This research project is an historical case study of the conflict which evolved from the deliberations and subsequent implementation of bilingual education in Central School District 13J, Independence, Oregon. The time period under consideration spans 35 months, beginning in August 1974, when district officials first proposed bilingual education, and ending in June 1977, when the first year of bilingual education in the district was completed.

Investigation of the conflict in Independence was guided by the following questions.

1. What is the nature of the conflict resulting from the bilingual education issue in Independence, Oregon?

2. To what extent does this conflict affect educational policy?

3. What is the nature of community influence regarding school decisions and educational policy?
The investigation of these questions required that two types of data be gathered. The first type—news media reporting, county and school district surveys, personal correspondence, government records—provided an historical perspective for considering the district's decision to implement bilingual education. The second type of data—personal interviews and informal conversations—addressed the need for bilingual education in Independence, the policy making process, and community involvement in decision-making.

Conclusions

The conflict which surfaced in the small community of Independence is rooted in the value conflict—assimilation vs. cultural pluralism. Two conflicting views have emerged in Independence regarding the role of public education as a transmitter of culture. One perspective endorses pluralism in society and encourages bilingual education as one means of accommodating pluralism. An opposing viewpoint supports traditional educational practices which support the assimilation of ethnic and racial minorities through the promotion of a single language and culture. The question of whether public education is responsible for promoting cultural homogeneity or the lesser accepted concept of cultural pluralism still remains unresolved in Independence as in other parts of the nation. Supporters for each viewpoint seem unwilling to compromise, thus prolonging the value
conflict in the community.

The value conflict existing in Independence has not been recognized as such by the community. Rather, this conflict is being viewed as mere misunderstandings due to poor communications between supporters of pluralism and defenders of assimilation. By refusing to recognize the existence of value conflict, the school district, Chicano parents, and the community at large have avoided any real confrontation with the status quo regarding bilingual education. Because the value conflict which presently exists within the Independence community is not acknowledged, it can have no effect on educational policy per se.

Throughout its existence, the bilingual education program has not prompted community activism either for or against the program. The sporadic and limited nature of community participation and influence in decision-making has not changed because of bilingual education, and it appears that maintaining the status quo regarding bilingual education in School District 13J has become preferable to seeking change through district policy.
Community Conflict: A Case Study of the Implementation of a Bilingual Education Program

by

Juan Guzmán

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed March 1978

Commencement June 1978
APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy
Assistant Professor of Education
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy
Dean of the School of Education

Redacted for Privacy
Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented  March 13, 1978

Typed by Opal Grossnicklaus for Juan Guzmán
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following individuals for their time and assistance in helping me complete this dissertation. First, my sincerest appreciation and heartfelt thanks go to Bill Kline, my major professor, for his many hours of reviewing and critiquing my total effort. His commitment to and support of my research cannot be measured—mil gracias, amigo. I would also like to thank the members of my committee—Professors Carvel Wood, Jo Anne Trow, Cliff Trow, and Jack Dymond—for their encouragement, support, and timely suggestions. In addition, I would like to express my appreciation to Amy Barr, Coordinator of the Central School District 13J Bilingual Education Project, for her time and assistance in making project data available. My family also merits recognition at this time, particularly my wife, Karen, whose constant support and encouragement have made this research possible. There is no way I can ever show my appreciation for her long hours of typing, proof-reading, and being a devil’s advocate. Finally, my two little muchachitas—Juanita Marie and Kristine Teresa—are to be commended for their patience when my research and writing schedule kept me from spending much time with them.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Antecedents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of the Study</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting the Interview</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| II. BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN OREGON | 29 |

| III. THE COMMUNITY | 44 |

| IV. BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN INDEPENDENCE | 56 |

| V. THE ESSENCE OF CONFLICT: ASSIMILATION VS. PLURALISM | 87 |

| VI. COMMUNITY INFLUENCE ON DECISION-MAKING | 106 |

| VII. CONCLUSIONS | 123 |
| Implications | 132 |

| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 139 |

| APPENDIX | 151 |
LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page
---|---
I. NATIONALITY AND ETHNIC ORIGIN. | 45
II. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS. | 50
III. BILINGUAL PROGRAM ENROLLMENT 1974-75. | 58
IV. ATTITUDE SURVEY--SCHOOL DISTRICT 13J MIGRANT PROGRAM. | 60
V. PARENT SURVEY FORM. | 65
VI. PROPOSED ENROLLMENT: BILINGUAL PROGRAM | 67
COMMUNITY CONFLICT: A CASE STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

I. INTRODUCTION

...Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shores.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

From: Inscription on the Statue of Liberty

The principle of freedom espoused by the United States has always been inextricably linked to its democratic convictions, and it is the staunch support of these combined principles which has encouraged many to regard the United States as a true refuge for people of diverse backgrounds. But beyond a concern for the "huddled masses," this nation's resolute confidence in personal freedom and self-government has made it imperative that its people be literate and well informed. This concern was first acknowledged by the nation's founders and continues to demand attention today.

It was Jefferson who first addressed the requisites for a free, democratic society in his attempts to formulate an educational and political policy which would support the existence of the young nation. He proposed that all citizens should have an education which would promote manners, morals, and habits which were homogenous with those of the country. George Washington, the nation's first President, stressed the need to maintain unity and supported Jefferson's call
for a "homogeneity of citizenry." Washington stated: "The more homogenous our citizens can be made in these particulars [principles, opinions, manners], the greater will be our prospects of permanent union..." (129, p. 85).

Early efforts intended to promote and maintain national unity, urged a homogeneity among the population and stressed the importance of education in achieving that homogeneity. Educators accepted the responsibility and proceeded to mold the "American" individual. Noah Webster prefaced his widely used spelling book with:

The American must be educated at home [America]...and he must study American textbooks. For Americans to use textbooks of the old world would be to stamp the wrinkles of decrepit age upon the bloom of youth and to plant the seeds of decay in a vigorous constitution. Americans must prevent the introduction of foreign vices and corruptions... promote virtue and patriotism...and diffuse an uniformity and purity of language... (130, p. 85).

The promotion of a "uniformity and purity" of language by the schools became an established and accepted truism in the nation's drive to establish an American society. The fact that the young nation survived its infancy, accepted and assimilated immigrants from throughout the world, and established itself as a world leader gave further credence to the founding fathers' belief that a "homogeneity of citizenry" and a "uniformity and purity" of language were the bases for a permanent union. These beliefs were exemplified best through the American Common School movement of the nineteenth
century and urban school reforms early in the twentieth century.

One product of these educational crusades was the enactment of state educational policies establishing English as the official language of public instruction. Thereafter, for over a century there seemed to be little need for challenging the practice of "instruction in English only" as a legitimate means for encouraging and promoting cultural homogeneity.

In 1968, however, such practices were challenged when the United States Congress enacted the Bilingual Education Act. This action officially encouraged, endorsed, and supported instruction in languages other than English. The new legislation challenged traditional conceptions of education as a transmitter of a single language and culture and was viewed by some as a threat to national unity. Questions were raised regarding the responsibility of public education for promoting languages and cultures other than the dominant one. How could bilingual education, which encouraged pluralism, possibly facilitate the assimilation of ethnic and racial minorities? Others, however, especially population groups having native languages other than English, hailed the legislative mandate as the legal impetus needed to force public education to become more accountable in its educational relationships with non-English speaking communities. Among the people who widely acclaimed and supported the Bilingual Education Act were Spanish speaking Americans.
Thus two conflicting views have emerged regarding the role of public education as a transmitter of culture. One perspective endorses pluralism in society and encourages bilingual education as one means of accommodating pluralism. An opposing viewpoint supports traditional educational practices which attempt to assimilate ethnic and racial minorities through the promotion of a single language and culture. This conflict, especially as it has evolved in Independence, Oregon, serves as the basis for the following study.

Chapter One reviews historically the roots of this nation's rationale for enforced assimilation through education and explores attempts by Spanish speaking Americans to make changes in national educational direction regarding language and culture. Chapter Two is a brief review of Chicano efforts to improve their educational opportunities during the last two decades in Oregon. It introduces the conflict which will be the major focus of Chapter Five and lays the background for Chapter Three, which looks at the Independence community and its socio-economic and cultural circumstances. Chapter Four is a summary/review of Monmouth-Independence School District 13J's early decisions and documentation efforts which initiated the bilingual education program. This chapter also introduces value conflict as it evolved in the community and influenced established attitudes among and between school district personnel and Chicano parents. Value conflict, namely the dichotomy between
assimilation and pluralism, is analyzed and explained in Chapter Five; while the extent of community participation in school decisions and its influence on educational policy is the focus of Chapter Six. The conclusions in Chapter Seven address each of the main questions which prompted and directed this research. This chapter also explores the implications of value conflict for educational policy in public education and for teacher education.

Historical Antecedents

Education in Colonial America was quite diversified. A single system of education throughout the colonies did not exist. Because a variety of languages were spoken and various religions practiced, distinctive and different lifestyles developed in each colonial settlement. Immigrating newcomers whose lifestyle and religious beliefs did not agree with those of an established community usually found their way to another settlement which offered a more acceptable way of life.

In most instances, each community enforced a strict educational program for its citizenry, and the responsibility for providing education fell upon the family, the church, and the community. Instruction in English as well as in other languages was a common occurrence. Leibowitz (1971) pointed out that during the 1700's, instruction in many parts of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the
Carolinas often was in languages other than English.

Practices such as these—establishing schools through churches and providing instruction in the native idiom of the community—became an established pattern that lasted well into the latter part of the 19th century. One result of this practice was the continuation and promotion of languages other than English, languages which supported lifestyles different from that which was becoming dominant in America.

The nineteenth century, however, brought serious challenges to the traditional means of education—the family, the church, and the community—and to the diversified nature of educational programs. In the century following 1815, the nation underwent tremendous social change. Thirty-five million immigrants sought to make new homes for themselves, four million slaves were freed, and urbanization and industrialization increased. These social forces demanded that the nation consider some means for insuring that these diverse elements would not threaten the security and unity of its citizenry.

The American Common School was the agent which evolved. It became responsible for assimilating diverse influences by providing a uniform and systematic process for education which would define what was "American." Through this system was channeled thousands upon thousands of children—American born and foreign born—whom the schools were supposed to mold into Jefferson's "American Individual."

The words of educational reformer, Calvin Stowe, were typical as he
sought to warn educators about the need for a homogenous citizenry.

...It is altogether essential to our national strength and peace, if not even to our national existence, that the foreigners who settle on our soil should cease to be Europeans and become Americans. The schools must create a national feeling, a unity of thought and action, for nothing could be more fatal to our prospects than to have our population become a congeries of clans, conge- gating without coalescing, and condemned to contiguity without sympathy. Only deliberate effort to shape the rising generation to our model in schools common to all could prevent this disaster (121, p. 229).

Mannheim (1951) suggested that formal education became re- sponsible for an increasingly larger share of the preparatory activi- ties basic to consensus and integration—the activities which would lead to instilling culture and training for adult roles in American society. Tyack (1975) reported:

A fear of ethnic diversity, of corruption, of class conflict led one superintendent of schools to conceive of public edu- cation as a force which would make a citizenship whose intelligence, moral rectitude, and steadfast virtues will counteract...disintegrate forces and social disorders... (120, p. 232).

Chief among the 'steadfast virtues' promoted through public schooling was that of citizenship. Successful endeavors in this area were expected to encourage and assist large numbers of immigrants and foreign speaking nationals to forego their diverse ethnic lifestyles and to learn to be "American."

The schools became socializing institutions on a national level. Clark (1964) described the role of the educator in the common school:
Educators are agents of cultural indoctrination, a segment of the adult population set apart to work full time at the socialization of the culturally unformed. The work of these socializers is conditioned by the core values of society in two principal ways: The values help to determine the personal ends of the "clients" and hence what these members of the public-in-contact expect as they enter the school; the values affect the institutional means themselves, or what educational agencies are ready and able to offer (30, p. 744).

But help was needed by the Common School Movement to enforce "an uniformity and purity of language." Immigrant groups wishing to preserve their cultural heritage exerted pressure on local and state officials for instruction in idioms other than English. These requests often led to conflict between local nativists and immigrant groups, conflicts which focused on the question, "Which language should be the language of instruction in the public schools?" Eventually, these conflicts led many states to establish educational policies which institutionalized English as the official language of instruction in public education.

One state which took steps to restrict linguistic pluralism was California. Settled by Spaniards, the state had provided instruction in both Spanish and English to its students since first joining the Union in 1848, and the use of Spanish had become so widespread that legislative sessions in the state's capital were often conducted in Spanish. In 1879, however, a California Constitutional Convention, under the leadership of landowners and labor unions, prohibited the reading of foreign languages in the public schools. While this edict was initially
aimed at controlling the Chinese in the state, it prohibited the use of Spanish as well, since it too was "foreign"; and in 1894 the entire non-English speaking population was disenfranchised when English became a requirement for voting.

Because of such attitudes and restrictions against the use of languages other than English, many immigrant groups supported, often at great financial sacrifice, private schools designed to perpetuate their religious and ethnic heritages. Norwegian Lutherans in Minnesota, Polish Catholics in Chicago, and Russian Jews in Boston created their own educational systems, sometimes to supplement public schools, often to compete with them, but always for the purpose of preserving their heritages.

The impetus to assimilate foreign immigrants reached a peak during the 30 year period, 1890-1920, when some 20 million newcomers arrived from southern and eastern European countries. These immigrants differed from earlier settlers and immigrants in language and customs and arrived at a time when the Common School was an accepted part of American life. Public education was faced with the task of transforming these millions of immigrants—people speaking dozens of languages, clinging to diverse folkways, owing multiple loyalties—into one people.

The American public school participated very effectively in the enforced assimilation of these immigrants. Ellwood Cubberly, a
noted education historian, explained the role of public education in 1909:

Everywhere these people [immigrants] tend to settle in groups or settlements and to set up their own national manners, customs, and observances. Our task is to break up their groups and settlements, to assimilate or amalgamate these people as a part of the American race, and to implant in their children so far as can be done, the Anglo Saxon conception of righteousness, law, order, and popular government, and to awaken in them reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things which we as people hold to be of abiding worth (38, p. 29).

The assimilation process for the immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe took longer than that of their West European counterparts. However, when these newcomers reached America, not only were public schools an accepted reality, but the factory system was well established. While their children attended public school, learning the "American way," parents working in the factories were encouraged by their employers to attend citizenship and English language classes at night. In time these diverse ethnic groups would become Americanized, accept the assimilationist viewpoint, and comply with those who promoted official monolingualism.

The nation's reluctance to condone instruction in languages other than English was further increased by national and international developments after the turn of the century. The advent of world conflict—especially Germany and Japan's rise to power—prompted American governmental leaders to consolidate the nation's territorial
gains and to solidify its political processes. President Theodore Roosevelt reiterated the need to create "an uniformity of language and a homogeneity of citizenry." Believing that a common language would forge a similarity of attitudes and values and that promoting different languages would only divide the population, Roosevelt claimed:

...any man who comes to this country must adopt the institutions of the United States, and therefore he must adopt the language which is now the native tongue of our people, no matter what the several strains of blood in our veins may be. It would be not merely a misfortune but a crime to perpetuate differences of languages and cultures in this country... (103, p. 8).

In spite of Roosevelt's urgent appeal, a large proportion of Americans have continued to maintain a native language other than English. According to the 1970 census, 33.2 million Americans (16% of the population) spoke a language other than English as a native tongue. Spanish, German, and Italian languages were the other dominant languages spoken, and of these, Spanish was the only one which has experienced substantial growth in number of speakers since 1940.

Several reasons have been given for the significant increase in Spanish speaking population. First, there was a great need for both industrial and agricultural labor during the early forties when the United States was at war. Mexico, possessing a ready labor market, was more than glad to help its neighbor to the north.
Second, the United States, during the postwar boom, became an economic mecca to many south of the border expatriates who anticipated not only increased economic opportunity but also an opportunity to live close to loved ones in a cultural environment which often approached that which was left behind. In many American communities, Spanish language newspapers, magazines, and radio stations daily reaffirmed a cultural heritage whose roots were not too distant south of the border.

At the end of World War II, thousands of Spanish speaking veterans returned to their home states more assured of their status as American citizens of Mexican descent. Education through the G.I. Bill, acculturation through economic opportunities, and new directions resulting from their wartime experiences began to modify the attitudes of the Mexican American. Meier and Rivera (1972) described this new mood among Spanish speaking communities:

This new self confidence led Mexican Americans to establish a number of political, social, and service organizations: the Mexican-American political Association, American G.I. Forum, Community Service Organization, American Association of Spanish Speaking Organizations. The returning Mexican American veterans took the lead in new attempts to achieve civil rights, thereby replacing traditional attitudes with a new spirit of hope and activism (77, p. 190).

Believing that education was an essential prerequisite for entry into the American mainstream, the Mexican-American community focused its attention on the public schools and proceeded to demand
changes in age-old practices which called for assimilation at any
cost. During the 20's and 30's, several states and the federal
government commissioned studies which focused on the educational
problems of Mexican Americans in American society. Herschel
Manuel, an educational psychologist, began studying the obstacles
encountered by Spanish speaking children in an English speaking
environment; Lloyd Tireman, in New Mexico, focused his research
on the unique educational problems of teaching bilingual children who
shared a bicultural background; and George I. Sanchez, a colleague
of Manuel, was at this time beginning to call for bilingual education
as the most appropriate educational mode for the bilingual-bicultural
Spanish speaking child. In 1946 the First Regional Conference on
the Education of the Spanish Speaking People in the Southwest was
held in Austin, Texas. Thomas P. Carter (1971) reported that
conference resolutions asked for:

... an end to segregation, a relevant curriculum built around
the Mexican-American community, improved and special
teacher training—particularly with respect to teacher's atti-
tudes toward this minority group—increased efficiency in
teaching English, and improvement in school facilities (19,
p. 12).

During the 1950's and 1960's, educational efforts to assist non-
English speakers emphasized supplemental English Language develop-
ment through English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. These
efforts, assimilative in nature, were further strengthened in 1958
by the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). Enacted as one reaction to Sputnik, NDEA legitimized and encouraged the active study of languages other than English; its direction was motivated by the Cold War, and national unity was its goal. The legislation did contribute, nevertheless, to the development of language education as a specialized field of study and specifically called for the retention and expansion of this nation's foreign language resources.

Since the Mexican American community contained one of the largest "foreign language" reservoirs in this country, they were provided with ESL programs in public schools for children and in evening classes for adults. While these ESL programs seemed to experience some success, many educators from the Spanish speaking communities criticized the approach programs employed. A common complaint was that ESL programs did not take into consideration the bilingual nature of the students they served. Gonzalez (1975) was especially critical of ESL methodology in the education of Mexican-American children. He wrote:

ESL was based on hypotheses and theorems which were basically sound, in that they recognized the primacy of oral language development as a prerequisite to formal instruction in reading and writing. When applied to the teaching of Chicano and other language minority children its successes were not optimal however, because it ignored all other incompatibilities save that of language. Furthermore, the wisdom of applying this approach to the education of young children is questionable since the methodology was originally developed to teach foreign languages to highly motivated adults (50, p. 10).
Bruce A. Caarder, speaking for the Southwest Council for Foreign Languages, also criticized public education's attempts to provide a meaningful education to a Spanish speaking population:

The greatest barrier is that the schools reflecting a dominant view of the dominant culture, want the child to grow up as another Anglo. This he cannot do without changing himself and his family and his forbearers, a form of masochism no society should demand of its children (18, p. 12).

By the sixties there was a growing recognition that language minority children needed some manner of special assistance if they were to have an opportunity to succeed in school. A second regional conference in 1964 held in Orange County, California, reiterated recommendations made in 1946. It appeared that little progress in the education of the Spanish speaking had taken place in the 18 years since the first conference.

In 1966 the Coleman Report confirmed that public education had neglected the educational needs of its Spanish speaking students. It verified that academically, language minority groups lagged significantly behind majority group Americans. By the 12th grade, the Mexican-American student was 4.1 years behind the national norm in math achievement; 3.5 in verbal ability; and 3.3 in reading. Studies by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights further revealed that Puerto Ricans and Asian Americans were likewise behind in academic achievement, and that the longer language minority students
stayed in school, the farther they fell behind their majority group classmates in grade level achievement. A five year study of the education of Mexican Americans in the Southwest, which was conducted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in the late sixties, was no less reproachful. This research confirmed what Coleman had concluded earlier and further reiterated what two regional conferences had stated..."problems of segregation, teacher training, and language difficulty are still severe for Mexican American students in the five southwestern states!" (122, p. 16).

While ESL was still considered the only viable alternative mode of instruction for the Spanish speaking in the Southwest, Cuban political refugees in Dade County, Florida, were laying the groundwork for future bilingual education programs. These exiled Spanish speaking people established bilingual education programs in the county schools as early as 1963. Gonzalez (1975) cited three reasons to explain why bilingual education became a reality for the Cuban community a full five years before the Bilingual Education Act was passed in Congress.

Many were from the middle and upper-middle classes. They had a strong literary tradition and were not unaware or reticent about demanding adequate services from social and political institutions. Additionally, they were politically cognizant of the workings of institutions and were knowledgeable of how to "negotiate" to the benefit of their children to a degree that was not then shared by other nation-origin minorities in the United States.

Because many of the early refugees came from the professional class, they were able from the onset to offer the
services of trained teachers and other educational personnel from their own ranks. In cases where certification or other credentialing obstacles existed, the Cuban Refugee Act offered financial assistance on a scale not then (or since) available to other groups.

Politically, American institutions responded to the educational needs viewed as temporary, unlike those of the Chicano or the Puerto Rican who presented more permanent or at least long-range potential for causing unwanted change (50, p. 11).

Such reasoning supported Leibowitz's earlier conclusion "that official acceptance or rejection of bilingualism in American schools is dependent upon whether the group involved is considered politically and socially acceptable" (65, p. 4).

The Dade County Bilingual Program served several purposes: (1) It became a national model and provided a goal for linguistically different groups to emulate. (2) It proved that bilingual education was a viable concept. (3) It laid preparatory groundwork and provided documentation necessary for the Federal Congress to consider in deliberating bilingual education. The Dade County Bilingual Education Program accomplished what had been denied thousands of linguistically different parents through the years. It presented a convincing case for bilingual education's ability to improve the linguistically different child's chances for success in school. The program also revealed that in order to guarantee the preparation of adequate materials, personnel, and instructional strategies, federal funds would be necessary for the development of pilot programs.
On January 1, 1968, Title VII was added to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as the vehicle for federal participation in promoting this new concept of schooling. Significant features of this legislation included:

It recognized the political feasibility of encouraging instruction in a language other than English, thereby raising serious questions about the "English-only" laws which existed in many states.

It began the process of formally recognizing "national-origin minorities" as constituencies which may seek differentiated services on grounds other than those of race/racism or segregation/integration.

It began the process of institutionalizing the notion that equality of educational opportunity is not synonymous with equal education.

By limiting its program development funding phase to a five-year period and exacting promises of continuity from LEA grantees, it succeeded, albeit imperfectly, in promoting the concept of local (and state) effort in financing the cost of program development and implementation.

As the first major legislative victory of linguistic-minority groups it went far in demonstrating to these constituencies that it was indeed possible to move the federal congress to action on an issue which was of interest only to minorities. This "taste of victory" was a political morale booster to many who up to then had felt powerless to change the system (50, p. 11).

The enactment of Title VII--Bilingual Education Act in 1968 marked the achievement of a goal long sought by Spanish speaking Americans. Promising new educational opportunities through bilingual and bicultural instruction, this particular federal legislative mandate suggested federal guidelines and provided federal dollars
with which to implement such programming. The endorsement of bilingual education by the federal Congress appeared to be a national commitment to the education of speakers of languages other than English. At the local and state levels, however, public education was somewhat skeptical about federal legislation which contradicted educational policies long supporting an "assimilation" philosophy.

**Statement of the Problem**

The assimilation of national ethnic minorities and other immigrants through education has long been supported as one goal of public education. Such a philosophy has been nurtured since early national attempts to promote "cultural homogeneity" through "an uniformity and a purity of language" were instituted by educational and political leaders. Consequently, when bilingual education was officially sanctioned by the national Congress, the stage was set for a confrontation between supporters of this assimilation philosophy and advocates of bilingual education.

This research project is an historical case study of the conflict which evolved from the deliberations and subsequent implementation of bilingual education in Central School District 13J, Independence, Oregon. The time period under consideration spanned 35 months, beginning in August 1974, when district officials first proposed bilingual education, and ending in June 1977, which marked the end of
the first year of bilingual education in the district. This research examined the conflict which surfaced and inquired specifically into the implications of such conflict for educational policy, especially noting the attitude it reflected toward the value concepts of assimilation and pluralism.

Specific questions which guided this research and formed the core of this project included:

1. What is the nature of the conflict resulting from the bilingual education issue in Independence, Oregon?
2. To what extent does this conflict affect educational policy?
3. What is the nature of community influence regarding school decisions and educational policy?

**Significance of the Study**

In the 1970's, numerous attempts were made to investigate and further define the educational barriers faced by bilingual minorities so that more viable education programs could be made available to these groups. One such study culminated in 1971 with the publication of *A Handbook for the Parent-School-Community Involvement Program*, a publication sponsored by the Texas Education Agency. It stated in its introduction:

*Public Schools traditionally have been designed for the value patterns of the middle-class Anglo population. Because the majority of school administrators and*
teachers share the attitudes and aspirations of the middle class citizens their schools serve, the middle class child experiences continuity between what he learns at home and what he learns at school. Schools serving disadvantaged migrant neighborhoods must work to establish and sustain meaningful relationships with parents whose socioeconomic circumstances, culture, and language are different from those of the school personnel (114, p. 3).

This particular publication focused on the educational needs of migrant, Spanish speaking Mexican-American students. The program it recommended emphasized the need to alleviate cultural and value conflicts in communities in which large numbers of Spanish speaking children attended public school.

A most recent United States Supreme Court Decision, Lau vs. Nichols (1974), supported a Chinese student in San Francisco who had charged that equal educational opportunity, while available, was not accessible due to the school district's monolingual teachers and instructional programs. The Lau Decision, while it did not specifically mandate bilingual education, nevertheless required school districts under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 "to provide children who speak little or no English with special language programs which will give them an equal opportunity to an education" (122, p. 2).

Similarly, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1975) stated in its spring quarterly report:

...no public institution has a greater or a more direct impact on future opportunity than the schools. Furthermore, this impact on future opportunity is largely
determined by the quality of teacher-student interaction in any given school and by the kind of role delegated to cultural and racial minorities in the school.... (122, p. 1).

This report, a review of bilingual education programs across the nation, stressed that schools had the potential for enhancing the lives of minority students and of the total American community by reducing inter-cultural tensions and conflicts. The Commission reported that specific changes in the areas of staff development, curricula, and community participation would have to take place before cultural and racial minorities could become part of the regular school program.

In essence, the U.S. Commission's position statement echoed earlier Supreme Court decisions which called for each state to provide equal educational opportunity for all students in terms of physical facilities, course offerings, extracurricular activities, and instructional support.

Aronson et al. (1975) investigated racial tensions in Austin, Texas schools whose enrollment included Blacks, Chicanos, Asians, and Anglos. Their research showed that the "process of education"—the interaction between the teacher and the child—was the most crucial factor in relieving racial tension in the schools and maximizing educational opportunities. They stressed the need to prepare teachers to work in culturally diverse settings in which differences in cultural values are recognized, appreciated, and integrated into the instructional program. According to their
research, most schools were not designed to cope with diversity, a fact which reinforced the teacher's anxieties regarding culturally different students.

Culturally different students, according to Aronson et al., did not always experience congruity between their role and expectations at home and those at school. This lack of congruity often led to value conflict--the values of the home versus the values of the school, which represented the values of the larger society.

James A. Banks (1973) likewise contended that cultural conflict could be reduced greatly if classroom teachers developed ethnic literacy and imparted this knowledge to their students. The claim by Banks reinforced Aronson et al.'s contention that until teachers and students became more tolerant of cultural differences and began to include these differences as positive contributions to educational programming, cultural conflicts and value differences would continue to plague the classroom, the school, and the community.

In Dignity and Worth (1970), the Oregon Department of Education claimed that schools in the state "have been staffed by persons of middle class value orientation and have not been entirely reflective of the diverse populations they serve!" (88, p. 3). A broad objective for the decade of the 70's, according to this publication, was "to minimize learning failures that can be attributed to...different ethnic origins and to create a school-community learning climate conducive to intergroup understanding..." (88, p. 3). Research by Matthews
(1971) among Spanish speaking populations in Oregon indicated "a strong desire to learn English... and a plea for bilingual and bi-cultural... or multicultural components in education in providing upward mobility of the Mexican American in meeting societal changes" (72, p. 1).

Since 1970, three communities in Oregon have implemented bilingual education programs (Woodburn, 1970; Salem, 1974; Independence, 1975). In each instance, program implementation was preceded by community conflict between school district policy makers and local Chicano groups who sought to influence school decisions and local educational policies. The issue in each instance was conflict between the merits of assimilation and the viability of pluralism. School boards endorsed assimilation while Chicano groups favored pluralism. School curriculum, staff development, and Chicano student academic achievement were given a secondary role in such community conflicts.

The bilingual education programs which have been established in Oregon, while alleviating community tension temporarily, have not appeared to resolve the original conflicts. Nevertheless, Chicano interest groups have gained some degree of visibility in their respective communities. This culturally and linguistically "different" minority group has been obtaining upward social and economic mobility through jobs, home ownerships, and involvement
in local elections. Such social and economic advancements will
inevitably lead Chicano groups to increase requests for expanded
educational programming to meet a variety of cultural and linguistic
desires.

Today, as a consequence of the Civil Rights movement and the
growth of minority group consciousness, social relationships and/or
interactions with minority groups are as likely to depend upon an
acceptance and understanding of pluralism by the majority group as
they are likely to depend upon the successful assimilation of minorities
into the dominant middle class Anglo-Saxon culture. Schools have
been caught in the middle of these competing community attitudes.
Educational programming is reflecting social conflict between estab-
lished traditions and emerging values, old priorities and new direc-
tions. While educational decisions in programming appear to favor
pluralism, educational policies related to these decisions are often
assimilative in nature and reflect a tendency to meet federal guide-
lines only for the purpose of receiving temporary financial assistance.

This study contributes to the understanding of conflict between
assimilationist and pluralist viewpoints and will specifically investi-
gate the nature of such conflict and its role in the political processes
which influence school decision-making and policy setting in rural
communities.
Design of the Study

This research project is an historical case study of the conflict which evolved from the deliberations and subsequent implementation of bilingual education in Central School District 13J, Independence, Oregon. Two types of data were gathered in an effort to examine the circumstances which generated the conflict. The first type—news media reporting, county and school district surveys, personal correspondence, government records—provided an historical perspective for considering the district's decision to implement bilingual education. The second type of data—personal interviews—addressed the need for bilingual education in Independence, the policy making process, community involvement in decision-making, and the extent of public education's responsibility for assimilation or for pluralism.

Conducting the Interview

The population which was interviewed to gather data included the following:

1. School board members, Central School District 13J (2)
2. School district administrators, Central School District 13J (5)
3. Federal Programs Director, Central School District 13J (1)
4. Bilingual Program Coordinator, Central School District 13J (1)
5. Classroom teachers, Central School District 13J (12)
6. Anglo and Chicano parents, Independence community (15)
7. Bilingual program advisory committee members (3)

8. School district counselors, Central School District 13J (2)

9. Third Party Evaluator, bilingual program (1)

10. Staff Development Consultant, bilingual program (1)

11. High school students, Central School District 13J (3 classes, 54 students)

12. Reporter, Independence Enterprise-Herald (1)

Interview data required for this research was gathered through individual and group interviews which were taperecorded. Elementary school classroom teachers involved directly with the bilingual education program were interviewed in groups of three to reduce their anxiety regarding program investigation. Three classes of high school students--an all Chicano Spanish class, an all Anglo Spanish class, and an all Anglo literature class--were interviewed through informal class discussions. Informal discussions were also held with specific individuals who did not wish a formal interview and with individuals already interviewed in order that additional data might be acquired.

An interview schedule (see Appendix) consisting of seventeen (17) questions was developed for this study. The interview format allowed a review of the bilingual education program from its inception to the end of its first year of implementation. Specific insights were sought into community conflict concerning the responsibility of
public education for the assimilation of ethnic minorities.

Most questions in the interview schedule address more than one issue; for example, inquiries into school district decision-making also addressed indirectly the district's attitude toward assimilation and pluralism. Information gleaned through this overlapping of issues strengthened the total data gathering process required to investigate and determine the implications of community conflict for educational policy.
II. BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN OREGON

During the 1960's, Spanish speaking migrants coming into Oregon were increasingly made aware of the educational shortcomings sustained by their children. Various political and social organizations in communities along the migrant stream had joined the national effort known as the War on Poverty and were attempting to provide a multitude of services to socio-economically and culturally deprived Americans. Current literature of the period, such as Harrington's *The Other America* and Riessman's *The Culturally Deprived Child*, and television documentaries, such as CBS Reports' film, *Harvest of Shame*, had prompted many organizations to champion the causes of the "oppressed," a group to which the transient agricultural worker belonged.

One action which encouraged the development of increased educational opportunity for migrant students was the Migrant Amendment to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This amendment enabled the Oregon State Department of Education to receive federal funds for educational programs in public schools, programs designed to meet the unique educational needs of the migrant student. Since a majority of the migrants passing through the state were Spanish speaking, most services provided through these programs encouraged a strong emphasis on English language development.
A second development which sought to improve educational opportunities for migrant children in Oregon was the Valley Migrant League (VML). Funded directly through the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, VML established itself as the official representative and advocate for the migrant populations in the Willamette Valley. This community based organization, headquartered in Woodburn, established five field offices throughout the Valley (Forest Grove, Jefferson, Independence, Salem, and Dayton) and became the vehicle through which the migrant communities would become politically involved and assertive in their push for improved social, economic, and educational opportunities.

Although VML provided services to all migrants--Russian, Spanish, and English speaking--the organization, a couple of years after its establishment, came under the leadership of Chicano oriented Spanish speaking migrants. Following the lead of other community-based Chicano organizations in the Southwest, the Valley

---

1"Chicano" is used to denote a philosophy espoused by Spanish speaking individuals which encourages cultural and linguistic maintenance and advocates self-determination through political and social action. The term has not been readily accepted by the older generations who prefer to be identified as Mexican or Mexican-American; however, this does not mean that these same individuals object to their younger offspring's identification with the term "Chicano." For the purpose of this research, the term Chicano will be used when referring to persons of Spanish speaking heritage unless it becomes necessary to use other terms.
Migrant League focused its efforts on the improvement of education for the bilingual migrant student. John Little, former League Executive Director, claimed,

We were able to exert pressure on school districts, such as Woodburn, receiving migrant education monies..., and pushed for the hiring of Chicano teachers to work in migrant education programs and for the inclusion of Chicano representation in local migrant education advisory committees.

To exert pressure on school districts, VML encouraged Chicano migrants from the Woodburn community to attend school district board meetings and to raise questions related to cultural conflict in district classrooms. Requests for Chicano teachers and for curricula to reflect a Chicano cultural heritage were made as suggestions for alleviating what Chicano leaders considered insensitive educational programming. Activism of this nature often led some local school administrators to criticize the League's Chicano leadership and to brand its efforts as "politically motivated."

Enactment in 1968 of the Bilingual Education Act in Washington, D.C., provided an impetus for increased activism by VML and the Chicano communities in Oregon. Seeking educational support beyond that provided through Migrant Education programs, these groups increased pressures on the Oregon Department of Education—especially the Division of Federal Programs, which housed Migrant Education—to apply for the federal funding available for implementing bilingual education. Title VII Bilingual Education Act guidelines,
however, were different from those for Title I Migrant Education. Title VII monies from the federal level could not be received by the State Department as Migrant Education monies had been; such funding had to be sought and administered by local school districts. This information discouraged Chicano leaders, and some felt that local school districts would be hesitant to initiate bilingual education programs unless the State Department of Education exerted leadership in promoting such programs.

Nevertheless, Chicano requests for improved educational opportunities for migrants did not go unheeded in the State Department of Education. In 1968, utilizing Migrant Education monies, the Department funded a project at Eastern Oregon College which developed specific training in the Spanish language and Chicano culture and which could contribute to a Master's Degree in Education. The funded project had two purposes: (1) to provide trained personnel for leadership positions in the state's migrant education effort, and (2) to begin preparation of culturally and linguistically relevant curricular materials for use in migrant education programs across the state. The first participants in the program were recruited from across the Southwest and also included a few Oregon Native Americans. While most of these students worked towards Master's Degrees, the project emphasis changed after a couple of years towards the development of an undergraduate bilingual teacher preparation minor in
Elementary Education.

One document which evolved from the Eastern Oregon Program and which was published by the State Department of Education was a booklet entitled *To Teach a Migrant Child*. This publication was intended to help educators alleviate cultural conflict in the classroom and to provide insights into the educational and cultural needs of migrant children. Whether or not *To Teach a Migrant Child* accomplished its intended purpose is debatable, but it did become a source of documentation for Chicano spokesmen calling for bilingual education. One entry which Chicano leaders felt described the Oregon school situation read:

> We [Oregonians] have children who are nominally bilingual, those who speak a polyglot and are only semi-literate in two languages. Because they have the ability for limited communication in English, they are often considered to be sufficiently proficient to participate in the regular school English oriented classroom. The child with a limited knowledge of English and with cultural acquisitions and concepts not concomitant with the classroom environment withdraws and accepts the attitude of failure; or, in order to combat or defy the minacious authority, develops emotional and psychological characteristics that will interfere with both his educational and social development.

> We must learn to recognize and accept the child for what he is, and place him in an environment in which he can succeed. And, above all, we must provide him with the opportunity to employ the language, social, and cultural tools he has previously acquired (80, p. 12-13).

Including excerpts from memoranda, political addresses, and news reports relating to migrant education, *To Teach a Migrant Child* became a resource handbook in migrant education programs.
and was distributed across the state. Since it was published by the State Department of Education, Chicano leaders interpreted its purpose and message as official State Department of Education affirmation of the need for bilingual education in Oregon.

Encouraged by the publicity of bilingual education programs in other states, Chicano and VML activists concentrated their efforts on the Woodburn community. Woodburn appeared the most advantageous location for a bilingual education program. Not only did it have the most sizable Spanish speaking student group of any city in Oregon but also a large Russian student population. Proponents for bilingual education felt confident that a joint request by the Chicano and Russian communities would be more persuasive than an isolated attempt by either group.

Opposition to the request for bilingual education in Woodburn surfaced from three distinct groups: school district personnel, some English speaking community members, and residents of the Senior Estates. Opposition was similar to that experienced by other communities across the nation seeking to implement bilingual education. Miguel Salinas, former migrant and presently a Woodburn school principal, related a comment typical of the arguments voiced against bilingual education: "My people came here, and they didn't know English, and nobody made any special provisions for them. Why do you need a special program?"
The opposition by Woodburn school district personnel usually reflected two basic arguments. The first argument emphasized the lack of district personnel prepared to teach bilingually while the second one focused on public education's traditionally assumed role of facilitating the assimilation of ethnic minorities. School district personnel were especially reactive to the term "Chicano." They argued that local migrant parents did not identify with the Chicanos who were seeking bilingual education and that many parents, in fact, did not want bilingual education (Salinas, 1977).

Opposition by members of the community and the Senior Estates reflected a much stronger assimilationist viewpoint than arguments posed by educational personnel. Having observed Spanish and Russian speaking migrants in the community in a variety of settings--shopping, obtaining community services, participating in school programs, engaging in recreational activities--many citizens were most conscious and concerned about the fact that these migrants were definitely "outside" the mainstream of society. Convinced that a knowledge of and fluency in the English language is a prerequisite for economic success in America, these citizens viewed bilingual education, not only as an obstacle to linguistic and cultural homogeneity, but also as an obstacle to the upward mobility of Spanish and Russian speaking students.

Opposition to bilingual education was voiced regularly at school
board meetings, but it was not a well organized, systematic effort. The Senior Estates, a retirement community, was usually represented at such meetings, but its opposition to bilingual education was no greater than its opposition to other district program suggestions which would require increased property taxes. Other arguments against bilingual programming were pursued individually or in small groups at the meetings and were only periodically reported by the local news media (Little, Salinas, 1977).

Spokesmen in favor of bilingual education were somewhat more organized and concentrated their efforts on the school district's inability to meet the educational needs of bilingual-bicultural children through traditional programming. Pointing to the high dropout rates and to the below average academic achievements of linguistically different students, Chicano spokesmen contended that bilingual education would help improve educational achievement by both Chicano and Russian children. The bicultural component of bilingual education was also expected to offer cultural encouragement to students and to work against their temptation to drop out because of cultural alienation in the school.

Obtaining united support from the Spanish speaking community for bilingual education proved to be a frustrating experience for Chicano leaders. Many parents, not fully understanding the concept of bilingual education, did not respond favorably toward it when
questioned by school district personnel. To overcome the community's lack of information, Chicano leaders with the assistance of VML held meetings to explain the nature of bilingual education and its potential for young Chicano migrant students.

Local and area newspapers reported the conflict between the supporters of bilingual education and its detractors. Editorials sought to influence the public by expounding on the merits or weaknesses of bilingual education. Reported opposition to bilingual education usually focused on two items: (1) Migrant education was already providing educational services to Chicano and Russian students, and (2) it was not the responsibility of the schools to teach a language and culture other than that of the dominant white middle class society.

The Chicano and Russian communities were not to be put off, however, and in the fall of 1970, Woodburn instituted a dual bilingual program (Russian-English and Spanish-English) utilizing federal Title VII funds.

The inception of the Woodburn bilingual program was a signal which had been long awaited in Oregon by Chicanos and other supporters of bilingual education. Encouraged by program efforts in Woodburn and by the undergraduate teacher training program in La Grande, Chicano leaders seized upon a variety of opportunities for the promotion of cultural preservation and bilingual education.

The next four years saw Oregon's Spanish speaking population
involved in a variety of political, social, and educational efforts across the North Willamette Valley, all of which served to remove the Chicano from the status of "invisible minority" to that of a resident minority group which seemed intent on pursuing the goal of bilingual education for Oregon's Spanish speaking school children.

Utilizing the political leadership of Valley Migrant League, the talents of transplanted Chicano professionals, and the increasing resources available through federal and private funding, grassroot movements moved out from Woodburn and established Chicano cultural centers in Gervais and Cornelius, the Chicano and Indian Study Center of Oregon (CISCO) at Adair, and El Colegio Cesar Chavez at Mt. Angel. Additional organizational support was received from the National Education Task Force de la Raza, a national project sponsored by the University of California at Los Angeles (U. C. L. A.) and funded through the U. S. Office of Education.

Among the most important benefits derived by the Spanish speaking community from these organizations were increased community participation in migrant education programs and improved political support for bilingual education. Serving as clearinghouses for state and national information relating to Chicanos, these established groups became the centers of political and educational activity. Supported by the growing Chicano population which began to spread throughout the Valley, the implementation of bilingual education in
communities having a sizable Spanish speaking population became a main objective for these groups.

Success in organizational efforts solidified the "Chicano" identification among the Spanish speaking in Oregon, especially among the younger generation. The older generation found it could support the declared goals (e.g., improved education, reduced school dropout rate) of the Chicano Movement even though it could not always support the means (protests, walkouts, etc.) by which these goals were pursued. The Chicano leadership discovered that it could organize and mobilize the Chicano community through regular programming at the cultural centers, through involvement in migrant education programs, and through a variety of community cultural activities. Most importantly, the Chicano community, young and old, was beginning to realize that it could exert some influence if it acted as a unified force.

In addition to recognizing their strengths as a unified group, the Spanish speaking communities in Oregon were buoyed in their efforts for improved educational opportunity--namely, bilingual education--by events outside the state. The first was the passage of bilingual education legislation in other states (Massachusetts, 1971; Texas, 1973; Illinois, 1973). The second was the Lau Decision (1974), which ruled in favor of a non-English speaking Chinese student in San Francisco. The media coverage of these events forced Willamette Valley school administrators to become more aware of
the Spanish speaking minority in the state and often prompted Chicanos to increase their demands for improved educational programming.

These demands were often communicated through parent advisory committees. Required by federal legislation for all federally funded education programs, these committees served several purposes. First, they promoted unity and direction among the Chicano parents. Secondly, school district administrators received cultural and linguistic input for programming directly from parents whose children were being served through federal programs. Though communications between English speaking administrators and Spanish speaking parents often suffered and had to be translated several times, the long term effects of such committee participation was a demonstration of Chicano parents' concern for the education of their children. The attendance and support of Chicanos at parent advisory committee meetings was never lacking.

Forces from outside local Chicano communities which rallied to support parental efforts for improved educational programming included Chicano students from the state universities, Chicano activists from other states, and Chicano educators from around the valley. An increase in Chicano student enrollment throughout the state at this time did not go unnoticed by the State Department of Education.

According to the Racial and Ethnic Survey '75-76, the Spanish
speaking student population in Oregon increased by 46% from 4,500 in 1969-70 to 6,573 in 1971-72. The number of Spanish speaking personnel employed full time by local school districts also increased during the same period by 423%, rising from 30 in 1969-70 to 157 in 1971-72. The next three years continued to show phenomenal growth; student population increased by 21% and school personnel by 36%. This growth prompted the State Department of Education to report in its 1975-76 survey: "Since 1969-70, the only minority group to show a significant increase in percentage of total enrollment is the Spanish surnamed" (96, p. 11).

Since the implementation of the Woodburn bilingual program, requests for bilingual education have continued to lead to conflicts between Chicano residents and some members of the dominant Anglo American population. These conflicts manifested themselves most strongly in the public schools in several Oregon communities of the mid-Willamette Valley where the majority of the state's Chicano population resided. Most of the conflicts have resulted from the Chicano student's attempt to maintain his cultural identity and heritage in school by speaking Spanish on the school grounds, establishing
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2"Anglo American" is used to denote the dominant and majority ethnic group in the United States without insinuating an Anglo-Saxon origin. The term Caucasian cannot be used to distinguish between the Chicano and the Anglo-American since the Chicano is included in this particular classification. The term Anglo will be used in this research when referring to individuals from the dominant and majority ethnic group.
Chicano clubs, and requesting Chicano related instruction and materials. Chicano students have confronted school district officials, requested special interest programming, and cited judicial decisions and Civil Rights legislation. These student-school confrontations have led to Chicano student walkouts in Gervais Union High School (1972) and North Marion High School (1974) and Chicano protests at school board meetings in Woodburn (1971, 1975) and Salem (1974).

School district administrators have continued to argue that English is the dominant and national language and that other ethnic minorities (Germans, Italians et al.) have been successfully assimilated. Additional arguments by school officials have stressed the lack of a unified cultural identification among many of the parents, who consider themselves Mexican or Mexican-American, and the students, many of whom identify themselves as Chicano.

Chicano leaders, on the other hand, have continued to stress the many benefits of bilingual education, not only for their children but also for society as a whole. While most school district officials have become fully aware of the Chicano community's desire for bilingual education, many have nevertheless persisted in their efforts to delay the development of bilingual education programs. Some districts have allowed the formation of cultural clubs, Chicano related coursework, and extended Chicano participation in advisory committees (North Marion, 1972; Monitor, 1973; Gervais, 1973).
Other Oregon school districts have continued to resist Chicano requests for programs and activities which support the maintenance and encourage the preservation of the Chicano cultural heritage.

Central School District 13J in Independence was one such district.
III. THE COMMUNITY

In 1976 Independence, Oregon, had a population of 3,850 residing within its city limits. Lying approximately 15 miles west, southwest, of Salem, the state capital, Independence is an urban-agricultural community in the mid-Willamette Valley (see map, Appendix). Adjacent to Independence on the west is Monmouth, a college community of 6,135. Both communities lie in the southeastern part of Polk County. This county’s largest community is Dallas, the county seat, which had a population of 7,735 in 1976.

Demographic data for Polk County (Table I) indicates a population of 35,349 (1970 census). Of these, 14,192 lived in the combined communities of Independence, Monmouth, and Dallas and felt more a part of Polk County than the 9,400 who resided in West Salem. Although the West Salem community is geographically situated in Polk County, it has been politically and economically attached to Salem which lies east of the Willamette River within the boundaries of Marion County.

Census data from 1970 showed that 97% of Polk County’s population reflected an Anglo or non-ethnic minority background, with 45.6% claiming to be native Oregonians. Among county residents, there existed some affiliation with languages other than English, an affiliation which indicated personal preferences for identification with and possible familial ties to a European cultural base. Local
### TABLE I. NATIONALITY AND ETHNIC ORIGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Polk County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>35,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native born of native born</td>
<td>30,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native born of foreign born</td>
<td>3,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in state (Oregon)</td>
<td>16,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in foreign country</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in same county since 1965</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mother Tongue for Selected Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Polk County</th>
<th>Chicano</th>
<th>Independence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>29,881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td></td>
<td>available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

newspapers and conversations with local county residents reflected this strong cultural and linguistic affiliation but also suggested a firm belief in the "melting pot" ideology.

Polk County, like many other Oregon counties, has experienced limited growth in ethnic minority population. As a result, many county residents have had little or no personal interaction with members of an ethnic minority. The rural isolation of the county has allowed values and beliefs which were brought by pioneer settlers to survive and persist to the present. While the majority of the Polk County population has continued in this tradition, the growth of a Spanish speaking minority in Independence has introduced a separate life-style, one whose customs and values have sometimes differed from those of the established community.

The Chicano community in Independence is a recent arrival to the county. Less than one fourth of the Spanish speaking community has been in the county for more than ten years. Records for Oregon Rural Opportunities (formerly Valley Migrant League) showed that it wasn't until the early 1960's that Spanish speaking migrants started coming in large numbers to Polk County. According to the U.S. Census (1970) the majority of Spanish speaking residents in Polk County were second or third generation native born United States citizens.

Most of the Spanish speaking people in Oregon regularly
traveled migrant routes between Southwestern states and the Northwest. Throughout the sixties, families left the migrant stream and settled throughout the northern half of the Willamette Valley. Small migrant communities became home bases for other migrant families who later chose not to make the long seasonal trek back to the Southwest, but who continued a migrant way of life in the Northwest (Salinas, 1977). These original cultural bases in the Willamette Valley grew as relatives and friends from the Southwest continued to limit their migrant travels or to completely abandon the migrant way of life.

As the Chicano population grew in Independence, conflict began to develop between the agrarian-based, long time resident Anglo population and the newly arrived, farm working Spanish speaking Chicano. Many Anglo residents of Polk County viewed the Chicano as a foreigner in this country and interpreted the Chicano's steadfast attachment to his language and cultural lifestyle as a refusal to become "American" (Ousterhout, 1977). Believing that assimilation was the only acceptable avenue into the American mainstream, many Anglos refused to accept the Chicano as an American citizen.

Leaving the migrant stream was not an easy task. Since migrancy is dependent on seasonal agricultural employment, many heads of households didn't have the education or technical skills needed to seek nonagricultural employment, and the problem of
finding permanent employment was further complicated by the language barrier and by the migrant's inability to afford the basic economic necessities of life and/or needed technical training while seeking employment (Salinas, 1977). Consequently, most migrants, although they sought permanent jobs, found it necessary to continue working as seasonal agricultural workers. It wasn't until the mid-sixties that the Valley Migrant League was able to provide the training and economic support required for migrants to make the transition to a nontransient way of life. Services provided through the League's branch office in Independence included vocational counseling, on-the-job training, English as a Second Language instruction, financial assistance, and housing support (Cantu, 1977; Matthews, 1971; Salinas, 1977).

Even with the provision of such services, however, transition was not easy. John Little, former Director of VML, points out that the economic situation for Chicanos was bleak in the small community of Independence, and it was almost impossible for former migrants to find employment during the off season. Seasonal unemployment forced many Chicanos to continue a migrant way of life during the agricultural season and to pursue VML sponsored OJT and educational programs during the off-season. Odd jobs and a small $35 per week stipend paid through the VML programs helped sustain many of the first Chicano residents in Polk County (Little, 1977).
The fact that it was difficult for Chicano residents or migrants to find employment, coupled with the fact that many of them were receiving welfare assistance, often led some Anglo residents to view the Chicanos negatively. Rather than examining the overall socio-economic conditions which caused the Chicano to become entrapped in a life of poverty and constant need, many of the Anglo population chose to believe that the Chicano was incapable of successful employment. Furthermore, many attributed the Chicano's lack of economic success to his steadfast attachment to his culture and language (Little, 1977).

In 1970 a major portion of the Chicano population in Polk County (Table II) found itself in severe socio-economic conditions. While a large percentage of the available male Chicano work force was employed, 28.4% only worked for a period up to 26 weeks a year, and 37.2% were employed 27-49 weeks. This indicated that while the unemployed at the time of the census was low (3.8%), a much larger number were without jobs during other periods of the year. This conclusion was further verified by 1970 Census data which indicated 31% of the Chicano labor force was involved in agriculturally related employment and that another 31% were employed as laborers in other than agricultural jobs. The 1970 Census data also indicated that most Chicanos lived at or below a level of relative poverty. In 1970 the median income for Chicanos in Polk County was $4,808 as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Polk County</th>
<th>County Total</th>
<th>Chicano</th>
<th>Independence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available Labor Force (16 yrs. and older)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8,367</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income (all wage earners)</td>
<td>$8,891</td>
<td>$4,808</td>
<td>$7,408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7,923</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periods of unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-49 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-26 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Level and Below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total persons</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculturally related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>data not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer (except farm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>data not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

compared to $8,891 for the county population and $7,408 for the community of Independence. More specifically, 151 Spanish speaking persons out of a total of 866, or 17.4% of the total Chicano population in Polk county, existed at or below a federally-defined poverty level. 3

Socio-economic hardships often lead to disrupted educational experiences, and Polk County's Chicano migrant children frequently experienced difficulties in school. Traveling the migrant stream kept many youngsters from participating full time in regular nine month school programs. Arriving at their Independence home base late in the fall led to late school enrollment, and early withdrawal in the spring contributed to the tendency of many migrant students to fall behind academically. As migrant students entered their teens, it often became easier for them to drop out than to continue in school (Little, 1977).

In an effort to assist the migrant student, Central School District 13J began providing special services in 1957. Subsequent funding through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title I,

---

3 In 1969, the poverty thresholds ranged from $1,487 for a female unrelated individual 65 years old and over living on a farm to $6,116 for a non farm family with a male head and with seven more persons. The average poverty threshold for a non farm family of four headed by a male was $3,745. The poverty threshold includes a range of poverty income cutoffs adjusted by such factors as family size, sex of family head, number of children under 18 years old, and farm and non farm residence (129, p. 29).
1965, and Title I-Migrant Amendment, 1967) enabled the school district to continue to strengthen educational services to migrant students. According to records at the State Department of Education, many activities in these programs endorsed an assimilationist philosophy and minimized the linguistic and cultural heritage of Chicano migrant students. Elementary school programs emphasized a strong orientation to acceptable social practices of the dominant white middle class society and constantly reinforced the importance of assimilation through an equally strong emphasis on English language development. Secondary school programs continued to stress language development and usually made little reference to a Chicano cultural heritage. Teachers in these programs did not always have the time, the materials, nor the administrative support required to assist migrant students whose attendance was often lacking and whose language and culture often led to conflicts within the school setting.

Minifie (1974) investigated student dropout data in three Oregon counties (Polk-Yamhill-Marion) to determine if a need existed for alternative high school programs. One of his conclusions was that Chicanos have had a much higher dropout rate than Anglo students in Polk County. His data for the three Mid-Willamette Valley county area reflected that in 1970, 34% of all Spanish speaking youth, 16-21 years old, were high school dropouts. In Polk County alone, according to Minifie's research, 24% of the Spanish speaking youth (16-21
years old) were high school dropouts, a percentage four times larger than the 6% dropout rate recorded for all the youth in the county (69). Minifie's figure of 24% was supported by an Oregon Department of Education Task Force which documented a 20.7% dropout rate among Hispanic students across the state (93).

Chicano parents in Independence have long been concerned with the high dropout rate among their children (Duran, 1977). The alienation of junior and senior high school Chicano students was of special concern to Chicano parents whose children were served through the district's migrant education program. To combat this alienation, the district sponsored, through Migrant Education efforts and upon parental request, a Chicano cultural club at the senior high school in 1973. Formation of the club, however, did not alleviate Chicano parents' concerns for their children's continued cultural conflict in the schools and lack of academic success in the classroom. The Spanish speaking community has acknowledged that Chicanos have not been educated well in Independence and that before the Chicano can improve his economic and social position, improved education--namely bilingual education--will have to be provided.

The changing status of the Chicano--from migrant to permanent resident--has not only led Chicanos to seek improved educational services from the school district but has made them more visible in the established community. The fact that many Chicano requests for
improved education have been prompted by differences between the Chicano and the majority Anglo population, has led to misunderstandings which have impeded acceptance of the Chicano as an American citizen. For example, the Chicano's use of his native language and retention of his cultural lifestyle have separated him from the dominant Anglo population. The effect has been for the Chicano to create a strong community within the larger community. Because of cultural differences, socio-economic conditions, and educational practices, the Chicano community is somewhat isolated from the majority community (Ericksen, 1977).

Two groups from within the Anglo communities of Independence-Monmouth have responded to the emerging role of the Chicano. One group has responded positively to the Chicano community, supporting its efforts to obtain improved social acceptance, better economic opportunity, and more relevant educational services. This group, mostly from Monmouth, has recognized the pluralism in society and would like to use public education in Central School District 13J as the vehicle toward a better understanding of ethnic pluralism (Crawford, 1977).

The second group has responded from a strong sense of commitment to a "melting pot" ideology. Endorsing a strong assimilation role for public education, these individuals have appeared to understand loyalties to a cultural heritage but have also felt the necessity
to sacrifice ethnic diversity, including language, as a prerequisite for entrance into the cultural mainstream of white middle class America. This group's perception of the Chicano population have led it to blame the Chicano community's strong attachment to its language and to its culture as the main reason for its lack of education and economic success.

Socio-economic conditions and strong cultural differences such as those found in Polk County have had powerfully influencing effects upon the community and its inhabitants. Misinformation and lack of information concerning the Chicano's identity and lifestyle have led to perceptions which have become easily misinterpreted, miscommunicated, and possibly incorporated into educational programs. These influences have been evident and have manifested themselves in Polk County, especially in Independence, Oregon.
IV. BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN INDEPENDENCE

In the early seventies, Independence Chicano parents began to inquire about the possibility of utilizing Migrant Education monies for bilingual education. Pointing to Chicano student dropouts and to the less than satisfactory rate of academic achievement among Chicano students, parents believed that bilingual education would begin to improve education for their children. Pressure was brought to bear upon the district's Federal Programs Director, who, after conferring with the parents, decided that a Title VII Bilingual Education grant would probably be more appropriate than utilizing a Title I-M Migrant Education grant for bilingual education.

The director's reasoning was based on the fact that many of the district's Chicano students could no longer be identified as migrants. The majority of the Spanish speaking "settled-out" migrants had resided in Independence for over five years, and most had given up seasonal farm work. Because federal funding for the Migrant Program was being reduced yearly, the Federal Programs Director felt that in order to develop the type of program desired in

---

4 The term "settled-out" migrant refers to families who claimed an established residence. This meant the family had not moved within the past year across county lines to seek employment in agriculture or agriculturally related occupations. The federally funded Migrant Education Program gave a higher funding priority to "active" migrants or those individuals who had moved within the past 12 months since it was felt students from these families warranted greater support.
Independence, Title VII offered the better opportunity in terms of level of funding, planning grant, and focus of programming.

Working jointly with Dr. Bill Moore of Teaching Research at Oregon College of Education, Monmouth, the Federal Programs Director prepared a joint school district-Teaching Research federal grant proposal requesting Title VII Bilingual Education funds for a planning period to cover July 1, 1974, to June 30, 1975. The initial proposal, submitted in late summer of 1974, asked for $82,272 and had the following three main objectives:

1) Clarify the need for bilingual education in Central School District 13J.

2) Develop a strategy for implementing a district wide bilingual curriculum.

3) Implement a bilingual curriculum at the preschool level (28).

The Federal Programs Director and Moore felt that a bilingual education program in Central School District 13J would stand a better chance of being accepted and adopted by the community if a period of time was spent investigating the need for bilingual education and if, once a need for bilingual education was documented, school district personnel and parents were involved in a decision to pursue additional funds for program implementation. Based on this rationale, the grant proposal requested funds for a school district bilingual education needs assessment and a concurrent implementation of a preschool bilingual effort for the district's Chicano preschool students.
There seemed to be little hesitancy about establishing a bilingual education program at the preschool level since for years bilingual instruction at this level had been taking place through Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title I and Title I-M) funds. These preschool efforts were known to school district personnel and to the community, who felt that such instruction (bilingual) provided appropriate preparation to young Chicano students for subsequent entry into an English speaking school program (Barr, 1977).

Parental review and approval of the grant proposal was sought and received to verify community support both to school administration and to federal proposal reviewers. Since a bilingual program advisory committee did not exist, it was decided to utilize the district's joint Migrant Education and Title I Advisory Committee as many of the same children projected for inclusion in the bilingual education program were then being served through these two federally sponsored programs.

The grant proposal projected the following enrollment for the 1974-75 school year.

### TABLE III. BILINGUAL PROGRAM ENROLLMENT 1974-75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-English Dominant</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>English Dominant</th>
<th>Total to be served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Research Preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After being reviewed and approved by the Parent Advisory Committee, the grant proposal was submitted to the school board at their regular meeting, August 19, 1974. Discussion regarding the feasibility of bilingual education was minimal. In fact, the board seemed satisfied with the proposal's intent to determine whether a need for bilingual education existed in the school district before implementing a full bilingual education program. Nevertheless, the board chose not to act on the proposal at this time, but rather to withhold approval subject to federal funding. The grant proposal was then forwarded to Washington, D.C.

Although it would be several months before the district could expect a response to their grant proposal, the Federal Programs Director proceeded to investigate whether a need for bilingual education existed. Following examples set by Woodburn and Salem in their documentation of a need for bilingual education, the director asked that a survey of reading comprehension scores be made from the district's 1973-74 testing records. The survey included 107 of the 120 Chicano students and 1140 of the 1197 Anglo students enrolled in grades 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11. Analysis of the data revealed that 74% of all Chicano students tested were comprehending below grade level as opposed to 44% of all Anglo students tested. The data also showed that 100% of all Chicano students at the 11th grade who were tested were comprehending below grade level, while only 52%
of the Anglo students at this level were performing below grade level (29).

Additional data to document a need for bilingual education was obtained through an attitude survey developed and administered by the Migrant Education Program at the State Department of Education. The survey, designed to determine how migrant education participants (parents and students) around the state felt regarding a need for bilingual-bicultural education, was administered in November, 1974. Three questions were asked in this survey, which was conducted by local program personnel:

1) Which is the dominant language spoken at home?
2) Do you desire bilingual education?
3) Do you desire instruction in the history and culture of the community's ethnic minorities?

Table IV reflects survey results for School District 13J.

TABLE IV. ATTITUDE SURVEY--SCHOOL DISTRICT 13J MIGRANT PROGRAM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participants</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant language at home--Spanish</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total desiring bilingual instruction</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total desiring instruction in history and culture of community's ethnic minorities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In late fall of 1974 School District 13J was informed by the United States Office of Education that its Title VII Bilingual Education Grant Proposal had not been funded. However, federal program officials explained that the district was eligible for funding through discretionary monies and had been granted partial funding for program planning. School district officials were requested to submit the school board's approval for accepting a six-month planning grant in the sum of $41,136.

Disappointment over rejection of the original grant proposal was somewhat eased by the federal government's proposal of partial funding for a planning grant, but it was feared by the Federal Programs Director that the board might not be receptive to a smaller grant. Nevertheless, the director prepared to go before the district school board to obtain the required approval. To assist him in the presentation were Miguel A. Salinas, Director of the Bilingual Education Program, Woodburn; Dr. Bill Moore, third party evaluator for the state's Migrant Education Programs and co-sponsor of the proposal; and a small contingency of Chicano parents. On January 6, 1975, at the regular board meeting, the reduced grant proposal was submitted to board members for approval.

An explanation of bilingual education was presented by the Woodburn Program Director, and the merits of bilingual education were discussed by Dr. Moore and Chicano parents. With two
members absent, the school board voted 4 to 1 to support the bilingual planning proposal and request federal funds. Dr. Bill Moore, the third party evaluator for the district's bilingual education program, recalled the meeting:

...The board was very open...It was not threatened by the concept of bilingual education...it was curious though and asked many questions from Miguel [Director, Bilingual Program, Woodburn]. I think the board took into consideration that parents, Chicano, were present and based its decision on the fact that what was being asked was not something for one person, but that it had the support of parents behind it....Miguel is very articulate, he's patient and explains well what bilingual education is. The fact that Bill Ousterhout, the district's federal programs director, was also part of the presentation also helped. The board was not threatened, but it saw some parents there, and this is important to the board....(Moore, 1977).

Because the board was not unanimous in its support of the grant proposal, the local newspaper, reporting on the meeting, described the board as "rather reluctant...with one Central 13J board member voting no and two others saying they were unsure of the need for the 100% federally funded program" (22).

The hiring of Amelia Diaz Barr to head the district's efforts in bilingual education followed later in January 1975. Barr felt her personal and professional background would facilitate the job of planning and coordinating a bilingual education program for Spanish speaking former migrants. Having experienced migrancy as a child, Barr understood the social and economic pressures former migrants faced upon leaving the migrant stream. Subsequent experiences as an
elementary school teacher of migrant students in Independence had given her an intimate knowledge of the local Chicano community and familiarized her with local school district educational practices. With this preparation behind her, Barr faced three immediate tasks: 1) to familiarize herself with the concept of bilingual education; 2) to further document a need for bilingual education; and 3) to begin planning a bilingual education program for the district.

The first task was not difficult. Visitations to bilingual education programs in Oregon, California, and other states plus participation in regional and national bilingual education conferences helped Barr and other district personnel become familiar with existing models of bilingual education. Interactions with Woodburn and Salem bilingual program personnel, parents, and students provided additional insights into preparing program proposals, designing curriculum, planning staff development, and forming advisory committees.

The second task, providing additional documentation to justify a bilingual education program in the district, called for close cooperation with Dr. Bill Moore of Teaching Research. As third party evaluator for the district's Title I-Migrant Education Program, Moore had access to numerous data reflecting academic achievement of the district's Spanish speaking students, most of whom had participated in the district's migrant education program. Initial documentation in the 1974-1975 Bilingual Program Application
stated:

The total district school population is composed of 11% Spanish surnamed children, but in the target area schools where most of the migrant and former migrant families live, over 20% of the school age population is composed of Spanish surnamed children. The only efforts to date by the district to accommodate these special needs had been the employment of bilingual aides, through district, Title I and I-M funds...many of the children are no longer eligible for E.S.E.A. I-M funds to meet their educational needs, and the district and the E.S.E.A. Title I funds have not provided adequate compensatory support (28, p. 19-20).

Another source of documentation sought was parental feeling toward a bilingual education program in the district. In February 1975, two teams of Project personnel, each consisting of two members who were known and accepted in their respective communities, conducted a survey to determine how parents felt regarding bilingual instruction. The population surveyed included all Spanish surnamed parents having children enrolled in the district plus those parents whose four year olds were being projected for preschool attendance the following year. To obtain Anglo viewpoints, the Project also surveyed a similar number of randomly chosen Anglo parents. Table V reflects survey questions and a tabulated result of the responses.
### Table V. Parent Survey Form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mex/Am</th>
<th>Anglo</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total parents surveyed</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses obtained</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to be surveyed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Family composition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Language most often used in the home:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which parents speak:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish only</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish only</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which members read:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Would you want your child to be enrolled in bilingual classes in which all of the students received instruction in both languages?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Would you like your child to be competent in both English and Spanish?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Mex/Am</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If your child's instructions were in both Spanish and English, how do you feel he would perform in school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do as well</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do better</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not as well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no opinion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. a. Should bilingual instruction be confined* to teaching concepts and skills?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Interviewers interpreted this to mean “include.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ... to include both Spanish and English language development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ... both of above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Should the school teach Mexican American history, culture and heritage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no pref.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you think that non-Spanish speaking children would benefit from bilingual instruction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Should bilingual education be taught in grades:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preschool-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preschool-6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through junior high</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through high school</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other choices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no pref./no opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Would you participate in school meetings and activities if a bilingual person were there to relate to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third task, planning a bilingual program for the district, was more difficult. Working closely with the Federal Programs Director, Barr proceeded to determine exactly how a bilingual education program would fit best into the existing educational system. Three main questions had to be answered: 1) How would the program be implemented? 2) How would the program be staffed? 3) Would the program follow a transitional or a maintenance model?

Program implementation was to be modeled after the Salem Bilingual Program. Since enrollment in the program would not be large, it was felt by Barr that program implementation could be carried out three grades at a time. Initial plans called for the district to have a bilingual education program for grades 1-3 in 1976-77, grades 4-6 in 1977-78, and similar expansion upward until a comprehensive bilingual program would operate in grades K-12 by school year 1979-80. The following planning model was developed:

**PROPOSED BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Independence Elem. 1-3</th>
<th>Henry Hill Elem. 4-6</th>
<th>Talmadge JHS 7-9</th>
<th>Central HS 10-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>operational</td>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td></td>
<td>operational planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td></td>
<td>operational planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td></td>
<td>operational planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions of staffing presented some difficulty to district administration. Since staff turnover at the elementary school level was minimal in the district, and since the district was not large enough to permit staff transfers, program administrators had to contend with the prospect of utilizing monolingual English speaking teachers as host teachers in the bilingual program. Working jointly, district administration, the principal at Independence Elementary School, and program administrators decided that volunteer teachers would be sought from the existing staff at the first, second, and third grade levels to work in the program. Four classrooms were projected for the first year of bilingual education. The first grade was to occupy two classrooms and the second and third grades were to each occupy one classroom.

The selection of monolingual program faculty then began to dictate the direction bilingual instruction would take. Because of Spanish language limitations among the volunteer teachers, it was decided at this point that bilingual instruction would consist of 50 minutes of Spanish oral language development daily under the tutelage of a bilingual-bicultural resource teacher. Each host teacher was to be assigned a bilingual-bicultural teacher aide to assist Chicano students during the day through instructional support as needed in Spanish or in English.

At the same time that instructional needs were being identified,
efforts to determine the language dominance of Chicano students enrolled in the district were being conducted by Barr. Federal guidelines defined dominant language to mean "the language most relied upon for communication in the home" (28, p. 26). Students found to be Spanish language dominant were automatically considered candidates for bilingual instruction and identified as having limited English speaking ability. This term, according to federal guidelines, when used with reference to an individual means:

(a) Individuals who were not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English, and
(b) Individuals who come from environments where a language other than English is dominant, and by reason thereof, have difficulty speaking and understanding instruction in the English language (122, p. 186).

Language dominancy was determined through informal interviews of Chicano families conducted by program personnel. Data from this survey was reported and incorporated into the 75-76 program proposal:

Fifty-five families were interviewed in the time allocated, and the results indicate that while the parents preferred and communicated in Spanish, many of the children communicated in English, even when spoken to in Spanish. It was determined that their English vocabulary was less extensive than Spanish, but due to the influence of the English dominant community and television, they (Chicano children) believed that they were expected to respond in English (28, p. 26).

One hundred forty (140) Chicano students in grades K-6, or the total Chicano enrollment, were identified as having limited English speaking ability according to federal guidelines. Of these, 20 were
currently enrolled in the preschool bilingual program, 62 in grades 1-3, and 58 in grades 4-6. It was decided that participation in the program would be opened to Anglo students upon parental request as long as Anglo enrollment did not exceed that of the Spanish speaking students. Federal guidelines stipulated:

...a program of bilingual education may make provision for the voluntary enrollment to a limited degree therein, on a regular basis, of children whose language is English, in order that they may acquire an understanding of the cultural heritage of the children of limited English-speaking ability for whom the particular program of bilingual education is designed. In determining eligibility to participants in such programs, priority shall be given to the children whose language is other than English. In no event shall the program be designed for the purpose of teaching a foreign language to English-speaking children (122, p. 187).

Thus the proposed enrollment for the district's first two years of bilingual programming were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total School Enrollment</th>
<th>LESA*</th>
<th>Others to Be Served</th>
<th>Total to Be Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool (K)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Elementary (1-3)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hill Elementary (4-6)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>614</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Limited English speaking ability.
The final question which demanded the attention of program planners—Would the program be a transitional or a maintenance model?—was the most difficult to address. These two types of programming were the major ones in existence and provided the bases for other program variations.

A maintenance bilingual model was one in which the cultural heritage of the student is maintained and promoted. This model has been highly favored by ethnic minorities seeking bilingual education as it promises to perpetuate and transmit a cultural heritage through the educational process. Josue Gonzalez (1975) pointed out some characteristics of this model:

1. Students' fluency in another language is seen as an asset to be maintained and developed.

2. Native English-speaking students are involved in the program only minimally if at all.

3. Recruiting and staff development efforts are made to increase the preparation and efficiency of bilingual staff.

4. Team teaching is often employed to maximize bilingual staff resources.

5. Much attention is given to development of English language skills but use of the home language is continued through the grades to the extent that resources make that possible.

6. Varying degrees of integration of the program into the "regular curriculum" but much of the developmental effort remains dependent on "soft money."

7. Parental involvement is recognized as a potential asset. Attention is given to community resources as sources for curricular content and programmatic direction.
8. The home language is used more extensively and systematically in the teaching of subject content areas and not merely for giving directions or class control.

9. Curriculum development, staff training and evaluation aspects of the program are more comprehensive, better planned and more adequately staffed than in transitional programs.

10. Extra-mural resources are sought out. e.g. college and university personnel, expert consultants, assistance centers, etc. In addition staff may be allowed to visit other programs and participate in conferences and other such opportunities for learning and interaction.

11. Efforts are made to reach as many non-native English speakers as possible but emphasis continues to be placed on language skill development to the exclusion of other, non-linguistic needs of the child. Differences often occur between programs on their approach to "standard" vs. colloquial usage of the home language for instruction (50, p. 14).

A transitional model, on the other hand, has been the program favored by school administrators who interpret bilingual education as a temporary bridge between the language and culture of the home and that practiced by the schools and the dominant society. Because the federal legislation of 1968 did not specifically dictate a transitional nor a maintenance program, its wording had been interpreted differently by groups with vested interests. In 1974, the federal government redefined bilingual education as

...instruction given in, and study of, English and to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system, the native language of the children of limited English speaking ability, and such instruction is given with appreciation for the cultural heritage of such children, and, with respect to elementary
school instruction, such instruction shall, to the extent necessary, be in all courses or subjects of study which will allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system (122, p. 172).

This definition provided much direction and attempted to prevent conflict between supporters of the two types of programs. Since then, state legislation pertaining to bilingual education has been more specific. The state of Massachusetts, for example, when it enacted its own legislation permitting bilingual education, was careful to include the term "transitional" in its description of the program and to limit student participation in bilingual education to three years (122, p. 213). The Civil Rights Commission has interpreted Massachusetts' bilingual education as "intended as remedial measures for language minority students, not as means for changing the basic orientation of school curriculum" (122, p. 214).

Legislation by Massachusetts (1973) and later by Illinois (1974), which restricted programming by stressing the transitional nature of bilingual education, has led some Chicano educators to openly criticize the motives of transitional proponents. Arguing that a transitional program was nothing more than another means of assimilation and that often these programs became "patchwork efforts," Gonzalez (1975) provided one interpretation of transitional bilingual education:


2. Few (if any) bilingual teachers.

4. Use of home language limited to small segments of time.

5. Preponderance of "home made" curriculum materials; some may be prepared by paraprofessional staff and due to lack of direction may lack proper sequencing and/or continuity.

6. Programs have extra-mural resources available to them for staff training, evaluation and overall capacity-building.

7. Clientele is limited to small percentages of children (usually poor and having other serious problems) who speak no English.

8. Greatest effort is in teaching English and eliminating home-language usage usually by grade 3.

9. Programs are not integrated into the ongoing school curriculum. Students often participate on a haphazard "pull-out" basis.

10. Few efforts are made to involve parents in a meaningful partnership with the schools. Home language, culture and child rearing practices are often perceived as detrimental to child's performance in school (50, p. 14).

Program personnel in Independence, when faced with the issue of implementing a transitional or maintenance model, felt most inclined to adopt a maintenance model but hesitated to use the term.

Barr explained her views in the following interview:

Question: "How did you decide between a transitional or a maintenance type program?"

Answer: "There really was no question about the program being transitional. We knew the Board would not accept a maintenance concept. Bill wanted a maintenance one, but we did not specify either one in our proposal."

Question: "But you described a maintenance model in your proposal, and the parents were believing that a
maintenance program would be implemented even though you did not use a descriptor in your proposal. Why didn't you mention either model?"

Answer: "We wanted to get funding, and we know that according to federal guidelines, it was much easier to get funded for a maintenance (program) than for transitional, so we described a maintenance model without actually calling it that."

Question: "When talking to the board, didn't they ever question program extension into the upper grades?"

Answer: "I spent a lot of time speaking with board members, and I don't think many even thought much about it because they were thinking transitional--how fast can we get the students into English? They also didn't seem to mind bilingual going into the upper grades because I think they saw it as a temporary thing needed to help only certain students. I don't think they saw it as a full blown program to help all students maintain and promote the language and the culture." (Barr, 1977).

The Federal Programs Director concurred with Barr that a maintenance model was preferable and probably possible because of the uniqueness of the community. The director also claimed that other factors--such as federal guidelines, low turnover in faculty, and low student enrollment--also had an influence in how the program was finally organized.

The final program designed and proposed during the planning period requested monies for an additional planning period during the 1975-76 school year. It was decided not to rush implementation since considerable planning regarding staff development, curriculum development, and language assessment still needed to be done. It
was proposed that following a year of planning, the program would begin in grades 1-3 the first year and move into grades 4-6 the second year. With these plans firmly established and approved by the district's Title I-M advisory committee, program officers presented the program proposal at the school board's regular meeting on March 10, 1975.

The Federal Programs Director for the district presented the grant proposal to board members, reminding them of the district's standing commitment to improve educational services for all students and especially for the Spanish speaking former migrant. One example of this commitment, he claimed, was the board's willingness to accept the initial federal grant two months earlier and to direct the Project to conduct a district wide assessment of a need for bilingual instruction for Chicano elementary school students. Citing the results of various community surveys and the low reading comprehension scores among Chicano students, the director asked the board to continue its commitment by approving the grant proposal.

In his testimony before the board, the Federal Programs Director explained that the proposal was for planning funds rather than for instruction because the first six month planning grant was primarily directed toward a needs assessment. The director claimed the district was not yet ready to initiate bilingual instruction; time was needed to plan the curriculum, train staff, and to
prepare materials. The federal grant proposal was being submitted to request Title VII dollars for such program activities.

The director also explained that some of the monies would be used to continue and expand the preschool bilingual instructional program begun under the original half year grant. He assured the board that these monies would only amount to approximately one quarter of the total preschool budget since the balance of the budget was met by Title I and Title I-M funds. Federal grant monies would only be used to strengthen already existing instructional services.

The board seemed satisfied with the presentation. A few questions were asked regarding the Chicano students' ability to progress academically in spite of time spent receiving bilingual instruction, but the director was quick to point to other bilingual programs in which Chicano students were achieving at a higher rate than some Anglo students. He also reminded the board of Miguel Salinas' presentation two months earlier on the success of the Woodburn Bilingual Education Program. Following the director's presentation, the board voted to approve the proposal requesting federal monies.

A subsequent board meeting on May 19th, 1975, began like any other meeting, and people in attendance were there because of vested interest in agenda items. A small contingency of Chicano and Anglo parents had come to the meeting to demonstrate concern for the
program approved earlier by the board. One of the Chicano parents in attendance was Reynaldo Cantu, a member of the Independence City Council and an outspoken critic of the school district's efforts regarding the education of Chicano students. Cantu, while very supportive of bilingual education, had been unhappy with the grant proposal because it did not specify the employment of bilingual-bicultural personnel to work in the program as teachers.

Mr. Cantu addressed the board urgently requesting that Central School District 13J "close the gap in reading skills and abilities that exist between Chicano and Anglo students" by hiring bilingual-bicultural teachers who would be able to relate with Chicano students and to provide the assistances required by Chicano students. He directed the board to the results of the survey of reading comprehension scores which showed Chicano students progressively falling below grade level in reading as they advanced through school. Mr. Cantu claimed:

Anglo-teachers are insensitive and not adequately trained to communicate with Chicanos; therefore, they are unable to assist Chicano students in developing positive self-concepts which would help prevent them from becoming alienated, withdrawn, and angry with the school system (52).

Jim Smith, board chairman, responded to Cantu suggesting "that the Chicano community forget its heritage and language and try instead to 'work toward one heritage.' Smith added, 'It's not the responsibility of the school to carry on everybody's background.'"
Another board member, Lester Versteeg, asked, "'What is a Chicano?...This is America, and there are loads of opportunities'" (52).

Although board members seemed upset with Rey Cantu's comments regarding Chicanismo and his implication that public education should promote Chicano cultural maintenance and preservation, there seemed to be no ill feelings at the close of the meeting; the board felt it was doing its best for the Mexican American students while Cantu felt he had taken a stand for the Chicano community regarding its identity and educational needs. According to the minutes of the meeting, May 19, "Consensus of board members' opinions indicated that the teaching and continuance of cultural heritage is largely the responsibility of the home" (26, 5/19/75).

The verbal exchange at the school board meeting on May 19, 1975, between Reynaldo Cantu and members of the board focused on (1) the term Chicano, (2) the role of ethnic heritages in American society, and (3) the role of public education regarding the transmission of ethnic cultures. The issue--low reading comprehension scores among Chicano students--which precipitated the conflict was not addressed further at that meeting nor in subsequent coverage by the news media. The initial report by the news media centered on the expressed opinions concerning the need for and the feasibility of a bilingual-bicultural instructional program which were triggered
by Mr. Cantu's request. The editorials and letters-to-the-editor which followed concentrated on the ethnic and cultural aspects of the Chicano population and on the role of public education regarding cultural preservation and transmission. Some consideration was given to specific educational benefits which a bilingual-bicultural education program would bring to the Independence community. The nature and purpose of the proposed bilingual education program had suddenly provoked a community controversy.

Letters-to-the-editor which opposed the concept of bilingual-bicultural education often appeared to be directed against the Chicano for his insistence on maintaining and preserving a cultural heritage. Such arguments endorsed the assimilation of ethnic minorities and stressed a "melting pot" ideology, the need to learn English, and the school's role of forbearance against the support of any single cultural way of life other than that of the dominant Anglo middle class. One person wrote that "tax dollars should no more be used in phony bilingual and cultural programs than they should for religious instruction in the public schools" (108).

Proponents for bilingual-bicultural education pointed out that...

...bilingual education does not promote complete isolationism, total independence, or lack of responsibility by part cultures within the larger society. Rather it facilitates and encourages effective participation in the economic and political systems of the larger society while enabling the smaller units to retain the traditions, the heritage, and the identity which are an important part of the human condition (1, p. 2).
Others pointed out that the school district ought to examine the real issues and become educated in the definition of, the need for, and the benefits of bilingual-bicultural education. Among such supporters were a mixed group of Anglo and Chicano parents who claimed to be "thankful that our children have an opportunity to live in a multicultural community" (36). Many of these supporters of bilingual education were at the same time very critical of the school board for not assuming the responsibility to educate the public regarding bilingual-bicultural education. The board was accused of failing to provide equal educational opportunity to local Chicano students by not having implemented a bilingual-bicultural program sooner and of denying its Anglo students a richer educational experience by failing to recognize the existence of a culturally pluralistic society.

Editorials reflecting on the bilingual issue presented both sides of the arguments but may have served more to antagonize the adversaries than to clarify the issues. The first editorial in the Independence paper referred to the school board's response to Mr. Cantu's request as "nothing less than a personal attack that smacks of insensitivity, aggressiveness and irresponsibility" (15). In like manner, an editorial in the Salem paper criticized the 13J School Board for handling the conflict poorly and for offering what seemed to be "a shabby and a cheap compromise to the Chicano community" (12). Nonetheless, the Salem editorial agreed with the
school board's position that "it isn't the public school's direct responsibility to perpetuate the special cultural background of its many students," and that by their very nature, schools are "giant blenders" and "Americanization" is their social product (12).

Thus the conflict, as reported through the media, focused primarily on cultural differences, ethnic heritage, and the roles and responsibilities of public education. The issue, it seemed, was not whether to implement a bilingual program, but whether ethnic and cultural heritages should be promoted by the schools. Differences of opinion were based on personal beliefs, and it was through these personal convictions that individuals and groups perceived cultural groups, the role of public education, and finally, what bilingual education should include.

One group which evolved from the controversy was a self-proclaimed Ad Hoc Committee for bilingual-bicultural education in Central School District 13J. Composed of Anglo and Chicano parents from both Monmouth and Independence, this group prepared an open letter to the public in an attempt to rally support for bilingual education. Believing that many community members probably had a minimal understanding of bilingual education, the Ad Hoc Committee not only explained the concept of bilingual-bicultural education and how it would benefit all students but also outlined the necessary steps needed in planning and implementing such a program. In an attempt
to clarify and mediate the existing community conflict, the committee wrote:

...a need which is part of the present issue, but which goes far beyond it, is the need for better identification of values and priorities within our two communities [Chicano and Anglo], and improved techniques and avenues for communicating them to each other, and to decision making bodies such as the school board. No one person or group is to blame...we become frustrated, we become antagonized, we are not always prepared, we misrepresent and we are misrepresented, we do not always say what we mean, we do not always say on the spur of the minute what we would say with time to reflect, we speak better than we listen, we have biases, we differ in our values and priorities, and we become polarized even though our values and priorities are not polar...but also in human nature is the genuine concern for others, the ability to learn, the ability to grow in understanding, the ability to work together to attain common values, and the ability to compromise--in the constructive sense of the word (1, p. 4).

However, neither this statement nor any other portion of the Ad Hoc Committee's four page letter was published in its entirety. The letter was originally prepared for presentation at a school board meeting, but since bilingual education was not addressed further at board meetings, a condensed version of the letter was submitted to the editor and published in the Enterprise-Herald June 4, 1975.

The fact that the Ad Hoc Committee itself dissolved after making some of its concerns public is consistent with what took place in the community at large; i.e., the initial conflict in Independence, as reported in the media, seemed to be shortlived. Some members of the community believed that if the local newspaper had been a daily rather than a weekly publication, the conflict might have expanded
and elicited stronger feelings from a larger portion of the community. Still another, and possibly more significant, reason for the public's reduced concern was the fact that schools soon closed for summer vacations, a time when community activity relating to schools tends to slow down. It must be noted, however, that while it seemed that all signs of conflict had disappeared, evidence of it still remained, especially among school district personnel and some members of the community.

Some parents and school district personnel felt the initial publicity given to differences in opinion regarding bilingual education was exaggerated. These people believed the publicity wrongly suggested the school board held a negative attitude toward bilingual education and the Chicano community. District administration, however, was quick to point out that the board supported programs for bilingual education and was open to and encouraged Chicano participation in district wide school committees. In fact, the superintendent specified that the board had approved every request made regarding bilingual education.

Chicano parents were divided in their opinion of the board. While some believe the board was prejudiced because of its comments at the May 19th meeting, these same parents were also aware of the board's approval of the program, the organization of the Bilingual Education Advisory Committee, and the attempt to hire
extra bilingual-bicultural teacher aides. Actions such as these were interpreted by some parents as an indication of the board's commitment to the Chicano community and to bilingual education.

Other parents have been critical of the school board and felt the board has not demonstrated support for the program. Reynaldo Cantu stated, "They do not understand the [bilingual] concept and have not become educated in it, nor have they pushed it..." He further claimed that "the district administrators are in the same boat as the board members...[since they do not understand the concept] they cannot fully support it" (Cantu, 1977). Another parent, Jose Raul Vazques, supported Cantu's contention that there was no advocacy for bilingual education on the board or in the district administration, but he believed the board was somewhat more knowledgeable about the concept of bilingual education than were school district administrators.

Parental concern about the district's support for bilingual education appeared to decline when the new school year began in the Fall of 1975. Washington, D.C., notified School District 13J that funding for the planning year had been approved; and the Bilingual Education Project began in earnest to prepare for the introduction of bilingual education at the elementary level and to expand and strengthen the bilingual component of the kindergarten program. Since the latter program was not new, and since the majority of
Chicano youngsters already attended as settled-out migrant students, its improvement did not raise concerns among school district personnel. Nor did district personnel seem particularly concerned about the fact that an expanded bilingual program was but one year away.
V. THE ESSENCE OF CONFLICT: ASSIMILATION VS. PLURALISM

Should the assimilation of ethnic minorities continue to be a goal of public education, or should pluralism become a new direction? The conflict in Central School District 13J regarding bilingual education was rooted in this question. Differences of opinion regarding the need for bilingual instruction, the promotion and transmission of culture, and the value of bilingualism have ultimately supported one of two opposing positions—assimilation or pluralism. Since bilingual education was a school district issue, the question of assimilation versus pluralism was argued most strongly by parties closest to the issue, namely school district personnel and parents of Chicano students.

That "assimilation" was a valid goal for public education seemed to be a generally accepted viewpoint among the majority of school district personnel interviewed. From the superintendent, who claimed, "The goal of schools is assimilation," to the classroom teachers, who reported, "Most Chicano students feel very much part of American society," there was general agreement that bilingual-bicultural education would probably delay the Chicano's entry into the mainstream of American society because it would tend to emphasize ethnic and cultural differences rather than promote a cultural homogeneity based on established tradition.
On the other hand, the resurgence in ethnic identification among ethnic minorities around the nation has influenced Chicanos in Independence and was partially responsible for the conflict experienced between the Chicano community and school district personnel. School district personnel were aware of ethnic resurgence and recognized the existence of a stronger Chicano ethnic identification than in previous years. However, in their instructional roles, most teachers did not view the Chicano's desire to retain and promote a cultural heritage as a valid concern nor worthy of public school support. Assimilation of the Chicano into the dominant society's mainstream was the one goal these teachers viewed as most important to the educational programs of the district. While admitting that bilingualism had its virtues and that biculturalism was to be envied, a higher value was placed on assimilation than on pluralism.

Independence Chicanos, nevertheless, continued to maintain and promote their cultural heritage. Retention of their cultural heritage has always been an expectation among the older and more traditional Spanish speaking residents of Independence. However, their children and grandchildren have become more bicultural in nature and have adopted many of the dominant society's customs, often at the expense of traditional Chicano cultural customs. Fearing that young Chicanos would lose their heritage entirely, the Chicano community viewed bilingual-bicultural education as one vehicle which
would help preserve and transmit elements of the Chicano way of life. Consequently, the Chicano community has increased its efforts to achieve bilingual-bicultural education not only that educational opportunities might be improved for their children but that their children's identity with cultural traditions might be strengthened.

The Chicano community has been encouraged in its efforts to promote cultural maintenance by two school district actions. The first was the formation of "Chicanos Unidos," a Chicano cultural club at the high school. The club's original purposes were to provide some cultural relevance, to promote unity among high school Chicano students, and to discourage Chicano students from dropping out of school. The club has been most effective in promoting a Chicano identity among junior high school students as well as among Chicano students in the high school. Club activities with other Chicano organizations throughout the Willamette Valley have strengthened a Chicano ideology and communicated to the Spanish speaking community in Independence that Chicanos have benefitted greatly from bilingual-bicultural education programs in other parts of the valley.

The second school district action which has encouraged the Chicano community in its efforts to maintain an identity with the Chicano culture has been the school board's consistent approval of requests for bilingual education. Recognizing that the board's intentions were primarily to assist Chicano students academically,
most Chicano parents felt that approval of bilingual education also indicated endorsement of cultural maintenance or pluralism. Thus, while total assimilation has never been palatable to most Chicanos, they have come to view bilingual education as a means for achieving both (1) the knowledge and skills needed for expanded, meaningful roles in mainstream society and (2) the promotion and maintenance of a traditional cultural heritage.

While the conflict in Central School District 13J appeared to be focused on whether a need existed for bilingual education and on the public school's responsibility for preparing students to live and work in an Anglo middle class society, a more basic conflict superseded these two issues. The larger issue which was at the root of the conflict in Central School District 13J concerned the relative value of cultural pluralism in our society today. Should public education continue to strive for the assimilation of students into a homogeneous society? Or is it time for public education to recognize not only the existence of cultural pluralism in the United States, but also the importance of maintaining and promoting it?

Participants in the Independence conflict were divided both by their personal feelings about assimilation and pluralism and by their lack of information on the issues being debated. Lack of communication between opposing groups intensified personal feelings and caused some people to become further entrenched in their own viewpoints.
In the middle of the conflict were the personnel of the Bilingual Education Project. They worked hard to "sell" the program to the district superintendent and to school board members but failed to communicate effectively with building principals and classroom teachers. Nor have they convinced the community at large that bilingual education is a necessary and worthwhile part of district programming. Until this is done, and some consensus is reached between school district personnel and the Independence community regarding the need for bilingual education and the role of cultural transmission in the schools, several community members believed that the larger issue of assimilation versus pluralism would continue to prolong the conflict.

Bilingual Program personnel agreed that much still needed to be done in the area of public relations with the community. According to the Federal Programs Director, some Anglos in Independence have not yet accepted nor adjusted to the existence of the Spanish-speaking community in their midst, especially since this minority community has sought to preserve its cultural heritage through public education programming. The director claimed:

...the power structure is very provincial in nature, with the philosophy that Americanization is good...that if you want to be an American, you really ought not to worry about your heritage and worry more about the American heritage.... (Ousterhout, 1977).
Dr. Bill Moore of Teaching Research concurred and believed that a lack of information was somewhat responsible for the resentment felt by some Anglos.

I think it is a lack of understanding in the Anglo community about what bilingual education is or can do...I think they look at it as a Chicano takeover.... (Moore, 1977).

One Chicano parent agreed with Moore that many Anglos lacked information regarding the concept of bilingual education, but he further suggested that many Chicanos were similarly uninformed.

Parents are unhappy because the kids do not feel good. The kids were not passing in school. The school didn't see the need for bilingual education. The communications were breaking down... (Vazques, 1977).

This parent felt the Chicano community needed to better understand the concept of bilingual education before communications between Chicano parents and school district personnel could be improved.

District elementary school principals directly involved in the bilingual education program agreed that a large portion of the Chicano community lacked familiarity with the concept of bilingual education. One principal stated, "There are many people, Mexican-American, who don't agree with the bilingual program" (Beight, 1977). He and other district administrators were often eager to "use" Chicano ignorance of bilingual education as a rationale for not giving full endorsement to the bilingual education program.

Rey Cantu, a spokesman for the Chicano community, contended
that school administrators usually measured community support for bilingual education by noting how many parents attended advisory committee meetings and special programs sponsored by the Bilingual Project. Cantu asserted that because attendance of Chicano parents at such functions was usually small, school administration erroneously concluded that Independence Chicanos did not wish to continue their language and heritage and that a bilingual program was not needed. This conclusion, Cantu pointed out, was not defensible. Some Chicanos have not supported bilingual education solely because they did not understand the concept. "Would you support something that might jeopardize the education of your children?" he asked (Cantu, 1977).

In an attempt to allay questions similar to the one Cantu raised, The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1975) provided the following definition of bilingual-bicultural education as well as some opinions on how it has been accepted:

Bilingual-bicultural education is instruction using the native language and culture as a basis for learning subjects until second language skills have been developed sufficiently; it is the most widely discussed of approaches to providing language minority children with an equal educational opportunity. On the one hand, it has been hailed as a sound educational approach that overcomes the incompatibility between language minority students and the monolingual English public school. On the other, it has been criticized as failing to provide language minority students with sufficient English skills and fostering ethnic separateness (122, p. 3).

The district's definition of bilingual-bicultural education further delineated its scope. Based on the federal guidelines of the
Bilingual Education Act, it stated:

Program of bilingual education or bilingual education program means a program of instruction, designed for children of limited English-speaking ability in elementary and secondary schools, in which with respect to the years of study to which such program is applicable (a) there is instruction given in, and study of, (1) English and (2) (to the extent necessary to allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system) the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability; (b) such instruction is given with appreciation for the cultural heritage of such children, and (c) with respect to elementary school instruction, such instruction is given, to the extent necessary, in all courses or subjects of study which will allow a child to progress effectively through the education system (122, p. 172).

Definitions of bilingual education have been brandished about in the district for several years, in the state for seven years, and nationally for almost a decade. Yet, little was known about this educational concept and philosophy among school district personnel interviewed. When discussing bilingual-bicultural education in the schools and in the community, it was discovered that very few people knew what it was, how it was affected, or what its potential could be. The fact that some people suggested support for bilingual education but opposed bicultural education was an indication that the program, in its first year of implementation and second year of funding, was still not fully understood. Two full years after the initial conflict at the May 19th, 1975, meeting, some members of the Independence community found themselves harboring the same thoughts and feelings expressed at that board meeting and subsequently through the media.
They raised questions which have been answered numerous times by project personnel through the media and through educational literature.

During the interviews, attempts by some school district personnel to define the program or to answer questions regarding its validity often reflected a lack of program familiarity. However, instead of indicating any personal responsibility for learning more about the concept of bilingual-bicultural education, most school district personnel interviewed suggested that the Federal Programs Director and/or Amy Barr be contacted for program information.

Even the District Curriculum Director appeared to feel little responsibility for exploring the role of bilingual-bicultural curriculum with respect to the total school curriculum, especially as it would affect or influence the established program at the elementary level. When asked if she was responsible for coordinating curricular efforts at the elementary level between the bilingual program and the established curriculum, her response was a negative one. She explained that the bilingual program had a resource teacher and a program coordinator who were responsible for that particular task. The curriculum specialist had not become involved with the district's bilingual efforts because of her self-declared lack of knowledge about bilingual education.

The fact that most instructors in the district knew little about
the concept of bilingual education was but one reason for their apparent apathy. They have also been influenced by the lack of demonstrated support for bilingual education by individual district administrators and by the uncertainty of continued federal funding. Teachers have been hesitant to develop and promote a program which could be "gone by next year."

One example given by teachers to support accusations of "lack of administrative support" was the district's refusal to employ teacher aides for the program with district funds. Because federal funds were less than expected, teacher aides, who were to provide much of the bilingual and bicultural assistance in the program's home classrooms, were not employed. This left English monolingual teachers during the first year of program implementation in the home classrooms frustrated and angry with the total idea of bilingual education. The host teachers directly involved in the bilingual education program felt overloaded with work, and teachers who had considered participating in the program at the upper grade levels began to strongly resist the projected expansion of the bilingual program.

The teachers interviewed claimed that their objections to bilingual education had little to do with their feelings toward bilingualism or biculturalism. Rather, they claimed to be most disturbed by one factor: most Chicano students already spoke English very fluently.
Arguing that Chicano students enrolled in the district's elementary school already spoke good English, most teachers felt that bilingual education was not really needed. One teacher explained:

There are not many students in this school who fit that category [Spanish dominant]... the trend among Spanish-Americans is away from the Spanish as a major language and [toward] the English as the major language... but eleven years ago, when we started, Spanish was usually forbidden to be spoken, and we were to discourage it in the schools... it was a general practice... (Bailey, 1977).

All the teachers interviewed more or less concurred that few if any Chicano students actually required bilingual instruction. These instructors were convinced that their classroom experiences supported the assertion that Chicano students could and did communicate well in English. For the few students who might be deficient in their use of English, most teachers interviewed contended that concentrated tutoring and special assistance would probably be of greater assistance than a bilingual education program. In other words, these teachers felt that English language development was a much higher priority than native language development.

The school district administrators, like the teachers interviewed, questioned whether there was a valid need for such a program. Only two elementary principals and the district superintendent admitted that a need existed for bilingual education in Independence and agreed that such a program probably would help Chicano students integrate into the mainstream of society. These same administrators,
while admitting that fluency in two languages was a positive characteristic and one which they personally desired, suspected that bilingual education would probably not satisfy the personal academic needs of Chicano students. One principal pointed out that since Chicanos would need to compete in English in high school, bilingual instruction at the elementary level would only impede their progress. He and other administrators feared that bilingual education would not only hinder students in learning English but that it would ultimately hamper Chicano students as they strove to compete successfully in an English speaking society.

Although the term "assimilation" was not used by school district personnel, their arguments against bilingual education were assimilative in nature. Strict adherents to established curriculum and instructional tradition, most district personnel stressed that instruction in English was of utmost importance in helping students achieve fulfilling roles in mainstream society. Little consideration was given to the importance of retaining or promoting native languages or cultures. In fact, they strongly questioned the validity of educational programming supportive of such notions.

Because of its linguistic nature, it is often assumed that opposition to bilingual education is primarily based on negative attitudes toward the use of another language besides English for instruction. While this may be true to some extent, opposition to the bicultural
component of bilingual education is usually just as strong. In Independence, just the mention of "bicultural" education has consistently led to questions regarding the school's responsibility for preserving, maintaining, and promoting cultures other than the dominant Anglo culture. Some members of the community believed that had the term "bilingual-bicultural" been used to define the original proposal for bilingual education, the ensuing conflict would have been even more severe and widespread.

The pro-assimilation position of school district personnel was as evident when the issue of bicultural education was discussed as when personnel responded to questions about bilingual education. The superintendent for the district asserted that bicultural education was not a district goal. He further explained that the crux of the conflict at the board meeting of May 19th, 1975, was Cantu's request for bicultural, not bilingual, education. He claimed:

The board, according to my knowledge, was never opposed to bilingual education...if there was any fight at all, it came with bicultural education...it simply was a matter that was not explained well to the board prior to the time of that meeting...and the press got that mixed up with bilingual education, which the board has never opposed... (Pratt, 1977).

Alan Guggenheim, former staff reporter for the Enterprise-Herald, who wrote the initial account of the conflict, agreed with the superintendent that school board opposition was against bicultural rather than bilingual education.
The school board members felt/thought that people deserve a fair education and treatment, but that a more positive effort [was needed] by the Chicano community to not only adopt Anglo ways but also repress the Chicano culture... (Guggenheim, 1977).

The superintendent's assertion was further validated by the recollections of one school board member:

We had so many people in the community, in the beginning phases of the program, who viewed it as a bicultural program rather than a bilingual... we had a strong group who favored it... however, that was not the intent, as we [the board] understood it, of the program (Smith, 1977).

Nevertheless, the program which was planned, developed, and implemented was a bilingual-bicultural education program. Program officials have insisted that it was impossible to offer a bilingual education program without including a cultural component. Thus, program direction from the district's Federal Programs office has emphasized a valid need for cultural pluralism in education, and most Chicano parents and other community supporters of bilingual education have endorsed the culturally pluralistic nature of the bilingual education program.

These advocates have raised issues relating to the academic achievement and development of self image among Chicano students. One parent, who had a daughter enrolled in the preschool bilingual program, expressed his concerns about the need for bicultural education at the junior high school:

There is a considerable need for that [bilingual-bicultural] education... We have a large Chicano community, and a lot of the kids, when they get to junior high, are still having
problems academically... such as being able to read, communicate... and also relating... they ask, is there any value in their culture?... They start withdrawing... the need is more obvious in school than at home where they revert to their language and culture, and therefore their parents do not always see the need (Torres, 1977).

Another Chicano parent explained that while the need for bilingual instruction was most important at the elementary level, bicultural education was most needed in the upper grades. Most parents and school personnel interviewed agreed that the need for bilingual instruction should decrease as the students advanced through the grades, but only the Chicano parents and the bilingual program administrators cited an increasing need for bicultural education as the need for bilingual academic instruction decreased.

One Chicano parent claimed that teachers in the program "still don't care... they feel threatened because of the language and take it out indirectly on the kids (Vazques, 1977). He referred to an open letter which the Ad Hoc Committee had prepared for presentation to the school board. It read in part:

Many Mexican-American youths who enter school speak only Spanish; many have difficulty understanding English, the language commonly used for instruction. This handicap greatly slows their progress. Many Mexican-American students also suffer from racial prejudice among teachers, a lack of Spanish speaking teachers, and little attention to Mexican-American affairs. These conditions lead to a high rate of failures and cause many Mexican Americans to quit school (1, p. 3).

One district counselor claimed there was an obvious need for bilingual-bicultural education in Independence and argued that many
Chicano students in junior high school were "language handicapped" in their ability to handle standard English. What was needed, the counselor contended, was a strong bilingual-bicultural education program at the elementary level which would not only provide, for the Chicano student, a sound English language development, but also the necessary cultural reinforcement needed to develop a positive self-concept.

Some Chicano students and two classes of Anglo students at the high school agreed with this counselor that the district's teaching faculty needed to develop an awareness of the Chicano's linguistic and cultural strengths in order to provide a meaningful education which would permit the Chicano to grow bilingually and biculturally. One group of Anglo students pointed out that at least three high school teachers did not permit Chicano students to speak Spanish during free time in class and that references to Chicano history and culture were seldom made in their classes.

That such omissions can have a negative effect on minority students was supported by research conducted by Carlos Cortes, professor of history at the University of California, Riverside. He wrote:

It is not necessary for language minority children to be taught explicitly that their group is less valued. The same idea is often conveyed when instruction doesn't include references to them or to their cultural group. Furthermore,
many school textbooks carry historical inaccuracies which discredit minority groups (34, p. 36).

In a similar vein, the Ad Hoc Committee for Bilingual-Bicultural Education presented another view of treatment given to Chicanos in monolingual settings.

In our present society, I sense that Mexican-American children are often regarded as culturally deprived. They are not culturally deprived. Culturally different, yes—but not culturally deprived. They have a culture and it is a rich one. Under our present system, Spanish speaking children are forced to sit in first, second and third grade classrooms taught in English. By third grade they may have become, on the surface at least, reasonably proficient in English, but they have missed much if not most of the other material presented in English before they could speak it. And they still do not learn as rapidly in English as in Spanish. This is not only wasteful—it is cruel (1, p. 2).

The Federal Programs Director agreed with the Ad Hoc Committee's position regarding the need for bilingual-bicultural education. He claimed:

There is still a need for bilingual education here in Independence; we have identified about 240 students who are at least partially Spanish language dominant...and the largest problem that Chicano students have is conceptualization in English (Ousterhout, 1977).

Supporters of bilingual education in School District 13J have continued to press for increased pluralism in district programming. Convinced that the pluralistic nature of society should be reflected in educational programming, these bilingual education supporters have strongly opposed the traditional assimilationist philosophy and practices of public education and have believed that educational programs
designed to promote appreciation of cultural differences would benefit not only individual minority students but also society as a whole.

Thus, the conflict in Independence has revolved around the opposing ideologies of cultural pluralism and cultural assimilation. The basic question has been, "Should public education continue to facilitate the assimilation of all minority groups into one homogeneous society, or should it help to maintain and promote cultural and linguistic pluralism?" Opposition to bilingual-bicultural education has been voiced most strongly by school district personnel associated with the district's bilingual-bicultural education efforts. Their opposition has been based on the contention that public education must continue to support the concept of assimilation because assimilation is the only viable avenue to success in mainstream society. Any educational program which encourages instruction in languages other than English and/or promotes a culture other than that of the dominant white middle class has been viewed by this group as contrary to the national spirit of unity and cultural homogeneity. On the other hand, the Chicano community in Independence has decided to resist assimilation and has pursued improved educational opportunities through bilingual-bicultural education. Fighting to retain and promote cultural diversity through public education, bilingual education supporters have
chosen to challenge one of public education's most traditionally exalted goals.
VI. COMMUNITY INFLUENCE ON DECISION MAKING

Throughout much of the history of this nation, conflict based on the question of assimilation versus pluralism has influenced educational policy and decision making in public education. Leibowitz (1971), Tyack (1974), and Gonzalez (1975) pointed out that prevailing community values regarding the assimilation of ethnic minority groups often were responsible for educational policies which prohibited the use of languages other than English for basic instruction and restricted the promotion of more than one cultural tradition in public education. Throughout much of the nineteenth century and through the first half of the twentieth century, a practice required by many school districts was the promotion of national unity and loyalty through cultural and linguistic homogeneity. Many states, especially those with large numbers of immigrants during this period, enacted legislation to enforce such requirements, further strengthening community expectations regarding the responsibility of public education toward the assimilation of ethnic and linguistic minorities.

Oregon has not differed significantly from other states. It, too, enacted state legislation which clearly defined the language of instruction to be used in the state. In 1965 the Oregon legislature approved a statute which read:

ORS. 336.074 Teaching in English Required; exception. All subjects taught in public, private, or parochial schools, except foreign languages, shall be taught in English (91, p. 111).
This statute became an Oregon Administrative Rule and was incorporated into the State Department of Education's guidelines as official state educational policy. In Oregon, as in other states, these policies were not altered until after passage of the 1968 Bilingual Education Act. The 1971 legislative session, through House Bill 1120-Bilingual Education, took under consideration the need to change the policy of prohibiting public school instruction in non-English languages in order to enable the Woodburn Bilingual Program to continue functioning as an official educational program in the state. The revised statute read:

ORS. 336.074 Teaching in English Required; Exceptions.
Instruction in all subjects in public, private, and parochial schools shall be conducted primarily in English except:
(1) Instruction in foreign languages;
(2) Instruction may be conducted in more than one language in order that pupils whose native language is other than English can develop bilingual skills to make an early and effective transition to English and benefit from increased educational opportunities (91, p. 111).

While this statute did not officially endorse bilingual educational programs, it nevertheless permitted instruction in other languages, an important prerequisite for bilingual education. Another step taken by the 1971 legislature, as part of the same action, established program procedures to ensure that the English language would not be ignored in educational programs utilizing languages other than English. This statute read:
ORS. 336.079 Special English Courses for Certain Children. Specific courses to teach speaking, reading and writing of the English language shall be provided at each grade level, starting from the first grade, to those children who are unable to profit from classes taught in English. Such courses shall be taught to such a level in school as may be required until children are able to profit from classes conducted in English (91, p. 111).

ORS. 336.074 legitimized bilingual education in the state but did not appropriate state monies. Consequently, any bilingual education program not federally financed had to be funded through local school district monies. Both this statute and the federal guidelines for Title VII-bilingual funds have placed the responsibility for bilingual programs on the local school districts. Because the responsibility for determining the need for bilingual instruction and for initiating such programming lay with the local education agency or school district, it would be expected that policies relating to bilingual education must be made at the district level. Yet, Central School District 13J has not established any specific policies regarding bilingual education.

The bilingual program in Independence was accepted and approved by the school board merely as another federal program intended to meet a specific educational need. Like other federal programs, bilingual education was viewed as temporary in nature and entirely dependent on federal funds. Since such programs have been supplemental to district programming, the district has not
incorporated the budgets or personnel of these programs into long range district plans and goals. A district policy regarding bilingual education has not been established because the need for such a policy has not been recognized. The district superintendent, for example, asserted that bilingual education in Central School District 13J has not affected existing district policy and that he did not expect future policy changes as a result of the program. The superintendent suggested that the program's future was more dependent on federal funding than on district policy.

Policy is established over a period of time...this program is still too young, and who knows, federal funding could be removed, and we wouldn't have the program anymore... (Pratt, 1977).

District principals working directly with the bilingual education program agreed with the superintendent that policies regarding bilingual education were not needed because of the temporary and federal nature of the program. However, these same administrators, as well as Chicano parents and some teachers, were concerned that the district had not taken a firm position on bilingual education. It was generally agreed that a district statement reflecting support for bilingual education might lead to improved acceptance of the program by school district personnel. Again, however, the district superintendent failed to recognize the need for such a statement.

...the district responds to conflict if any exists within the community regarding educational programs...but, no, we
don't have value conflict here because of the bilingual program... (Pratt, 1977).

Program supporters, fearing that bilingual education might be discontinued if federal funds were terminated or if the board should decide not to approve the yearly grant proposal, felt that the bilingual program's strength and continuity depended on the board's unconditional commitment. That the board has lacked such commitment was demonstrated, according to Chicano parents, by the district's failure to subsidize three bilingual teacher aide positions eliminated from the bilingual program when federal funding was reduced for FY 76-77. The board's failure to fund these positions with local monies has been interpreted by many as a clear indication of the district's indifference towards the success of bilingual education in the district. Furthermore, there was a general consensus among all persons interviewed that if federal funding were again reduced or were terminated, district funding would not be utilized for bilingual education.

There is no consensus, however, between the school board and the community regarding the rationale for the district's attitude toward bilingual education. All parents and teachers interviewed agreed that bilingual education probably would not be supported through local funds simply because it is not a high priority. School board members, on the other hand, did not feel bilingual education was necessarily low in the district's priorities. Rather, they
stressed that before local funds could be committed to bilingual education, a district evaluation would have to document a "district need" for bilingual education.

The school board for District 13J was seen by most Chicanos and some Anglos in the community as a conservative body unresponsive to the linguistic educational needs of the local Chicano community. However, a direct contradiction to this perception was the board's approval of every grant proposal submitted by the district's bilingual education program. In addition, on April 11, 1977, at its regularly scheduled meeting, the board adopted a Federal Programs Policy and Operations Manual. While this action established district direction and guidelines for federal program implementation, it nevertheless, did not commit financial support of any kind should federal funds be terminated. Consequently, federal programs in School District 13J were made secure in terms of direction and commitment to program accountability, but they continued to be dependent on federal funds for their existence.

The board for Independence-Monmouth Central School District 13J has been, in many ways, similar to other boards in rural Oregon. It has consisted of elected officials chosen by the community to represent that community's educational interests in the planning of educational programming. By the very nature of its community membership and representation, the school board, either through
individual members or as a group, has been in a position to be influenced. Such influence might come from individuals, groups, and/or community events. In the Independence-Monmouth area, one interest group has appeared to predominate and has been considered the most influential in school district affairs. Drawing the majority of its membership from the faculty at Oregon College of Education, this Monmouth-based Anglo group has not been a fixed group, but one whose membership has been determined by the issues under consideration. The existence of such a group was acknowledged by all persons interviewed; they referred to it as the Monmouth group or community.

This group appeared to have a dominating influence in educational matters over other groups because of its association with Oregon College of Education. It was also noted that this group was the most permanent and involved community group. Several individuals claimed this group's influence was derived from its educational knowledge and its ability to articulate well on matters relating to and affecting the school district children. In fact, it was believed by some school district personnel that had it not been for this group's interest in and support for the concept of bilingual-bicultural education, the program would never have been accepted nor approved by the board. Members of the Chicano community would not go as far as to admit that the Monmouth community was responsible for the implementation of the bilingual program; however, they did admit that the Monmouth community was very influential
because of its active involvement in and knowledge of educational matters.

Other special interest groups have emerged periodically and become actively involved in supporting or opposing specific educational issues. The lifetime of these groups has usually equalled the length of time needed by the board to reach a settlement on a given issue. At the time of this research, for example, the issue of "tackle football versus flag football" was addressed by the board; however, once the board arrived at a decision, the groups formed to debate the issue dissolved and disappeared just as quickly as they had appeared. Such groups could not be identified either as Independence nor as Monmouth groups since most have drawn their support from a cross-section of both communities. However, two special interest groups, supportive of bilingual education, have been frequently identified by their locale--the Chicano group from Independence and the predominantly Anglo group from Monmouth. During the interviews, there was no mention made of Anglo groups from Independence or from the surrounding county areas outside either community which could be considered supportive of bilingual education.

It was difficult for most people interviewed to predict the influence which special interest groups have had on the board and its deliberations on educational policy. However, most parents and district personnel interviewed held definite opinions regarding the
criteria which the board has used to assess community input. Among the criteria suggested were conciseness of plan, organization of presentation, proper use of English, and number of people represented. The superintendent did not agree that these criteria were necessarily used by the board. He asserted that all legitimate group requests were usually recognized and acted upon if presented properly to the board. He did, however, concur with the notion that the Monmouth group was the most influential in educational affairs.

School board members interviewed felt secure in the fact that the board was open to its constituencies and to requests from either community. It was pointed out that the board received requests, evaluated the requests in light of the district's ability to meet the requests, and then decided what was best for the total district. Board members agreed with others interviewed that the "Monmouth group" was the most actively involved in debating local educational issues, but the board disagreed that this group was the most influential. One board member was adamant in his opinion that no one particular group had any edge in providing influence. "Persons with the best ideas have the most influence," he said (Smith, 1977).

Nonetheless, board members and school district personnel interviewed agreed that the Chicano community in Independence probably had the least influence in community affairs. They were quick to explain that this was not because of the Chicano's difficulty
with the English language, but rather, because of the lack of unity
among the Chicano community and its inability to speak with one
voice, especially on the bilingual education issue. Since every mem-
ber of the Chicano community has not spoken out on the bilingual
issue, it has been concluded by many school district personnel that
the Chicano community as a whole has not necessarily recognized a
need for bilingual education. The lack of such unanimous support has
often been interpreted as a legitimate reason for not pursuing bilingual
education more earnestly.

Interpretations such as this one are not supported through
Project data. In fact, they are in direct opposition to a community
survey conducted in February 1975 in which all parents of Chicano
children enrolled in school were personally interviewed in an attempt
to determine language dominancy in the home and parental attitudes
toward bilingual education for their children. A total of 77 Chicano
parents were surveyed with one declining to be interviewed. Seventy-
six parents expressed a desire to have their children enrolled in a
bilingual education program, and 67 of 69 Anglo parents also inter-
viewed expressed a similar desire. Data from this survey has often
been ignored or forgotten by district administrators and board mem-
bers who have continued to claim a lack of unity among the Chicano
community regarding bilingual education.

Perhaps what the board and district personnel have interpreted
as a lack of unified support for bilingual education has really been
criticism by Chicano parents of the way bilingual education in
Independence has been implemented. There has been concern
among Chicano parents about the effectiveness of a program in which
chief instructional personnel have not been conversant in Spanish.
Another parental concern has focused on the district's unwillingness
to appropriate funds for the bilingual teacher aides who were sup-
posed to have assumed a large portion of the Spanish language instruc-
tion. Nevertheless, the fact that some Chicano parents have been
more outspoken and critical of the school district's efforts in bilin-
gual education than others has not necessarily implied that the
Chicano community has not been unified in its support of the "con-
cept" of bilingual education.

Another reason given for the Chicano community's lack of
influence on the school district administration and board has been
their apparent lack of political and economic power in the community.
Because no formal organizations have emerged from within the
Chicano community, it has been difficult for Chicanos to make their
political and/or economic concerns known, much less to gain support
for them from the larger Independence community. The sole vehicle
through which Chicano feelings have been expressed to the school
district has been the Migrant Education Program Advisory Committee,
and this committee's contact with the board and administration has
been through the Federal Programs Director. It was therefore not surprising that those who viewed the board for School District 13J as a "power responsive" board, felt it has been unresponsive to groups such as the Chicano community. One school district employee asserted:

Policymakers in this school district are indeed influenced by groups whom they perceive to hold power...this is a power responsive decision making group, and groups must be perceived as powerful before they can influence issues. In this particular community, there is an extreme spread of affluence; there is a disproportionate level of poverty that does not exist virtually any place else in the state. It is not just the poverty of the Chicano community, it is a poverty of language as well as of economic poverty (Ericksen, 1977).

This educator's assessment was reiterated by a group of Anglo students through an informal class discussion. They agreed that the Chicano community has not exerted any influence upon school decisions or educational policy--especially in matters relating to bilingual education. Two reasons were given by these students for the lack of Chicano influence: (1) the inability of Chicanos to communicate well in English, and (2) the poor educational background of the Chicano community. When asked why these two factors limited Chicano influence, students were quick to point out that the board listened to all community requests but paid attention only to educated people who were knowledgeable about all aspects of the position they supported.
The assumption made by these Anglo students and by most others interviewed was that the Chicano community—due to its migratory background, its limited educational experiences, and its inability to express itself in acceptable English—has had no significant economic or political power. The small size of the Chicano community and its willingness to remain culturally and linguistically separated from the majority community has further reinforced this perception among many who were interviewed. Nevertheless, board members and district administrators maintained that Chicano requests for educational programming were given as much consideration as requests made by other special interest groups. Others shared the conviction that the Chicano community's lack of political and/or economic power had little bearing on how its requests for educational programming were regarded.

The Chicano community held two convictions regarding their role in the decision making processes of the school district. The first conviction was almost unanimous: "We don't exert any influence on the board," but there was some disagreement among them as to why they were ineffective. Some parents felt the small size of the Chicano community contributed to its ineffectiveness. Others felt the inability to speak "perfect" English was a factor, but most felt that any Anglo group whose representative also spoke "imperfect" English would stand a better chance of influencing the board. These
parents were convinced that the board and district administration were significantly affected by the Chicanos' maintenance of a different culture and language since these differences had always been addressed and questioned when issues in migrant or bilingual education were discussed. Other Chicano parents, although they felt strongly that the board was not concerned about the bilingual-bicultural educational needs of the Chicano community, were unable or unwilling to provide a basis for their feelings.

A second contention expressed by most Chicanos, and even by some Anglo students, was that agricultural circumstances in the area have had a greater influence on the board and its decision making than any particular interest group in either Monmouth or Independence. There appeared to be a belief among some Chicano parents that farmers on the board might find it difficult to relate objectively with the educational needs of Chicano students since many farmers in the area had, in the past, hired migratory Chicano labor and had engaged in conflict with the Valley Migrant League over housing and employment conditions for migrant workers. Anglo students, especially those who lived in rural areas, seemed to agree that many farmers saw local Chicanos in a negative light because of confrontations with Chicano migrants in the past and because of the Chicano's strong adherence to cultural maintenance. Whether such assumptions were valid or not, they may have accounted for the hesitancy of many Chicano
parents to become actively involved in attempts to influence school district policy. The consequence of their reluctance to directly confront board members and school district administrators has caused most Chicano parents to remain ignorant about how educational decisions are made and educational policy is established.

The Federal Programs Director was the one Anglo district employee who has had the most contact with Chicano parents. In his position, he has been responsible for coordinating efforts for Title I-Disadvantaged, Title I-Migrant, and Title VII-Bilingual programs in which Chicano students have participated and which have required parent advisory committees. According to the director, the majority of Chicano parents have not fully understood the role of the board or the functions of district administration. He attributed this lack of understanding as most responsible for the Chicano's ineffectiveness in community-board relations. Furthermore, the director said he expected limited influence by the Chicano community on board decisions regarding bilingual education to continue until the community became involved and began to address other issues in addition to bilingual education. He claimed that once-a-year appearances to support a bilingual program proposal was insufficient visibility and provided very limited input to the board.

The Federal Programs Director has attempted through the parent advisory committee process to educate the Chicano community
in the functions of district administration and the role of the board. However, according to him, the majority of Chicano parents who have held two year terms on the advisory committee or attended its meetings were more concerned about the survival of the federal programs in which their children were enrolled than in the functioning of the board or administration. Discussions regarding program survival, stated the director, always seemed to focus on the superintendent's position regarding federal programs and on his perceptions of such programming. Chicano parents have not seemed too concerned with the board's role in effecting school policy because they have depended on the Federal Programs Director to represent them at board meetings. They recognized, however, that unless the superintendent supported the bilingual education program, its future would be dubious.

There is no question that Chicano influence on educational policy and school decisions in School District 13J has been minimal. Increased participation by the Chicano community is probably not forthcoming. In fact, it will not take place until the Chicano community begins to see a positive role for itself in school district affairs. With few exceptions, the Chicano community has considered its

---

5 During this research, Rey Cantu filed for a position on the School Board. Though he received the endorsement and support of the Chicano community, he managed only a third place finish behind the incumbent, who was also defeated.
influence on educational policy to be restricted to federal programs and cannot see or has not been allowed to perceive itself as a welcome participant in other district programming. With the Federal Programs Director as its spokesman before the board and supported by the predominantly Anglo Monmouth group, the Chicano community might be expected to continue to have a low profile in Independence, permitting other community groups to continue achieving greater influence on school board decisions—even in matters concerning the education of Chicano students.
VII. CONCLUSIONS

This chapter addresses each of the three questions which guided this research. A final portion of this chapter explores implications for public education as these relate to value conflict.

Question #1: What is the nature of the conflict resulting from the bilingual education issue in Independence, Oregon?

The conflict which surfaced in the small community of Independence is rooted in the value conflict—assimilation versus cultural pluralism. The request for bilingual education and the initial publicity given to this request quickly aroused conflicting feelings in the community at large. The two value concepts—assimilation and pluralism—were endorsed and opposed by individuals and groups whose viewpoints were reported and reflected in the media. However, once the initial publicity died and program planning and implementation began, the locus of the conflict shifted from the community to the two groups closest to the bilingual education program, namely school district personnel and Chicanos whose children were enrolled in district schools.

School district personnel have overwhelmingly favored an assimilationist posture and have expressed this disposition in their arguments against bilingual-bicultural education. Chicano parents, on the other hand, have supported bilingual-bicultural education as
one means of promoting the concept of pluralism. Consequently, the conflict which has surfaced in Independence as a result of the request for and the implementation of a bilingual-bicultural program might be best represented by the question, "Does public education have a responsibility for the preservation and promotion of languages and cultures different from those of the dominant white middle class majority?"

Historical tradition is responsible for part of the conflict. Assimilation of immigrants into the American societal mainstream has long been a goal of this country, and public education has been one vehicle through which this national expectation has been realized. That public education should embrace the "melting pot" principle has become an established tradition, one to be cherished and not questioned. Thus, when a public school district sponsors an educational program—such as bilingual-bicultural education—which is contrary to its traditional role, conflict is likely. The fact that Independence is a stable, conservative, and rural community has further encouraged the likelihood of such conflict. Because Independence has not experienced significant racial or cultural conflict as have larger metropolitan communities, it has been able to sustain an assimilationist orientation.

Nevertheless, during the last ten to fifteen years, the Chicano community in Independence has become an increasingly visible
component of the larger community. Over the years, the Chicanos have established an increased sense of community and sponsored a variety of activities—Chicano dances, social suppers, political rallies—which have not only strengthened the spirit of "community" but have also strengthened the Chicano cultural heritage and made it more visible. These activities, for the most part, have not come into conflict with activities of the larger Independence community, and the majority Anglo population has shown minimal interest in them.

Furthermore, in the last eight years, Chicanos have become more involved in activities of the whole community. As "Americans," they have sought to avail themselves of opportunities promised in the mythical "American Dream." Some have run for positions on the City Council, on the school board, and in the Parent-Teachers Association; and many others have become employed throughout the community. This increased visibility of Chicanos in Independence has exposed the dominant Anglo population to an intercultural relationship which was not previously possible when the majority of the Spanish speaking Chicanos were still part of the migrant stream. Such interactions between Chicano and Anglo residents, while on the job or through community activities, has provided each group with deeper insights into the other's way of life. While these interactions are viewed positively by most residents of Independence, the bases for value conflict has not been removed.
Consequently, when School District 13J sponsored the bilingual education program, supporters of the assimilationist philosophy found themselves in conflict not so much with program promoters and participants as with their own deeply held values. Opposition, overt and covert, to such programming has followed and has been most evident among school district personnel. Opposition has not been directed at the Chicano community nor at the education of the Chicano students, but rather, it has been aimed at one effect of the bilingual-bicultural education program—endorsement of the concept of pluralism. Outward manifestations of this conflict have not necessarily designated assimilation or pluralism as values to be defended or destroyed, but all of the arguments given for and against bilingual education in Independence have definitely reflected adherence to one of these two positions.

The ensuing conflict which the Chicano in Independence has experienced is similar to that faced by other ethnically and linguistically different immigrants who have come to this country, especially members of second and third generation immigrant families. In such instances, cultural conflict results from incongruity between traditional practices in public education and familial expectations in the ethnic minority community. Public education in Independence is similar to that of most communities throughout the nation in the sense that one of its major goals has been to introduce ethnic
minorities to the wide range of cultural values of the white middle class dominant group, values such as individualism, competition, success, ambition, social independence, and "good" English language skills. In most cases, the instructional process has de-emphasized or omitted references to the cultural values and lifestyles of ethnic minorities. This pattern can be observed generally throughout the United States where educational programs and practices usually have not allowed these differences in culture to be reflected.

The effect of an assimilationist point of view in Independence is that Chicano students in Central School District 13J tend to experience incongruities between public education and their cultural base in the community. Cultural values such as familial responsibility, group cooperation, language maintenance, and the extended family are part of their upbringing but have not been reinforced in school. Some Chicanos have become assimilated and have given up their cultural heritage; others have resisted assimilation and maintained their cultural heritage, often at the expense of their educational development and of their social and economic advancement. Still others have managed to survive the conflict by subscribing to a little of each culture. They have become truly bilingual-bicultural individuals able to function in an English dominant society while maintaining and promoting their cultural heritage.

The question of whether public education is responsible for
promoting cultural homogeneity or the lesser accepted concept of cultural pluralism still remains unresolved in Independence, as in other parts of the nation. Supporters for each viewpoint seem unwilling to compromise, thus prolonging the value conflict in the community.

Question #2: To what extent does this conflict affect educational policy?

The conflict described above has not been recognized as a value conflict by school district personnel and community members in Independence. Interview data shows that what this researcher identifies as a value conflict has usually been interpreted by members of the Independence School District and the community at large as mere misunderstandings due to poor communications between assimilationists and pluralists. Nevertheless, this researcher suggests that the denial of value conflict may underline the reluctance of individuals involved in the conflict to come to terms with it. By refusing to recognize the existence of value conflict, the school district, Chicano parents, and the community at large may have avoided any real confrontation with the status quo. Presently, the individuals interviewed

6 Only a few interviewees agreed to the existence of value conflict based on assimilation vs. pluralism. This researcher explained each concept and elaborated on the term "value conflict." However, the majority would only agree to the existence of "differences of opinion" regarding the goals of bilingual-bicultural education in district programming.
do not feel a need to pursue the resolution of this conflict. The Chicano community is more concerned about the future security of the bilingual education program at the primary level and its expansion into the higher grades. Some parents feel that too much pressure on district administration and the school board might jeopardize the whole program. They have chosen to focus their attention on improving the academic performance of their children, refusing to recognize or participate in any broader controversial issues.

Most school district personnel and board members are likewise content to deny value conflict. Because maintaining the status quo regarding bilingual education is preferable, School District 13J has not felt a need to develop specific educational policies addressing bilingual-bicultural education. Consequently, the program continues to be governed by policies common to all federal programs in the district, and therefore, any conflict which arises relating to bilingual education will more than likely be examined according to the guidelines in the district's new Federal Programs Policy and Operations Manual. Any need for policy revision or new policy will inevitably be considered under the federal programs umbrella rather than individually on its educational merits. Furthermore, the temporary nature of federal funds has prompted school district officials to view any conflict or disagreement as temporary and without significant long range effects on district programming. Because the value conflict
which presently exists within the Independence community is not acknowledged, it can have no effect on educational policy per se.

Question #3: What is the nature of community influence regarding school decisions and educational policy?

Community influence over school decisions and educational policy in School District 13J is not unlike that in other small rural communities. It is sporadic and issue-oriented rather than a continuous phenomenon. The issue of bilingual education provoked some community concern when the initial grant proposal was presented to the school board. Since then, however, the community has shown little interest in attending the weekly board meetings to address concerns regarding bilingual education. There have been no efforts by either Chicanos or Anglos to solicit decisions or policy statements from the board relating to bilingual education. It appears that the community is content with current educational policy.

The Chicano community, however, does have some concern about current policy. Leaders want some guarantee that bilingual education will be continued in the future, even if federal funds are cut back. Program expansion into the fifth and sixth grades and some kind of Spanish as a first language coursework offered at the secondary level is also desired. However, as a group, the Chicano community has not formally organized politically or socially for the expressed purpose of pursuing change within the community. This
lack of political initiative by the Chicano community will more than likely keep it from being effective as a change agent in respect to school decisions and policies.

The Monmouth-Anglo group, which was very supportive of bilingual education at first and expressed concern over the lack of ethnic pluralism in district programming, has dissolved since the initial bilingual education grant proposal was accepted by the board. Feeling there is no longer a need for advocacy, this group, which is considered to be the most influential in local educational decisions, has not continued to address expanded and strengthened bilingual education in the district. It is felt by some members in the community that unless this particular group coalesces on any given issue, the chances of that particular issue being supported and endorsed by district administration, and especially by the board, are slim.

Throughout its existence, the bilingual education program has not prompted community activism either for or against the program. The sporadic and limited nature of community participation and influence in decision making has not changed because of bilingual education, and it appears that maintaining the status quo regarding bilingual education in School District 13J has become preferable to seeking change through district policy.
Implications

Contemporary educators have recognized that the public school system is in drastic need of some firm direction in these rapidly changing times. Harold G. Shane, in "America's Next 25 Years: Some Implications for Education," concluded: "Educators must learn to participate in, not merely respond to change in an era of discontinuity!" (110, p. 79). The value conflict in Independence is a prime example of the predicament Shane is addressing. The community of Independence, including its school district personnel, have not actively participated in the educational changes which prompted the request and subsequent implementation of a bilingual education program. Instead, its role has been one of responding to the requests, plans, and implementations of the Chicano community, of federal guidelines, and of program coordinators. Until district personnel recognize their own responsibility for initiating and supporting programs to meet the needs of their Chicano students, the value conflict in Independence will continue to smolder, impairing inter-group relationships which will ultimately affect the education of all children.

For example, Woodburn School District 103C, the site of the first bilingual education program in Oregon, was the victim of unresolved value conflict for six years. Because the district refused to address the value conflict which erupted when a bilingual education
program was introduced, the conflict in Woodburn became increasingly overt due to a large Chicano population and a sizable Russian population. Value conflict regarding assimilation vs. pluralism prevailed in the district and affected staff relations and curriculum planning. It further influenced school-community relations, eventually forcing the district, in its sixth year of programming, to establish a policy clearly defining bilingual education and establishing program guidelines. A subsequent policy addressed the issue of bicultural education for the district.

Such educational policies are needed in public education to address value conflict arising from new programming demands brought about by the changing times. While the policies will not resolve the conflict, they do recognize its existence and establish a local mechanism for analyzing, understanding, and resolving such conflict. Once a school district takes this step, firm direction for its educational programming is given to teachers and school administrators, and some semblance of commitment is assured the local community. Only then can conflict be confronted, addressed, and resolved and its resolution incorporated in the mechanics of school administration and school decision-making.

This same process has been traced to similar conflicts which have drawn national attention—busing in Detroit, Louisville, and Boston; the Brownsville-Oceanside Community Control Program;
and national Supreme Court Decisions such as *Brown vs. Topeka* and *Lau vs. Nichols*. In each of these cases, the basic issue of contention transcended the obvious racial conflict which was reported through the media. A close scrutiny of each case would reveal both the presence of value conflict—the defense of assimilation vs. the affirmation of pluralism—and the fact that the participants in these situations were merely responding to change and not deliberately participating in the process of resolving conflict.

If schools are to successfully address the inevitable complexities of the future, three concepts must be incorporated into public education. These concepts have not been emphasized in traditional curricula, but each contributes to the resolution of intercultural value conflict. First, multicultural education, in which bilingual education must be a priority for particular population groups, must become a reality. Multicultural education facilitates two additional concept areas necessary for cultural pluralism to exist, values clarification and intergroup relations. The importance of values clarification in education cannot be ignored. Toffler addressed this particular issue in *Future Shock*:

> Millions pass through the educational system without once having been forced to search out the contradictions in their own value systems, to probe their own life goals deeply, or even to discuss these matters candidly with adults and peers (119, p. 81-82).

The third concept area, intergroup relations, becomes critical for public education in light of the increased political and social
participation by America's racial and ethnic minorities. The emergence of such groups has increased pressures on public education for improved programming, pressures which often lead to value conflict. Educators need to assume a new role quite different from that in traditional public education. Advocacy and leadership is needed for stimulating intergroup relationships and exploring relative values through multicultural education. These areas, which have often been considered too sensitive and controversial as curricular issues, must become central to public education. That such curricula is needed—one which would help both students and teachers cope with the realities of our rapidly changing society—has been documented by many educators (Aronson, 1975; Banks, 1972; and Carter, 1970). In fact, the reduction of intercultural tensions and value conflict has become an imperative for the future, and the responsibility for this challenge falls squarely on the shoulders of public education.

Whether public education is able to address this challenge and begin to make progress in these areas will depend largely on whether "the analysis and strategies for educational problem solving will be cosmetic or fundamental" (56, p. 164). In 1972 the International Council on Education for Teaching reported:

...too often new programs and changes are no more than superficial gimmickry designed for publicity and fund raising purposes rather than thorough and positive responses intimately linked to the real problems of our society (61, p. 109).
One reason many public education programs have too often been "cosmetic" in nature is because they have lacked a fundamental commitment to special population groups. Such lack of commitment is not surprising when one considers that many teacher training institutions similarly lack a philosophical base for addressing "change" in education and in society. If public education is to survive and provide the leadership required for the future, teacher education must not divorce itself from the real problems of society, but rather, it must incorporate critical social issues into its training programs. Such programming should introduce future educators to real life problems which not only affect the education of students but society as a whole.

One specific social issue which should be addressed by teacher training institutions is the responsibility of public education for the assimilation of ethnic minorities. Essential to an exploration of the role and purpose of public schools are values oriented curricula, both theoretical and practical, focusing on conceptual analyses of assimilation and pluralism. The importance of this one issue cannot be ignored. If school district personnel are better prepared to cope with the pluralistic nature of society, intergroup conflict might be reduced significantly. It seems reasonable to suggest that if schools continue to maintain an assimilationist curricula intergroup conflict will persist.
The concept, proposed by Ballinger, that schools are not merely agencies of cultural transmission but of culture mediation provides excellent rationale for exploring the concepts of assimilation and pluralism. Ballinger wrote:

Some individuals have held at times a conception of education as simple transmission of the culture. The schools as a mediating agency of the culture does not merely "reflect" something called the "culture." Mediation involves selection. When we conceive of a culture in terms of the definitions given above, it seems clear that the school neither can nor would want to transmit uncritically and unselectively the total culture.... The other selective aspect arises from the necessity for the schools to choose what is held by someone, at least, to be good or bad, appropriate or inappropriate, desirable or undesirable to perpetuate or foster within the culture (6, p. 2).

Most public school teachers have, through their training and/or their experience, developed good mediating skills; and one can only expect that since teachers often are caught in the middle of social and value conflict, their role as mediators will continue to be significant. Whether or not educators will be able to fill this role successfully shall be dictated by the adequacy of their preparation to cope with the processes of social and cultural change. That such preparation has been inadequate in the past is a reality which must be recognized. Teachers in public schools have often found themselves forced to address value conflict through a process of culture mediation which has ignored the values of minority groups. This has happened not so much because of personal intentions to disparage minority
individuals, but because teacher education has defaulted in its responsibility to seriously confront the reality of pluralism in contemporary society.

What is to be done? Can teachers actually cope with conflict which arises in their classrooms without permitting their personal values to influence the final resolution of the conflict? Can curriculum specialists and administrators pursue changes in programming and educational policies which permit equal educational opportunity and still maintain a relative neutrality in a setting of contradictory values? How can the public schools involve their communities in the decision-making process? These questions must be addressed by public education in a self-examination of purpose and function. If these issues are not addressed, public education shall be forced to forfeit a position of leadership; and its irresponsibility shall help to perpetuate what Margaret Mead has observed to be a real danger for society:

...a chasm [is developing] between the school program carried on by teachers whose ideas and methods have been learned a generation or more ago, and the present life of the child, rooted in a new historical and cultural orientation (76, p. 6).
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INTERVIEW

Introduction

In late spring of 1975, Central School District 13J School Board took under consideration the implementation of a bilingual education program for the school district's Chicano elementary school students. It seemed at the time that misunderstandings among Chicano and Anglo members of the community were leading to value conflict and raising questions concerning the need for and the feasibility of a bilingual education program. School District 13J approved the program, spent one year determining how to implement the program, and is now operating a k-3 bilingual education program for the district's Chicano elementary school students through the use of federal funds. Present plans call for expanding the program.

The following questions are intended to review what has happened in Central School District 13J as a result of the bilingual education program and to explore possible implications for school district policy as a result of the bilingual education program.

Interview Questions

1. How much of a need is there for bilingual education in Independence?

2. How has the bilingual program affected or influenced other educational programming?

3. What changes do you foresee for the school district as a result of the bilingual education program?

4. How has the bilingual education program reduced the value conflict within the school? community?

5. How do teachers and administrators not in the bilingual program view bilingual education?

6. What staff development and curricular changes do you anticipate as a result of the bilingual program?
7. Will the bilingual program help the Chicano students integrate more easily into American society?

8. How has the community supported the bilingual efforts of the district?

9. How would the district continue the program if federal funding were terminated?

10. How much influence did the Chicano community have in designing and implementing the bilingual program?

11. What is the school district's responsibility in helping Chicanos, Asians, and other minorities maintain and promote their cultural heritage?

12. How do community groups influence educational decisions? Which segments of the community are most influential?

13. What implications for educational policy do you anticipate as a result of the bilingual program?

14. How should public education in small communities meet the growing demands of ethnic minorities and other pressure groups for specialized programming?

15. How much influence should community groups exert in determining educational policy?

16. To what extent should value conflict influence school policy? (e.g., busing, bilingual programs, etc.).

17. To what extent is educational policy in Independence influenced by events in larger urban centers? (e.g., Salem, Portland).
APPENDIX

GLOSSARY

Anglo: A term used to denote the dominant and majority ethnic group in the United States without insinuating an Anglo-Saxon origin. The term Caucasian cannot be used to distinguish between the Chicano and the Anglo American since the Chicano is included in this particular classification. The term Anglo is used in this research when referring to individuals from the dominant and majority ethnic group.

Assimilation: The process of becoming similar to, in a cultural way; it refers to the total abandonment of a person's cultural heritage in favor of another, usually that of the dominant group.

Bilingualism: The use of two or more languages by an individual.

Bilingual Education: The use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction. At the elementary level, the student's native language is used as the primary mode of instruction. At the secondary school level, an increased use of English as a Second Language (ESL) methodology accompanies a bilingual education program.

Chicano: A term used to denote a philosophy espoused by Spanish speaking individuals which encourages cultural and linguistic maintenance and advocates self-determination through political and social action. The term has not been readily accepted by the older generations who prefer to be identified as Mexican or Mexican-American; however, these same individuals do not object to their younger offspring identifying with the term "Chicano." In this research, the term Chicano is used when referring to persons of Spanish speaking heritage.
English as a Second Language: One approach used to teach English to speakers of other languages. Instruction time varies depending on the age and need of the individual. Most instruction consists of formally learning the oral language skills of listening, comprehension, and speaking. Such instruction does not usually attempt to teach any particular subject matter, nor does it give any emphasis to the student's native language.

Pluralism: A belief that members of diverse ethnic, racial, religious, or social groups can maintain an autonomous participation in and development of their own traditional culture or special interest within the confines of a common civilization.