve an examination or testing mechanism suitable for evaluating the proficiency in English language skills of a child of limited English-speaking ability.

Sec. 396. The state department of education shall:

(a) Advise and assist school districts in complying with and implementing sections 390 to 396.

(b) Study, review, and evaluate textbooks and instructional materials, resources, and media for use in bilingual instructional programs.

(c) Compile data relative to the theory and practice of bilingual instruction and pedagogy.

(d) Encourage experimentation and innovation in bilingual education.

(e) Recommend in-service training programs, curriculum development, and testing mechanisms to the state board of education.

(f) Make an annual report relative to bilingual instruction programs to the legislature and the governor.

This act is ordered to take immediate effect.

Thos. Thach
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Beryl J. Herzon
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved

Governor.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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Bilingual Teacher Certification, Fall, 1975
STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Bilingual Teacher Certification
Fall, 1975

Section 395.2 of Act 294, P. A. 1974, requires the State Board to promulgate rules governing the endorsement of teachers as qualified bilingual instructors who shall be proficient in the oral and written skills of the language for which they are endorsed. Section 391.1 requires local school districts with an enrollment of 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability to establish and operate a bilingual instruction program. This requires that certification procedures be developed for certificate endorsement of bilingual teachers and a permit system for employment in bilingual programs of qualified persons not eligible for that endorsement.

The following actions are intended to resolve Michigan's bilingual teacher certification problem on or before the fall of 1975:

1. State special permits can be issued for employers wishing to operate bilingual programs who have staff they believe to be qualified for such employment who do not hold at that time an endorsement as a bilingual teacher. Existing appropriate Certification Code rules are:

   a. Rule 42 and Rule 43 authorize full-year and substitute permits respectively.

   b. Rule 45 authorizes the issuance of permits under emergency circumstances.

2. Endorsements to an existing certificate may be made for a person who meets the program requirements for a bilingual teacher. Endorsements to existing certificates are defined in Rule 1 (g), (h), (i), and (k) and are further detailed in Rule 29 (1), (2) and (3). These rules authorize the addition to an existing teacher certificate of an appropriate endorsement representing the completion or the acquisition of the skills required of a bilingual teacher.

3. An appropriate endorsement can be made to certificates issued to new graduates of training programs designed to prepare bilingual teachers which have been approved by the State Board of Education. Appropriate Code provisions are Rules 26, 27, 32, 33, and 51. These rules specify the provisions for elementary and secondary provisional and continuing certificates and the approval of teacher preparation programs by the State Board.
4. A certificate coding system for bilingual teachers needs to be selected. The present foreign language coding is not appropriate but the first letter of the present foreign language coding system is F with the second letter designating the specific language. A similar pattern with the selection of a new first letter code, the continuation of existing second letter foreign language codes and the addition of new codes for languages such as Arabic not now included will resolve the certificate endorsement problem. That solution is administrative and does not involve Certification Code rule changes.

It is concluded that existing administrative rules are adequate to certificate the bilingual teaching staff beginning with the fall of 1975, with only the minor problem remaining of the selection of an appropriate coding representing bilingual preparation which also designates the language in which the teacher is skilled.

Approved Program Characteristics for Certificate Endorsements

Section 390 of Act 294, P. A. 1974, defines bilingual instruction as the use of two languages, one of which is English, as media of instruction for speaking, reading, writing, or comprehension. Other portions of the act specify that a child be enrolled in a program for three years, or until the pupil achieves a level of proficiency in English language skills sufficient to receive an equal educational opportunity in the regular school program. The act also authorizes the inclusion of instruction in bilingual programs in the history and culture of the area associated with the language spoken by these children of limited English-speaking ability.

The act states or implies the characteristics of bilingual programs and, therefore, bilingual teacher preparation program content. The objective of the public school bilingual program is the enhancement of English skills of English-limited children to the end that these children can succeed in the regular school program.

It is concluded that while the greatest frequency of bilingual programs will be in the elementary grades, programs must extend through the 12th grade to provide appropriate assistance to all pupils in need of this experience. Rule 51 (4) of the Certification Code authorizes a K-12 teacher certificate endorsement and it is concluded that the K-12 endorsement pattern should characterize all bilingual teacher training programs whether this be for new trainees or as a preparation program leading to an endorsement to an existing teacher certificate.
Rules 26 (1) (b) and 27 (1) (b) identify a minor as being 20 semester hours or a group minor as being 24 semester hours. It is concluded that a bilingual preparation program for new trainees or an endorsement to an existing certificate must be a group minor of at least 24 semester hours.

The essential ingredients for a bilingual preparation program are as follows:

1. **A methodology component** designed to develop trainee skills in teaching English to children of limited English-speaking ability. This will include, but not be limited to, teacher knowledge and skills necessary for the development of pupil skills in speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension when English is a second language for such pupils. It shall also include work in linguistics appropriate to the preparation of bilingual teachers.

2. **A cultural component** specific to the non-English specialization area for which the teacher is seeking an endorsement shall include instruction in the immediate history and the culture of the geographic areas associated with the non-English language referred to below. The objective of this component is to enable the teacher to understand the culture and the environment of the child of limited English ability.

3. **A foreign language component**, since the act requires that bilingual teachers be proficient in both the oral and written skills in the language for which they are endorsed. The purpose of the skill in a foreign language is not concluded to be identical with the credit hour system of a foreign language major or minor. The foreign language skill level must be high enough to permit the bilingual teacher to use that non-English language as a communications medium to teach limited English-speaking ability children. Applicants for admission to bilingual teacher preparation programs may be highly proficient in a foreign language or have little, if any, proficiency. This training component, therefore, must include an assessment procedure to determine the trainee’s proficiency, and flexible options leading to skill development in the use of a non-English language. While proficiency is defined as that level typically possessed by a person completing a college minor in a foreign language as measured by a nationally standardized examination, this component of the program must be defined in skill levels and not credit hours.

This portion of the bilingual teacher training program must be characterized as flexible, as including an assessment procedure to determine proficiency prior to admission, an opportunity for the acquisition of the non-English language skills, and a terminal assessment procedure to determine that the teacher trainee has in fact achieved that desirable skill level.
4. Because the statue proposes programs to serve all children of limited English-speaking ability and because of the very strong probability of children attending schools with any of the possible languages spoken in the world, it is concluded that some schools may wish to offer bilingual programs for children whose native language is not reflected in any available college-based training program. Such schools may be able to identify a teacher aide with proficiency in the language of the target population who can work with a bilingual teacher in assisting these pupils to develop skills in English in speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension. The training component, therefore, should include the development of trainees' abilities in working with the teacher aide.

5. Programs designed to prepare candidates for initial certification should include a directed teaching component for such persons. Such directed teaching experiences should occur in currently-operating bilingual public school programs. This new program characteristic is not proposed as a requirement for programs leading to an endorsement of an existing certificate.

Endorsements to Existing Certificates

An endorsement to a certificate has been proposed above as a group minor of at least 24 semester hours. Code Rule 32 (1)(b) authorizes a continuing certificate upon the completion of an 18 semester hour planned course of study which may include work toward the bilingual endorsement. The earlier definition of a bilingual endorsement to a certificate requires a group minor of at least 24 semester hours consisting of a methodology component, a cultural component and a foreign language component. Following completion of 18 semester hours of this work, a person is authorized a recommendation for a continuing certificate by Code Rule 32 (1)(b), but may not be eligible at that time for the bilingual endorsement. For persons proficient in the oral and written skills of the language for which they are seeking an endorsement, the 18 hour requirement for a continuing certificate presents little, if any, problem since the person will not require intensive foreign language skill development. It is concluded, therefore, that a higher education institution teacher preparation program leading to a bilingual endorsement to an existing certificate or fulfilling the credit requirements for a continuing certificate must provide a mechanism for assessing oral and written skills in the foreign language for candidates with existing foreign language proficiency. Other persons seeking that endorsement must acquire that skill by conventional means.

Equivalency Option

Recognizing that certificated teachers seeking bilingual endorsements will bring to that program a broad range of skills in the non-English language, Rule 52, the equivalency option, provides a flexible means
for institutional use in adapting bilingual endorsement programs to a broad range of non-English language skills brought to such programs by trainees. The equivalency option guidelines approved by the State Board and distributed to teacher preparation institutions provide substantial institutional flexibility in regard to this program component.

In assessing non-English language skill adequacy preparing institutions are encouraged to work with public schools offering bilingual programs and employing bilingual teachers in determining the adequacy of the non-English language skill necessary for functioning as a bilingual teacher.
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STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING THE ENDORSEMENT OF QUALIFIED BILINGUAL INSTRUCTORS

(By authority conferred on the state board of education by section 395(2) of Act number 294 of the Public Act of 1974, being section 1157 (2) of the school code of 1976)

R ___

General Provisions

1. The holder of a provisional or continuing certificate (elementary or secondary) may be granted a certificate endorsement as a qualified bilingual instructor by presenting evidence of completing: a planned program designed to lead to bilingual education endorsement at an institution approved by the state board of education for the preparation of bilingual teachers in the language of endorsement.

2. The endorsement program for new certificates must be a group minor requiring 24 semester hours of course work, as specified in Rules 26(1)(g) and 27(1)(b) of the Teacher Certification Code.

3. A teacher seeking a bilingual endorsement to an existing provisional or continuing (elementary or secondary) certificate may qualify for this endorsement after completion of 18 semester hours of study in the areas of linguistics, bilingual methodology, and culture, provided that he/she meets the language proficiency and field experience requirements of these rules. Courses taken to develop basic language proficiency in either the endorsed language or in the English language may not be counted in the 18 hour program leading to the endorsement of an existing certificate.

4. Endorsement as a bilingual teacher shall be granted at the K-12 level. The bilingual endorsement will authorize public and private school assignments in grades K-12 and shall be a specific addition to elementary and secondary teacher certificates. When the bilingual endorsement is made on an elementary certificate, the teacher will be authorized to teach all subjects in a bilingual capacity in grades K-8 and to teach in a bilingual capacity in only his/her major and minor areas in grade 9. When the bilingual endorsement is made on a secondary certificate, the teacher will be authorized to teach in a bilingual capacity in the areas of his/her major and minor.
in grades 7-12. The assignment of classroom teachers shall be
restricted as described above. However, teachers may function
in an advisory capacity as follows: A person holding an elementary
certificate with a K-12 bilingual endorsement may serve in an
advisory capacity to staff at the secondary level. A person
holding a secondary certificate with a K-12 bilingual endorsement
may serve in an advisory capacity to staff at the elementary
level. Since the bilingual endorsement authorizes instructional
or consultant activities in grades K-12, the preparation program
must develop the appropriate knowledge and skills to cover both
elementary and secondary assignments.

5. Recognizing that candidates seeking endorsement as qualified bi-
lingual teachers will bring to the program a broad range of skills,
Rule 52, the equivalency option of the Teacher Certification Code,
provides that candidates may satisfy any requirement for bilingual
endorsement by presenting evidence of equivalency as determined by
the State Board of Education.

R II

Components of Approved Bilingual Endorsement Training Programs

1. Programs leading to endorsement of qualified bilingual instructors
shall prepare candidates in all four essential areas as described
in these rules.

2. Language Proficiency: This component is designed to measure the
candidate's proficiency in communication skills in English and
in the language for which endorsement is sought. Language pro-
ficiency shall be assessed by means of a State approved examination
process which indicates that the candidate possesses the State
approved level of competency needed to use both languages as media
of instruction in bilingual programs at the grade level for which
the endorsement process is the responsibility of the teacher training
institution.

3. Linguistics and Bilingual Methodology: This component is designed
to develop a candidate's knowledge and skills in the practice of
bilingual education, in the methods of teaching English and the
endorsed language as first and second languages, and in the methods
of teaching content subject matter in both languages. This component
will include work in linguistics appropriate to both languages.
The bilingual methodology component will provide training appropriate
to the teaching of bilingual education at the elementary and
secondary levels. Instruction should prepare a candidate to:
a. Demonstrate knowledge of the historical background and pedagogical rationale of bilingual education.

b. Demonstrate effective skills in using both English and the endorsed language as media of instruction in the subject matter areas for which certification is held or being sought.

c. Demonstrate effective skills in classroom management, particularly with respect to multiple groups and individualized instruction.

d. Demonstrate skills in coordinating effective instruction which involves teacher-aides, tutors, resource teachers, and/or team teaching.

e. Demonstrate effective skills in the instruction of English and the endorsed language as both first and second languages as individual classes or as activities integrated into content areas.

f. Demonstrate effective skills in the linguistic analysis of both English and the endorsed language and in the testing and assessment of language skills.

g. Demonstrate knowledge and skills in analyzing, selecting, and/or developing appropriate instructional materials for the age groups involved.

4. Culture: This component is designed to develop a candidate's skills in understanding the cultural background of the child, in understanding the culturally pluralistic environment of the classroom, and in incorporating that understanding and information into the content and methodology of the bilingual instruction program. This component will include instruction in the relevant historical, cultural, social, and psychological factors associated with the endorsed language group as well as with other groups living in the United States. A candidate should be able to:

a. Demonstrate effective skills in planning appropriate curricula and implementing instruction which incorporate multiple cultural backgrounds in a school.

b. Demonstrate effective skills in utilizing cultural information and activities as means for developing basic skills.

c. Demonstrate effective skills in presenting the history and culture of the United States from a perspective that fully recognizes the roles and contributions of all groups in the history and development of a pluralistic society.
d. Demonstrate effective skills in presenting the history and cultures of the geographical area associated with the endorsed language.

e. Demonstrate effective skills in presenting the history and culture of the endorsed language group within the United States.

f. Demonstrate effective skills in communicating with parents and involving them in the bilingual program.

5. **Field Experience:** This component is designed to provide the candidate with practical experience in an ongoing bilingual instruction program at the appropriate level for which certification is held or being sought. For teachers seeking bilingual endorsement on an existing certificate, this experience may be in:

1. Community activities of the appropriate language group

2. Either tutoring or classroom instruction of students in the appropriate language group and grade level.

Pre-service training programs for teachers seeking certification and bilingual endorsement must contain a directed teaching component. Whenever possible, a portion of the directed teaching experience should be in a currently operating bilingual instruction program at both the elementary and secondary for the K-12 bilingual endorsement.

**R III**

**Procedures for Approval of Bilingual Endorsement Training Programs**

(1) The state board of education may grant approval to certain institutions and their programs for the purposes of preparing candidates for endorsement as a qualified bilingual instructor. Institutions seeking approval from the state board of education for the purposes of preparing candidates for endorsement as qualified bilingual instructors shall present a program description which shall contain:

a. Explanation of how the institution will develop the competencies required in the areas of (1) language proficiency, (2) linguistics and bilingual methodology, (3) culture, and (4) field experience as described in R II of these rules.
b. Explanation of how the institution will develop any additional competencies not specifically described in R II of these rules.

c. Explanation of how all competencies will be measured to ensure that candidates, through course work, independent studies, examination, life experience, field work, etc., actually possess the required competencies.

d. Description of training components: credits, courses independent studies, examination, and other training and proficiency assessment processes which will ensure quality preparation at both the elementary and secondary levels.

e. Description of the process and/or instruments to be utilized in the determination of language proficiency in English and in the endorsed language.

f. If the equivalency option is to be used, explanation of plans and procedures for utilizing the equivalency option with the intent to fairly and accurately measure the candidate's ability and ensure quality training. Permission to utilize the equivalency option must be granted by the State Board of Education.

2. Colleges and universities which offer teacher training programs leading to the endorsement of teachers as bilingual instructors will be granted program approval for a five year period. At the end of the approval period, colleges and universities must re-submit programs for re-approval by the state board of education.

3. The Michigan Department of Education will conduct periodic reviews of approved bilingual endorsement programs for the purpose of providing technical assistance, recommending improvements, and coordinating information, materials, and procedures among the various bilingual endorsement institutions.

4. Any approval granted by the state board of education to an institution or program leading to endorsement as a qualified bilingual instructor shall be terminated on September 1, of the year following the effective date of these rules, except that students enrolled in such programs on or before the effective date of these rules may complete the program in which that student is enrolled.

5. Beginning 60 days after the effective date of these rules, the state board of education shall review and approve institutions and programs leading to endorsement as a qualified bilingual instructor.
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Guidelines for the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of Bilingual/Bicultural Education (Center for Applied Linguistics, November 1974)

Personal Qualities

The teacher of bilingual/bicultural education should have the following qualifications:

1. A thorough knowledge of the philosophy and theory concerning bilingual/bicultural education and its application.

2. A genuine and sincere interest in the education of children regardless of their linguistic and cultural background, and personal qualities which contribute to success as a classroom teacher.

3. A thorough knowledge of and proficiency in the child's home language and the ability to teach content through it; an understanding of the nature of the language the child brings with him/her and the ability to utilize it as a positive tool in teaching.

4. Cultural awareness and sensitivity and a thorough knowledge of the cultures reflected in the two languages involved.

5. The proper professional and academic preparation obtained from a well-designed teacher training program in bilingual/bicultural education.

The guidelines which follow are designed to meet these necessary qualifications and describe the various academic areas considered essential in teacher training programs in bilingual/bicultural education.

I. Language Proficiency

The teacher should demonstrate the ability to:

1. Communicate effectively, both in speaking and understanding, in the languages and within the cultures of both home and school. The ability will include adequate control of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and regional, stylistic, and nonverbal variants appropriate to the communication context.

2. Carry out instruction in all areas of the curriculum using a standard variety of both languages.

II. Linguistics

The teacher should demonstrate the ability to:

1. Recognize and accept the language variety of the home and a standard variety as valid systems of communication, each with its own legitimate functions.

2. Understand basic concepts regarding the nature of language.

3. Understand the nature of bilingualism and the process of becoming bilingual.

4. Understand basic concepts regarding the natural effects of contacts between languages and the implications of this information for the instructional program.

5. Identify and understand regional, social, and developmental varieties in the child's language(s) at the phonological, grammatical, and lexical levels.

6. Identify and understand structural differences between the child's first and second languages, recognizing areas of potential interference and positive transfer.
7. Develop curricular activities to deal with areas of interference.
8. Understand theories of first and second language learning, differences between child and adult language learning, and their implications for the classroom.

III. Culture

The teacher should demonstrate the ability to:
1. Respond positively to the diversity of behavior involved in cross-cultural environments.
2. Develop awareness in the learner of the value of cultural diversity.
3. Prepare and assist children to interact successfully in a cross-cultural setting.
4. Recognize and accept different patterns of child development within and between cultures in order to formulate realistic objectives.
5. Assist children to maintain and extend identification with and pride in the mother culture.
6. Understand, appreciate and incorporate into activities, materials and other aspects of the instructional environment:
   a. The culture and history of the group’s ancestry.
   b. Contributions of group to history and culture of the United States.
   c. Contemporary life style(s) of the group.
7. Recognize both the similarities and differences between Anglo-American and other cultures and both the potential conflicts and opportunities they may create for children.
8. Know the effects of cultural and socioeconomic variables on the student’s learning styles (cognitive and affective) and on the student’s general level of development and socialization.
9. Use current research regarding the education of children in the U.S. from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
10. Understand the effects of socioeconomic and cultural factors on the learner and the educational program.
11. Recognize differences in social structure, including familial organizations and patterns of authority, and their significance for the program.

IV. Instructional Methods

This component should enable teachers to assist students in achieving their full academic potential in the home language and culture as well as in English. To this end, the teacher is expected to demonstrate the following competencies:
1. Assist children to maintain and extend command of the mother tongue and the second language in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
2. Apply teaching strategies appropriate to distinct learning modes and developmental levels, including preschool, taking into consideration how differences in culture affect these and other learning variables.
3. Organize, plan, and teach specific lessons in the required curriculum areas, using the appropriate terminology in the learner’s language(s) and observing the local district curriculum guidelines. Basic elements and methodologies best suited to the teaching of reading and language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science, as a minimum, must be identified and applied in the learner’s language(s).
4. Utilize innovative techniques effectively and appropriately in the learner’s language(s) in the various content areas, namely:
   a. Formulation of realistic performance objectives and their assessment.
   b. Inquiry/discovery strategies.
   c. Individualized instruction.
   d. Learning centers.
   e. Uses of media and audiovisual materials.
   f. Systems approaches to the teaching of reading and mathematics skills.
   g. Team teaching and cross grouping.
   h. Interaction analysis.
5. Develop an awareness of the way in which the learner’s culture should permeate significant areas of the curriculum.
6. Utilize first and/or second-language techniques in accordance with the learner’s needs at various stages of the learning process.
7. Utilize effective classroom management techniques, for optimal learning in specific situations.
8. Work effectively with paraprofessionals and other adults.
9. Identify and utilize available community resources in and outside the classroom.

V. Curriculum Utilization and Adaptation

The teacher should demonstrate the ability to:
1. Identify current biases and deficiencies in existing curriculum and in both commercial and teacher-prepared materials of instruction. Materials should be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria:
   a. Suitability to student’s language proficiencies and cultural experiences.
   b. Provisions and respect for linguistic and cultural diversity.
   c. Objectives, scope, and sequence of the materials in terms of content areas.
   d. Student’s reaction to materials.
2. Acquire, evaluate, adapt, and develop materials appropriate to the bilingual/bicultural classroom.

VI. Assessment

General. The teacher should demonstrate the ability to:
1. Recognize potential linguistic and cultural biases of existing assessment instruments and procedures when prescribing a program for the learner.
2. Utilize continuous assessment as part of the learning process.
3. Interpret diagnostic data for the purpose of prescribing instructional programs for the individual.
4. Use assessment data as basis for program planning and implementation.

Language. The teacher should demonstrate the ability to:
1. Determine language dominance of the learner in various domains of language use—oral and written.
2. Use assessment results to determine teaching strategies for each learner.
3. Identify areas of proficiency (oral and written: vocabulary, syntax, phonology) in the learner's first and second language.
4. Assess maintenance and extension levels of the learner's language(s).

**Content.** The teacher should demonstrate the ability to:
1. Evaluate growth, using teacher-prepared as well as standard instruments, in cognitive skills and knowledge of content areas utilizing the language of the home.
2. Assess accuracy and relevance of materials utilized in the classroom.
3. Prepare tests to evaluate achievement of proposed objectives of instruction.

**Self.** The teacher should demonstrate the ability to identify and apply procedures for the assessment of:
1. Own strengths and weaknesses as a bilingual teacher.
2. Own value system as it relates to the learner, his/her behavior, and his/her background.
3. The effectiveness of own teaching strategies.

**VII. School-Community Relations**

Current trends in education have specifically identified the significant role of the community in the educational process. The knowledge that the community has goals and expectations creates for the schools the need to include, integrate, and enhance those expectations in the regular school program.

Bilingual education offers distinct opportunities to bridge the structural and cultural gap between school and community. The school with a bilingual/bicultural education program should serve as a catalyst for the integration of diverse cultures within the community.

The teacher should demonstrate the following competencies:
1. Develop basic awareness concerning the importance of parental and community involvement for facilitating learners' successful integration to their school environment.
2. Acquire skills to facilitate basic contacts and interaction between a learner's family and school personnel.
3. Demonstrate leadership in establishing home/community exchange of sociocultural information which can enrich the learner's instructional activities.
4. Acquire and develop skills in collecting culturally relevant information and materials characteristic of both the historical and current life-styles of the learners' culture(s) that can serve both for curriculum content and for instructional activities.
5. Acquire a knowledge of the patterns of child rearing represented in the families of the learners so as to better understand the background of the learners' behaviors in the classroom.
6. To act as facilitator for enhancing the parents' roles, functions, and responsibilities in the school and community.
7. Serve as a facilitator for the exchange of information and views concerning the rationale, goals, and procedures for the instructional programs of the school.
8. To plan for and provide the direct participation of a learner's family in the regular instructional programs and activities.
VIII. Supervised Teaching

Because of the great disparity between theory presented in the context of a college environment and practical teaching realities in a bilingual/bicultural classroom setting, it is essential that a portion of every teacher's training include on-site supervised teaching experience in a bilingual/bicultural program. To the extent possible, relevant competencies should be demonstrated in the direct context of such a classroom setting.
APPENDIX E

Teacher Education Programs For Bilingual Education in United States Colleges and Universities
APPENDIX E

Teacher Education Programs for Bilingual Education in United States Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>#PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>*PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>269</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of programs or institutions. This information is only current up through the 1975–76 school year.*
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Personal/Professional Checklist

For the teacher or teacher training institution that would like a simple checklist of personal characteristics and professional qualifications, the one that follows is by Dolores Gonzales from a work she and Casso prepared for an institute on the bilingual teacher and the open classroom.6

Criteria for the Selection of Teachers for Bilingual/Bicultural Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Personal Characteristics</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effective teacher for a bilingual program demonstrates:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The belief that cultural diversity is a worthy national goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A respect for the child and the culture he/she brings to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The conviction that the culture a child brings to school is worth preserving and enriching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An awareness that cultural and linguistic differences are obvious individual differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A commitment to enhance the child's positive self-image.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A positive self-concept of his/her ability to contribute to a bilingual program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### I. Personal Characteristics (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. A willingness to learn more about bilingual education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Flexible human relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A capacity to share ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A confidence in children and their ability to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Professional Qualifications

An effective teacher for a bilingual program demonstrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Competency and experience as an elementary school teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A knowledge of areas related to bilingual education: English/Spanish as a second language, linguistics, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Literacy in the Spanish language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A facility in applying modern approaches to improve teaching of concepts and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. An ability and a resourcefulness in adapting materials to make them relevant to the child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A readiness to participate in team teaching or other innovative organizational patterns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. An awareness of the implications of culture to learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A knowledge of research to explain what bilingual education is and why it is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A willingness to work cooperatively with other adults (teachers, aides, parents, etc.) in a classroom setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A loyalty and a commitment to the objectives of an experimental program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. An interest in seeking new approaches to contribute to the experimental nature of the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Languages Served 1977-78
as of November 28, 1977

1. Albanian-
   Dearborn, Farmington, Hamtramck

2. Arabic-
   Berkley, Birmingham, Dearborn, Detroit, E. Lansing,
   Farmington, Ferndale, Grosse Pointe, Hamtramck, Kalamazoo,
   Melvindale, Oak Park, Royal Oak, Troy, Warren

3. Cantonese-
   Detroit, Farmington, Troy

4. Chaldean-
   Berkley, Birmingham, Farmington, Ferndale, Oak Park, Royal
   Oak, Troy, Warren

5. French-
   Grosse Pointe, Southgate, Warren

6. German-
   Troy, Warren

7. Greek-
   River Rouge, Royal Oak, Utica, Warren

8. Hebrew-
   Kalamazoo, Oak Park

9. Icelandic-
   Kalamazoo

10. Italian-
    Grosse Pointe, Kalamazoo, Melvindale, Southgate, Troy,
    Utica, Warren

11. Japanese-
    Troy

12. Korean-
    Grand Rapids, Hamtramck, Troy

13. Macedonian-
    Warren

14. Mandarin-
    Detroit, Farmington, Troy
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15. Ojibway-
Lansing

16. Persian-
East Lansing, Kalamazoo

17. Polish-
Hamtramck, Warren

18. Portuguese-
East Lansing

19. Romanian-
Dearborn, Troy

20. Russian-
Oak Park, Utica

21. Serbo-Croatian-
Hamtramck, Warren

22. Spanish-
Adrian, Albion, Alma, Almont, Bay City, Bridgeport-
Spaulding, Buena Vista, Capac, Carrollton, Croswell,
Detroit, East Lansing, Farmington, Ferndale, Flint,
Grand Rapids, Hamilton, Hamtramck, Holland, Kalamazoo,
Lansing, Lawton, Lexington, Melvindale, Muskegon, Oak
Park, Owosso, Port Huron, Romeo, Royal Oak, Saginaw,
Troy, Warren, West Ottawa

23. Vietnamese-
Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, Lansing
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Pilot Test Introductory Letter

As I am sure you are aware, a great deal of research regarding bilingual education is necessary before this novel approach to education attains the status and recognition, which it so rightfully deserves. As a result, I am conducting a research study at Western Michigan University with which I would like your assistance.

As a doctoral candidate at Western, I am currently in the process of conducting a descriptive analysis of all bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan. This type of research is greatly needed, in that very little research has been done in this area.

The assistance which I am referring to entails your completing the enclosed questionnaire and evaluation form in order to conduct a pilot test of this instrument. Similar data will be collected from various other bilingual education teacher-training programs throughout the United States. The results will be used solely to measure the quality of the instrument and will be kept strictly confidential.

Your assistance in the pilot testing of this instrument is extremely important in that the results obtained through this study depend, to a great degree, on the effectiveness of the instrument and on how well it was pre-tested. Please complete and return the questionnaire and the evaluation form at the earliest possible date.

Thank you for your contribution.

Sinceramente,

Gilbert L. Montez
Director, Minority Student Services

Member, Bilingual Education Advisory Council
Michigan Department of Education

GM/ac
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Introductory Letter for the Survey

Bilingual education has become a significant and widespread movement in Michigan education. The passage of Public Act 294 by the Michigan Legislature has helped in introducing a major change in our educational philosophy. The previous rejection or disparagement of languages, other than English, is being replaced by a respect for their validity and their value as mediums for learning.

However, despite a very real interest in bilingual education, surprisingly little research has been done to help in the implementation of such programs. A vivid example is bilingual education teacher-training programs, in that, very little or no research has been done in this area in the state of Michigan.

In order to complete the requirements for my doctoral degree, I wish to compile data which will depict the status of bilingual education teacher-training programs in Michigan through a descriptive analysis of these programs. This descriptive analysis will be conducted through a survey instrument which will be administered to all the bilingual education teacher-training program directors in the state of Michigan. This information could serve as a basis for decisions regarding the planning, development and implementation of bilingual education teacher-training programs as well as for further research.

Thus, I am requesting your assistance in accumulating these data. I sincerely hope you can take a few moments out of your busy schedule to complete the enclosed questionnaire. All the information you provide will remain confidential as described in the opening statement of the questionnaire. Enclosed is a return, pre-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience.

Your expedience in this matter will be greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sinceramente,

Gilbert L. Montez
Director, Minority Student Services
Member, Bilingual Education Advisory Council (M.D.E.)

Dr. William P. Viall
Professor, Educational Leadership Department
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Questionnaire
A Descriptive Analysis of Bilingual Education Teacher-Training Programs in the State of Michigan

This questionnaire is being administered to all the program directors of bilingual education teacher-training programs in the state of Michigan. The results will be held completely confidential. No one will see your responses except professional staff working on this study. All results will be summarized by groups and individual results will not be released.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide a comprehensive description of the current programs in operation. This is to be done through the collection of data concerning the characteristics of each of the various programs. The accuracy of this analysis depends solely on the kindness and conscientious assistance of each respondent. Thus, your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

When the word program is used, it refers to the Bilingual Education Teacher-Training Program(s) at your institution. If more than one program is available at your institution, then consider the various individual programs as a single unit and respond accordingly.

Program Elements

For each of the items listed below check the appropriate "yes" or "no" response. Please answer all the questions and check only one response per question.

I. Language Proficiency Component: Is your program designed to:

1. Provide an assessment procedure to determine the level of language proficiency of the teacher trainee in the endorsed language? 1. Yes ( ) No ( )

2. Provide an assessment procedure to determine the level of language proficiency of the teacher trainee in English? 2. Yes ( ) No ( )

II. Methodology Component: Is your program designed to:

3. Include a minimum of nine semester hours (or equivalent term hours) of credit in the area of teacher methodology in bilingual education? 3. Yes ( ) No ( )
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4. Provide for the development of teacher knowledge in instruction in two languages (English and the endorsed language)?

Provide for the development of teacher knowledge in the instruction of children of limited English-speaking ability in the areas of:

5. Speaking? 5. Yes ( ) No ( )
6. Reading? 6. Yes ( ) No ( )
7. Writing? 7. Yes ( ) No ( )
8. Comprehension? 8. Yes ( ) No ( )
9. Provide for the development of teacher knowledge in the area of linguistics as it pertains to bilingual instruction? 9. Yes ( ) No ( )
10. Provide for the development of teacher knowledge concerning the philosophy of bilingual education? 10. Yes ( ) No ( )
14. Prepare a teacher trainee to use bilingual education instruction in all the subject matter areas for which certification has been granted? 14. Yes ( ) No ( )
15. Provide for the development of teacher knowledge in working with a teacher aide(s)? 15. Yes ( ) No ( )
16. Provide for the development of teacher knowledge regarding instruction through a team teaching approach?

III. Cultural Component: Is your program designed to provide for the development of teacher knowledge regarding:

Social-cultural factors in bilingual including:

17. Societal attitudes toward bilingual education?

18. Parental attitudes toward bilingual education?

19. Family structures of bilingual children?

20. The relationship between the community and bilingual education?

Psycho-cultural factors in bilingual education including:

21. The self-concept of bilingual children?

22. The relationship between bilingual children and measures of intelligence?

23. Teacher attitude toward bilingual education students?

The dual roles of a bicultural child including:

24. Dominant society role?

25. Language classification group member role?

IV. Practical Experience Component: Is your program designed to provide:

26. A practical experience component?

27. A practical experience component which consists of a minimum of six semester hours (or equivalent term hours)?
28. A practical experience component which takes place in a bilingual education program of a local school district?  
28. Yes ( ) No ( )

29. A practical experience component in the appropriate grade level of certification?  
29. Yes ( ) No ( )

30. A practical experience component which involves community activities associated with the language classification group within which the teacher trainee seeks endorsement?  
30. Yes ( ) No ( )

31. A practical experience component which involves a supervised tutorial program including students of the endorsed language classification group within which the teacher trainee seeks endorsement?  
31. Yes ( ) No ( )

V. Endorsements to Existing Certificates: Is your program designed to provide:

32. The necessary requirements in order for a teacher to obtain the addition of a bilingual education endorsement to an existing teaching certificate?  
32. Yes ( ) No ( )

33. The same components (Language Proficiency, Methodology, Cultural, and Practical Experience) for candidates seeking a bilingual education endorsement to an existing teaching certificate as provided for teacher trainees seeking an initial certificate?  
33. Yes ( ) No ( )

34. An eighteen semester hour (or equivalent term hour) minimum requirement for teachers seeking the addition of a bilingual education endorsement?  
34. Yes ( ) No ( )

35. An assessment process to determine the level of language proficiency in the language in which the candidate is seeking a bilingual education endorsement?  
35. Yes ( ) No ( )
36. An assessment process to determine the level of language proficiency in English?  36. Yes ( ) No ( )

VI. General: Is your program designed to:

37. Provide a twenty-four semester hour (or an equivalent term hour) minimum requirement for teacher trainees seeking a bilingual education endorsement for an initial teaching certificate?  37. Yes ( ) No ( )

38. Provide all the necessary requirements for the completion of a masters degree in bilingual education?  38. Yes ( ) No ( )

39. Provide all the necessary requirements for the completion of a specialist degree in bilingual education?  39. Yes ( ) No ( )

40. Provide all the necessary requirements for the completion of a doctorate degree in bilingual education?  40. Yes ( ) No ( )

41. Function in cooperation with local school districts offering bilingual education programs?  41. Yes ( ) No ( )

Program and Institutional Characteristics

Please write in the space provided the correct answer (to the best of your knowledge) for each one of the following questions. Any questions that you do not know the answer to, please write in the term unknown in order to illustrate that all the questions have been responded to.

42. Is your institution of higher education public or private?  42. __________

43. How many students are enrolled at your institution (Fall semester count)?  43. __________

44. In what year was your program established?  44. __________
45. How many students are currently enrolled in your program?

46. How many language classification group members (of the language(s) endorsed by your particular program) are enrolled?

47. How many undergraduate students are enrolled in your program?

48. How many graduate students are enrolled in your program?

49. How many language classification group members (of the language(s) endorsed by your particular program) have completed your program?

50. How many undergraduate students have completed your program?

51. How many graduate students have completed your program?

52. How many enrollees have left prior to completion of the program requirements?

53. How many full-time staff members (teaching and non-teaching) are included in your program?

54. How many of these full-time staff members are language classification group members of the language(s) endorsed by your particular program?

55. How many part-time staff members are included in your program?

56. How many of these part-time staff members are language classification group members of the language(s) endorsed by your particular program?

57. How many full-time staff members have special state permits for bilingual instruction?

58. How many part-time staff members have special state permits for bilingual instruction?
59. How many full-time staff members have bilingual education endorsements on a teaching certificate?

60. How many part-time staff members have bilingual education endorsements on a teaching certificate?

THANK YOU

Please use the enclosed, pre-addressed, reply envelope to return your questionnaire.