DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 712 SP 003 382

TITLE	The EPDA Institute in Bilingual Education for Teachers of Spanish to the Spanish Speaking (Univ. of Arizona, June 16-August 8, 1969). Final Report of the Director.
INSTITUTION	Arizona Univ., Tucson.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	53p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.75
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education, *Institutes (Training Programs), Mexican Americans, Secondary School Teachers, *Spanish, Spanish American Literature, Spanish Culture

ABSTRACT

An 8-week summer institute (three weeks background and preparation, two weeks practice, three weeks summary and translation) was conducted to improve and reorient the abilities of selected high school teachers by giving advanced academic training in the areas of Mexican language, literature, and culture; and by relating these areas of experience to the teaching of Spanish to Spanish speakers in the American Southwest. Four participants were Anglos; 24 were native speakers of Spanish in the Southwest. A core of continuing classes included study of the literary and cultural heritage of modern Mexico, teaching methodology, and culture conflict. Flexible scheduling allowed for a number of guest lectures, field work with junior and senior high school students (demonstration classes, tutoring, etc.), an unscheduled field trip to Huasabas, Sonora (in isolated rural Mexico), extracurricular newspaper and theatrical groups, and films. Participants gained (1) new knowledge of books and other materials suitable for the classroom; (2) new knowledge of programs in other districts, some with federal funding, designed for Mexican-Americans; (3) new awareness of Mexican-American publications, organizations, and activities across the Southwest; (4) a clearer idea of the nature of large-scale public dissent and its repercussions, planned and otherwise, personal and organizational; and (5) for the Anglos, a sharp awakening to what it feels like to be a minority. (JS)

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 712 SP 003 382

TITLE	The EPDA Institute in Bilingual Education for Teachers of Spanish to the Spanish Speaking (Univ. of Arizona, June 16-August 8, 1969). Final Report of the Director.
INSTITUTION	Arizona Univ., Tucson.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	53p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.75
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education, *Institutes (Training Programs), Mexican Americans, Secondary School Teachers, *Spanish, Spanish American Literature, Spanish Culture

ABSTRACT

An 8-week summer institute (three weeks background and preparation, two weeks practice, three weeks summary and translation) was conducted to improve and reorient the abilities of selected high school teachers by giving advanced academic training in the areas of Mexican language, literature, and culture; and by relating these areas of experience to the teaching of Spanish to Spanish speakers in the American Southwest. Four participants were Anglos; 24 were native speakers of Spanish in the Southwest. A core of continuing classes included study of the literary and cultural heritage of modern Mexico, teaching methodology, and culture conflict. Flexible scheduling allowed for a number of guest lectures, field work with junior and senior high school students (demonstration classes, tutoring, etc.), an unscheduled field trip to Huasabas, Sonora (in isolated rural Mexico), extracurricular newspaper and theatrical groups, and films. Participants gained (1) new knowledge of books and other materials suitable for the classroom; (2) new knowledge of programs in other districts, some with federal funding, designed for Mexican-Americans; (3) new awareness of Mexican-American publications, organizations, and activities across the Southwest; (4) a clearer idea of the nature of large-scale public dissent and its repercussions, planned and otherwise, personal and organizational; and (5) for the Anglos, a sharp awakening to what it feels like to be a minority. (JS)

FINAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR
On
The EPDA Institute In Bilingual Education
For Teachers Of
Spanish To The Spanish Speaking

CONDUCTED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
JUNE 16 TO AUGUST 8 1969

Pursuant to a contract with
THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

DIRECTED BY *Professor Charles Olstad*

It should be needless to say that an educational experience should, as a basic requirement, enhance the dignity of the individual. The traumatic experience of taking a young child who has been raised in one language and culture and forcing him to abandon it in favor of a majority language is an example of a misconception of democracy and of the tyranny of the majority. It is also a manifestation of ingrained racism. When I moved to Tucson 12 years ago I was astounded to learn that Spanish was not officially available as a second language in the primary-school system. (From a letter to the Arizona Daily Star, Sept. 4, 1969.)

* * *

The author of the above remarks, a European, was "astounded" that bilingual education is still the exception rather than the rule in the Southwest. The institute participants this summer are past being astounded; they are incensed. For them, bilingual education alone is no longer an issue; rather, they try to see the total picture of the school and society, of which rigid monolingual education is only one factor. (C.O.)

INTRODUCTION

The objectives of the institute, as stated in the Plan of Operation, were as follows. "The objectives of the institute are to improve and reorient the abilities of selected high school teachers by (1) giving advanced academic training in the areas of Mexican language, literature and culture, and (2) relating these areas of experience to the teaching of Spanish to Spanish speakers in the American Southwest."

The traditional academic phase of the institute consisted of formal classes designed to meet the needs of the high school teacher of Spanish to the Spanish speaking. Participants studied the literary and cultural heritage of modern Mexico. They studied some variations of the Spanish of the Southwest and the implications for the teacher. And they broadened their knowledge of written Spanish.

Participants related these areas of study to the teaching of Spanish to the Spanish speaking partly in the formal classes dealing with methodology and culture conflict. In addition, they organized their thoughts and prejudices regarding a minority culture as they responded to the guest lecturers and other special events.

The educational need to which this institute responded has been documented by countless conferences, papers, hearings, etc., at the local, regional, and national level. Spanish speaking Americans are the victims of discriminatory educational policies and practices. Again last month (July 26) another group added its voice. A minority caucus of the Western Regional Conference of the New Democratic Coalition, held in Denver, called for "educational changes so that the education our children receive is oriented and relevant to the specific cultural and linguistic characters of the Mexican and other Spanish speaking people in the U.S.A."

OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM

1. Planning

The planning phase of the institute was informal and personal. The staff had no pre-institute meetings until just before the institute. No outside consultants or agencies were used.

Since all staff but one are Tucson based, informal individual consultation was easy and frequent. Thus, for example, that part of the program involving the Tucson Public Schools was arranged step by step over a period of months. The potentially controversial, or at least emotionally charged, nature of any program dealing with minority groups constituted no obstacle here. This was due to a number of factors: (a) The careful ground work of staff member Henry Oyama of Pueblo High School; (b) the cooperative interest of principals Florence Reynolds and Frank Ott of Pueblo High School and Wakefield Junior High School; (c) the kind permission of the Tucson District #1 school board.

Other planning such as textbooks, course outlines, scheduling, physical plant use, etc., was accomplished similarly. Consultation with Octavio Romano (Berkeley) involved a few telephone calls.

Ours was a small, close-knit institute. Elaborate formal plans were hardly in order. In any case, given the volatile personalities and the thorny issues involved, we wanted to be free to improvise. We were and we did. Major improvisations centered around the late arrival of Prof. Romano, the unscheduled optional trip to Huásabas, Sonora, the institute newspaper, the institute drama group, and the walkout. Minor improvisations involved certain guest speakers and the internal structure of certain class periods. I do not mean to say that we did not know what we were doing. But in general, we were flexible enough to

take advantage of unexpected interests, talents, and occurrences. Even the walkout, unexpected and certainly embarrassing to the University, served as a valuable lesson.

2. Participants

Applicant response was good in terms of numbers--about 200 for 30 spots. Response was less satisfactory in terms of meeting the criteria for admission. Many applicants were not teaching native speakers or did not have code 1 proficiency in Spanish. A disheartening number seemed not to have read the brochure. On the other hand, 15 applicants were obviously first rate, and the second 15 turned out to be not far behind.

The program was designed to attract and give preference to native speakers of Spanish in the Southwest. It did. There were 4 anglos out of 30. Of the remaining 26, all were native southwesterners except a lone Cuban. Since anglos were a minority among the staff also, many new feelings and behaviors were confessed all around. To carry this tendency to its logical extreme, an all chicano institute would have to be organized (as has, in fact, been suggested by one of the anglos involved).

A cautionary note on selection: By and large minority group students do relatively less well, according to transcripts and grade records. The well documented unequal educational opportunities afforded linguistically different barrio residents need no elaboration here. The point is, that the Mexican-American who manages to avoid dropping out of high school, who sweeps floors or hauls gravel to stay in college, and who squeaks through with a "C+" average, may very well turn out to be the strongest candidate for a barrio school, a district leadership slot,

or a rigorous institute program. In short, an institute selection committee must be willing to "risk" choosing applicants on the basis of flimsy paper evidence (so-so grades, non-committal letters of recommendation, etc.). Our evidence indicates that the risk pays off.

Geographically, 6 of the 30 participants were California teachers, 6 were from Texas, 3 were from New Mexico, 1 from Colorado, 1 from Nevada, and 13 from Arizona. The relatively low representation from California is due perhaps to the early starting date. The relatively high representation from Arizona is due, I suppose, to the location of the institute. For reasons I cannot explain, there were no participants from key large cities--Los Angeles, Oakland, San Diego, Phoenix, Albuquerque, San Antonio, etc. Thus the institute tended to have a small town or small city cast. This is neither good nor bad, I suppose. But it is probably significant that large urban barrios, the birthplace of the radical activist and/or destructive groups, were not represented.

3. Staff

The regular and visiting staff exerted an almost exclusive influence over the institute. That is, lecturers were present only briefly, and no consultants were used. The staff could not be said to have exerted a unified or monolithic influence, however. Because of varied background and training, they provided a multiphased, perhaps even kaleidoscopic, treatment of several issues.

A thumbnail sketch of each staff member will indicate their breadth of experience.

Robert R. Anderson. Anglo-American. Literary training. Interest in literary theory and avant garde literature and criticism. Teaches at graduate college level. Bilingual.

Dolores Brown. Anglo-American. Literary and philological training. Interest in medieval literature and Mexican Spanish dialectology. Teaches at graduate college level. Bilingual.

Adalberto Guerrero. Mexican-American. Pedagogical and literary training. Interest in Mexican-American students, organizations, politics. Teaches at high school and university level. Bilingual.

Henry Oyama. Japanese-American. Pedagogical training. Interest in administration and in Mexican-American problems. Teaches at high school level. Bilingual (Spanish-English).

Herminio Ríos. Mexican-American. Pedagogical and literary training. Interest in organizations of active involvement and/or protest. Teaches at high school and university level. Bilingual.

Octavio Romano. Mexican-American. Anthropological training. Interest in Mexican-American history, thought, writing. Teaches at graduate college level. Bilingual.

Since the staff was chosen because they could each make a special contribution to the program, they needed next to no orientation. For example, Prof. Anderson always works with modern literature; the institute job required only a different focus. Prof. Guerrero works constantly with Mexican-American students and with schools and other systems; the institute was only one more phase of his work. Prof. Ríos is an indefatigable organizer, picket, and protester; he drew on his special experience at the institute. Etc.

Likewise, the problem of encouraging carry-over into the regular (academic) work of the staff hardly existed. Even the two anglo instructors, whose major professional activities do not necessarily center on the Mexican-American cause, can hardly escape some kind of

involvement. At the very least they teach, in every class, every semester, some students of Mexican-American heritage.

4. Orientation Program

No special orientation procedures were used. The first day was devoted to registration and a brief explanation of the program. During the first week the entire institute ate lunch together. Since the institute was small, and since activities were confined, for the most part, to two neighboring buildings, communication was easy and constant. Coffee hour and lunch hour "seminars" took place, spontaneously, more than once a day. The institute reading room, next to my office, was also a busy place during the long lunch hour and in the later afternoon. Thus dialog not only ensued, it flowed unceasingly.

Typical changes in the program resulting from dialog: (1) Extra-curricular theater group formed beginning second week. One work was presented. (2) Guest lecturer Arnold Muñoz scheduled. (3) Film Forgotten Village shown. (4) Most of the activities of the two-week interim period, arranged by Prof. Ojama after consultation with the participants. (5) Optional bus trip to Huásabas, Sonora, July 11-14. (6) Guest lectures by Miguel Méndez and Sal Baldenegro. (7) Showing of the film on the Los Angeles demonstrations. (8) Formation of an extra-curricular newspaper group, which published two issues of an institute newspaper.

5. Program Operation

For the sake of convenience, discussion of the institute program will be organized according to the three phases of the institute, as outlined in the Plan of Operation. In spite of some modifications, the dates and the basic nature of each phase remained as proposed:

June 16-July 3: Background and Preparation
July 7-July 18: Practice
July 21-Aug. 8: Summing Up and Translation

The first three weeks of the institute, June 16 to July 3, were very much a distinct phase. First of all, due to complicated reasons beyond anyone's control, Prof. Romano did not arrive until the fourth week. Thus all the formal class work was devoted either to Prof. Guerrero's methodology class or to the literature-composition team.

Prof. Guerrero's work, as always, dealt with day-to-day classroom needs of the high school teacher. He centered his attention on such matters as teacher attitude, language style, grammar texts, literary materials, tapes and films, the color line in the classroom, etc. Because he is himself a high school teacher, a university instructor, and now also a junior college official, he brought to the participants an immense practical experience, tested in a variety of contexts from traditional high schools to volunteer non-credit classes. Thus it is no surprise that year after year participants react with unanimous favor to his contributions to their most immediate needs.

The literature class, of course, was quite different. Prof. Anderson's description follows:

> My general purpose in the literature course was to introduce the participants to a few pieces of Mexican literature that they probably were not acquainted with, covering the period since the Mexican Revolution.
>
> The idea was not specifically to present works that might be useful in high school, but rather to offer a new personal experience with Mexican literature to them for whatever practical gains they might make of it. At the beginning I asked several of

the participants to do a typical high school presentation of some of the pieces before the entire group, and these were quite successful, but they were not continued because, as stated above, practicability for high school use was not a goal.

The literature lectures were shared on a couple of occasions by Dolores Brown and Herminio Ríos, both of whom are to be commended on their work with me.

In the lectures and also in the discussion groups on literature, the following works were read and analyzed:

Los de abajo by Azuela
El llano en llamas by Rulfo
Suave Patria by López Velarde (distributed in class)
Corona de sombra by Usigli
Confabulario total by Arreola
Taller de imágenes (from El espejo) by Miguel Méndez
poetry of Salomón Baldenegro (distributed in class)

Also read, but not commented on were: El guardagujas and La tierra pródiga.

In general, the participants had had poor academic training in literature. Though most were Spanish majors, their formal readings often did not go beyond a survey course or two. Most were completely unfamiliar with modern Mexican literature. This is not to say that they were unreceptive, however. Except for one gentleman who affirmed categorically that modern literature was "no good," attitudes ranged from hungry interest and active involvement to nondisruptive disinterest.

Since Prof. Guerrero's approach leans heavily on literary texts, there was some healthy overlap of these two areas. By the same token, participants were able to see more clearly the relevance of literary texts to their high school classes, even though that was not a primary goal of the literature class.

The discussion sections following the literature class were supposed to serve as more intensive seminar-type encounters in which to elaborate on some points introduced by Prof. Anderson. Often this was the case. But perhaps just as often discussion centered on some other matter of immediate interest, either an institute event, something in the news, or whatever. A random selection of discussion topics might be: the origin and meaning of the word chicano, imagery in the works of Miguel Méndez, how to organize a Spanish club, any guest lecturer, the historical development of spelling conventions, the migrant, antagonistic school administrations, etc.

It is clear, then, that institute staff were flexible enough, during the discussion sections, to accommodate the immediate and/or long-range interests of the participants.

The composition sections during the first three weeks centered their work primarily on the readings of the literature class. However, when guest lecturer Herbert Wilson's presentation turned out to be a controversial topic, the instructors used it as the basis of two writing exercises. Writing assignments for the first three weeks follow.

June 19 - imitation of one paragraph, last chapter, Los de abajo.
June 23 - imitation of last chapter of Los de abajo.
June 26 - neutral account of one of H. Wilson's lectures (newspaper style).
June 27 - slanted account of one of H. Wilson's lectures (newspaper style).
Assigned for July 8 - an original scene between historically identifiable characters presented as Usigli did in Corona de sombra.

The most significant special events of the first three weeks are listed in the following calendar.

June 16: Registration
June 16-20: Lunches in a group
June 24: Visit by Mary Jane Smalley
June 24-25: Prof. Herbert Wilson, guest lecturer
June 25: Formation of the extra-curricular theater group
July 1: Arnold Muñoz, guest lecturer
July 2: Showing of the film, Forgotten Village

A discussion of the lectures by Prof. Wilson and Mr. Muñoz follows.

Guest Lecturer: Prof. Herbert Wilson, College of Education, University of Arizona

Prof. Wilson has worked in the areas of educational administration, the culturally different (Mexican-American), and group dynamics. He is consultant to the Nogales Public Schools for their bilingual education (Title VII) program.

Prof. Wilson is biased against the concept of cultural pluralism, as he specifically admitted. He gave a two-day presentation of acculturation as "additive": the Mexican-American, without losing or betraying his "folk" or "residual peasant" culture, learns the language and values of the dominant culture. He overcomes the hampering influences of familia, raza, and machismo to adopt the "puritan ethic" of study, work, delayed gratification, etc.

Prof. Wilson made repeated reference to the professional literature and to his own experience in order to buttress and elucidate his views. His presentation was lively, orderly, well-conceived, and well-received. The group applauded him at the end of both sessions.

But the participants were also lively and orderly. Questions and/or objections were pertinent and insistent. Certainly, this was expected. Prof. Wilson is, at least in appearance, the typical bolillo: tall, blonde, light skinned with a tendency toward freckles, and informal in manner. He understands a little spoken Spanish, but he is

far from at ease with it. The stage was set, then, for immediate reaction from the predominantly dark-skinned group.

Questions concerned definitions (chicano, raza), sources of statistics, regional differences, historical differences, confusion of terms (acculturation or urbanization?), and possible misplaced emphasis (Mexican-American docility or anglo suppression?). Objections tended to be based on autobiographical reference.

In general, the interchange was fruitful for all. The participants showed an eagerness to learn and an awareness of the subject that would surprise one familiar only with the traditional sociology. I was amazed, myself, to see ex-students I had recalled as timid, struggling, even slow, here able to contribute aggressively and pointedly to the discussion.

Prof. Wilson, it must be added, fielded questions and objections with personal flair and intellectual vigor. As he told the group, his views have changed over the past few years, and he admits he is still growing and still learning. His own flexibility, then, added to the participants' urgency of purpose, made for two exciting afternoons.

One apparently insignificant anecdote sums up the value of the experience and serves also as a compliment to Prof. Wilson and as a key to a change in the picture of higher education in general. The anecdote centers on A.M., a Mexican-American visitor to the institute, who is a school teacher in California, and a graduate of the University of Arizona. A.M. is the son of a janitor. He was only an average student (perhaps because he was at the same time working forty hours a week as a janitor himself).

But near the end of Prof. Wilson's second day, A.M. commented approvingly on some of the presentation and added, "Dr. Wilson, you've come a long way since 1962-63." I submit that this remark was offered

as a compliment, deserved, and that Prof. Wilson accepted it as such. I submit also that the remark is symbolic of the openness with which the participants are speaking as well as symbolic of the receptivity of Prof. Wilson. And I submit, finally, that the remark is representative of the new temper of the times--often uncomfortable but also invigorating. Traditionally, the professor speaks and the students only listen. But now A.M., the "timid" chicano, to whom I once gave a "D," grants (or withholds) approval to the learned doctors. And makes us see why. And like it.

During the last half hour of the second day, Prof. Wilson conducted briefly two types of group dynamics or "sensitivity awareness" sessions. The purpose, given the lack of time, was to introduce the techniques to the participants rather than to elicit or change their attitudes. As one staff member commented later, the predominantly chicano group proceeded at once to demolish some ethnically oriented clichés: docility, lack of initiative, tendency to follow a leader-type, little concern for rights of others, etc. Results were perhaps three-fold. (1) Participants learned new techniques for working with students. (2) Participants came to know each other and themselves a little better. (3) Cliché oriented observers (or participants) may have begun to see new light.

Guest Lecturer: Arnold N. Muñoz, Sacramento, California

Mr. Muñoz is Intergroup Relations Advisor for the Sacramento City Unified School District. He happened to be a summer session student on our campus, where he visited several institute classes and talked informally with the participants. We were happy to take advantage of his presence.

I was not present at Mr. Muñoz's lecture. He dealt with matters of in-service training and sensitivity awareness for the teacher of Mexican-American children. He also made available, at the request of the participants, prepared materials which he uses in his work.

The second phase of the institute was the two-week period July 7-18. It was devoted primarily to work with junior and senior high school students under the direction of Prof. Oyama. Due to a host of circumstances, the schedule as envisioned in the Plan of Operations could not be followed closely. Nevertheless, Prof. Oyama made use of Tucson District #1 summer session programs as they developed and translated them into valuable experiences for the participants, thanks to his own efforts, as well as to the cooperation (beyond the call of duty) of District #1 officials and teachers.

Here follows Prof. Oyama's list of activities.

1. A demonstration class in beginning Spanish for native Spanish-speaking students was conducted at Wakefield Junior High School with students from that school participating.

2. An advanced (third or fourth year level) high school Spanish class for native speakers of Spanish was conducted employing Pueblo High School students for this demonstration class.

3. Daily half-hour tutoring sessions were arranged to provide assistance to Wakefield Junior High School Summer School Program students. The classes involved in the tutoring sessions were: Mathematics, Health-Science, Language Arts, Geography of Arizona, and Practical Economics.

4. An hour presentation was made by Mr. Mike Pelusi, Director of the Summer School Program at Wakefield Junior High School, concerning this federally funded (PL 89-10, Title I) program at his school.

5. Mr. Atco Maklin, Assistant Principal, Student Personnel, explained the Summer Program at Pueblo High School which is also funded through PL 89-10, Title I, and serves some 300 students.

6. A color-sound film comparing regular first and third year Spanish classes at Pueblo High School with first and third year Spanish N (for native speakers of Spanish) classes was employed as the basis for explaining the school's approach towards meeting the special needs of these students. Included in the film are scenes from the bilingual (English-Spanish) shorthand class offered at this school. The fairly extensive collection of Spanish literary works, record albums, tapes, filmstrips, films, and slide series were also used to explain the school's program.

7. The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's filmstrip (with taped narration) entitled "Search for Opportunity" was shown. The booklet accompanying the filmstrip describes it as follows:

> "Search for Opportunity" is one of five filmstrips prepared as an outgrowth of the first National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans conducted in Spring 1968 in Austin, Texas.
>
> The high school program described in the filmstrip is in operation at Pueblo High School in Tucson, Arizona. High School Equivalency programs described in the filmstrip are offered at 13 colleges and universities across the nation. The on-the-job-training program for adults is in Denver, Colorado, and offers that city's Mexican-American citizens training that culminates in guaranteed employment.
>
> The purpose of the filmstrip is not to present final, perfected solutions to the diverse educational and employment problems of Mexican-Americans but to encourage the development of innovative programs to meet the different needs in different areas.

8. A half-hour video tape of the second act of El color de nuestra piel filmed at Pueblo High School by a third-year Spanish N (native Spanish-speakers) class was shown.

Prof. Oyama's commentary and evaluation follows.

The presentations concerning various programs for bilingual students appeared to be well received. The questions and comments from the participants indicated genuine interest. They were provided with copies of program proposals, lists of books, tapes, filmstrips, and other instructional materials.

The tutoring sessions did not prove popular. Explanations that teachers of bilingual students should attempt to better understand the problems encountered by these students in areas outside the Spanish class, to consider more of the student's total environment, did not suffice. The participants felt that though the tutoring sessions were of some value, the time could more profitably be spent discussing what they had observed during the demonstration classes or what they had seen and heard on the video tape, filmstrip presentation, and film. This recommendation was accepted and the change was made.

The participants felt that the demonstration classes provided them with instruction they especially wanted and needed. What they observed they could apply directly to their classroom situation with perhaps slight modifications, some commented. The techniques Mr. Guerrero employed and his ability to create an interesting learning atmosphere were highly praised by the participants.

I believe this type of interaction between university institutes and the public schools and their students is beneficial to all concerned. In place of tutoring sessions, however, perhaps informal small group discussion sessions should be arranged where topics such as student protest movements, authority relationships (parent-child, teacher-student, administrator-student, boss-employee, etc.),

educational and vocational levels of aspiration, cultural differences and similarities and their significance, and other such topics could be discussed with emphasis on problems encountered in these areas by minority group members.

In addition to the morning work with students at Wakefield and Pueblo, other regular class work proceeded as follows. The composition sections met four times; the methods class met three times; Prof. Romano arrived and conducted his class daily; Prof. Guerrero taught a volunteer class at the Chicano House (a small young people's center sponsored by MALC, the Mexican-American Liberation Committee), which was visited by some participants.

Prof. Romano began his class, titled Culture and Culture Conflict, even before the class proper, by entering into conflict concerning a matter of culture. During a Techno-Fax man's demonstration of his company's versatile visuals, there was shown an apparently innocuous transparency concerning Central American Indian civilizations. The transparency, a printed chart, made simplistic reference to polytheism and human sacrifice. Prof. Romano asked what a teacher might do to block out such references rather than allow them to contaminate his class. The tone of his question was such as to put the salesman on the defensive without understanding the attack. The purpose of the question--for the group--was to shock them into an awareness of facile clichés, apparently harmless, but selectively used to disparage one culture--here the "primitive" and "savage" Indian--to the benefit of another.

When Prof. Romano began in his own regular class, he proceeded according to his now familiar and always informal mode. He waded into the conflict surrounding the "traditional culture" of the Mexican-American with epithets flying. Using his famous article, "The

Anthropology and Sociology of the Mexican-Americans," El Grito, II (Fall, 1968), as a starting point, he questioned and then dismissed the clichés describing the culture belonging to the majority of the participants.

Here are his own words:

> It was decided to begin with a critique of the anthropological and sociological philosophies which have determined the structure and content of such studies on Mexican-Americans as are available virtually everywhere. This was, as I soon found out, a most judicious (although unintentional) beginning, for the bulk of the participants were still "seething" over a presentation given them from the traditional anthropological framework. The decision to begin at this level was also favorable in light of the fact that virtually all of the participants generally agreed on what problems exist, and their potential ramifications for the future. Following the critique of social science studies of Mexican-Americans (drawn largely from social science sources themselves), an attempt was made to relate these sources to a larger picture, i.e., the Protestant Ethic and its influence on contemporary thought, the emergence of experimental educational changes relating to minorities, and changes taking place in the barrios today. This, essentially, covered the first week and a half.

One of the most interesting side-effects of these first classes of Prof. Romano was a revealing questionnaire developed by one of the participants. After going through some respected and widely distributed literature on the culture and character of the Mexican-American, he extracted fourteen statements and reproduced them on a dittoed sheet. This questionnaire was then distributed to twenty-five of the participants,

all of them Mexican-American. All were asked to agree or disagree with each statement.

The results, it seems to me, are stunning. The group was relatively homogeneous: all were Mexican-American, all were middle-class professionals, all were high school Spanish teachers, most were not from large cities, and the age span was relatively small. Yet the responses show a marked lack of uniformity. Perhaps, then, the Mexican-American character is as varied as that of any other group. And perhaps his culture depends, not simply on genes, color, and language, but on geography, economics, urbanization, and a host of other factors and pressures.

The questionnaire and the resulting data follow.

Statement	Agree	Disagree
1. Not many things in life are worth the sacrifice of moving away from your family.	11	13
2. The secret of happiness is not expecting too much and being content with what comes your way.	2	21
3. The best job to have is one where you are part of a group all working together, even if you don't get much individual credit.	8	16
4. Planning only makes a person unhappy, since your plans hardly ever work out anyway.		23
5. Nowadays, with world conditions the way they are, the wise person lives for today and lets tomorrow take care of itself.	2	21
6. Not many things in life are worth the sacrifice of moving away from your friends.	5	17
7. When a man is born, the success he is going to have is not already in the cards; each makes his own fate.	16	2
8. The Mexican-American has stronger family ties than most other Americans.	20	4
9. Other Americans do not work as hard as the Mexican-American.	5	18
10. Other Americans are more materialistic than the Mexican-American.	10	14
11. Mexican-Americans are very emotional.	13	12
12. Other Americans tend to be more progressive than the Mexican-American.	7	16
13. Mexican-Americans often blame other Americans for their position, but really it is the Mexican-American's own fault.	7	17
14. They often shout about their rights but do not have anything to offer.	2	21

Special events of the second phase of the institute are listed in the following calendar.

July 7:	Representative of Techno-Fax, a producer of educational visuals
July 9:	Miguel Méndez, guest lecturer
July 10:	Octavio Márquez, guest lecturer
July 11-14:	Optional trip to Huásabas, Sonora
July 16:	Showing of film, Decision at Delano

Guest Lecturer: Miguel Méndez, Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Méndez is a bricklayer by trade. He is also a widely read, self-taught philosopher and a published writer. His first lecture before the institute, also his first public lecture, covered three main areas: recent literature of Sonora, recent literature of cosmopolitan Mexico, and village narradores, the repositories of a dying oral literature tradition. His lecture was such a success that he was asked to return for two additional appearances, a first in the history of our institutes.

Guest Lecturer: Octavio Márquez, Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Márquez is a lawyer who has represented dissident Tucson students and teachers. He talked of constitutional rights enjoyed by all citizens, including teachers and students. He distinguished between legitimate demonstrations and protest (right of assembly, petition for redress of grievance) and civil disobedience. He noted the historical immunity of school systems to court decisions affecting the general public, but he also noted a recent Supreme Court decision which may remove this immunity. In the case of Pickering v. Board of Education . . . , decided in 1968, the Court held, in general, that a teacher enjoys the same rights of free speech as any other citizen, including especially on matters of school policy, operation, etc.

Specifically, "absent proof of false statements knowingly or recklessly made by him, . . . (his speaking out) may not furnish the basis for dismissal from public employment." Copies of excerpts from the Pickering decision were distributed to the participants.

Under questioning, Mr. Márquez indicated that there is often a gap between the letter of the law and local practice. Specifically, the Pickering decision seems to insure freedom of speech for the teacher. But Arizona statutes defining teacher tenure and grounds for dismissal are exceedingly imprecise. School boards are given a good deal of latitude. A dismissed teacher, rather than undertake a costly and lengthy court fight, may opt simply to find another job, as has, in fact, happened in a recent case.

The participants were fully aware of the spirit of protest which is a part of the modern school scene. They recognized that they would themselves doubtless by involved, willy nilly, and thus were concerned about legal rights, limitations, responsibilities, and liabilities. For this reason Mr. Márquez was invited to speak a second time later in the term.

The Optional Trip to Huásabas, Sonora

The optional trip to Huásabas came about because of a coincidence of two factors. One--while studying Los de abajo it was observed how difficult it is for modern civilized man to imagine the mountain wildness of Mexico during a civil war half a century ago. Two--one of the participants had relatives in Huásabas, and he had previously conducted a group of high school students on a special excursion there. Thus, after justifying an institute tour on the basis of the first factor, and receiving permission to use a Friday and a Monday, the participant put into action his plans involving the second factor.

By modern standards, Huásabas is remote. On a good day, with no rain, travelling by a tough bus mounted on a truck chassis, it is a 10-12 hour trip from the border. With breakdowns and rain, it developed into a spine-jarring journey of 17 hours. Old style village hospitality was no less warm, however, despite the 2:00 a.m. arrival.

Participants spent Saturday and Sunday "visiting." In a rural village with no electricity, very little commercialism, and special guests, this means going to call and endless talking. Talking went on into the wee hours, in the form of conversations, declamations, narrations, etc. Special events included a big dance and a barbecue.

No institute funds were used for the Huásabas trip, and only about half the participants, with one staff, took part. But for them it was perhaps the most memorable part of the eight weeks. Areas of institute-related benefit include: (1) Coming to know the geography and the people of a rural Mexico familiar only through readings. (2) Coming to know a relatively isolated rural culture--the roots of many immigrants. (3) Recognizing the similarity between the Spanish of "real" Mexico and the language of most Mexican-Americans.

The final three-week phase of the institute, July 21-August 8, continued in large part the activities of the first three weeks, but with the following exceptions: the literature class proper, as planned, was not continued; Prof. Romano, absent during the first three weeks, continued during the final phase; the extra-curricular newspaper group began work; the 1:30 hour was regularly used for guest lecturers, films, and announcements.

Prof. Guerrero continued his regularly scheduled class. Along with the usual matters of texts and other materials, methods and classroom procedure, and curriculum planning, he touched also on the teaching

of reading. Many Mexican-American students come to high school speaking Spanish but are almost unable to read it. Drawing on years of trial and error in his own experience, and using the recent contact with Wakefield and Pueblo students, he suggested texts and outlined procedures which he has found useful.

The composition teachers continued with aspects of writing experience such as newspaper work, dialog construction, a new ending for an old story, characterization, and literary values vs. historicity. They also spent some time discussing matters related to other institute activities such as guest lectures, the writings of Mr. Méndez, and other classes.

Prof. Romano continued his discussions of the Mexican-American in various activities and organizations of American life. There is a considerable amount of material stemming from the Mexican-American community and rapidly finding its way into print. Therefore, he decided to focus sharply on these sources as documents of the contemporary scene--thereby providing an immediacy that cannot be gained from the usual sources. A new focus was brought to bear on contemporary literature (Mexican-American). This permitted the class to discuss the potentials of various forms of articulation: bilingual poetry, short stories, essays, art, and articles on the contemporary scene as articulated by Mexican-Americans themselves.

Literature covered:

El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary Mexican-American Thought
El Espejo: Selected Mexican-American Literature
Newspapers of the Chicano Press Association (as available)

Special events of the final phase of the institute are listed in the following calendar.

July 21: Spanish language color film on the human heart
July 24: Miguel Méndez, guest lecturer
July 25: Salomón Baldenegro, guest lecturer
July 29: Octavio Márquez, guest lecturer
July 29: Charles J. Bustamante, guest lecturer
July 29: Publication of first issue of institute newspaper
July 30: Rudolph Serrano, guest lecturer
July 31: Showing to University of Arizona TV films for teaching English to speakers of Spanish. Walkout.
Aug. 1: Miguel Méndez, guest lecturer
Aug. 1: Rudolph Serrano, guest lecturer
Aug. 1: All institute party
Aug. 5: Showing of film, Education and the Mexican-American
Aug. 6: Lt. George Robles, guest lecturer
Aug. 7: Visit by two participants to Arizona State University's EPDA institute for counsellors
Aug. 7: Dramatic presentation by institute theater group
Aug. 8: Publication of second issue of institute newspaper
Aug. 8: Report on visit to ASU institute
Aug. 8: Closing ceremonies

Guest Lecturer: Miguel Méndez

Mr. Méndez considers the phenomenon of the pachuco as a unique movement; he prefers not to generalize and see it as similar to other forms of alienation or rebellion. He sees the movement as different from and uninfluenced by French existentialism, its contemporary. Among the most important differences are that pachuquismo never had a formal philosophical base or a sophisticated intellectual apologist--such as Sartre. Concerning pachuco argot, Mr. Méndez recognizes its widespread usage, south to Mexico City, west to the Asian war theaters; but he deems it unfit for genuine literary expression, too crude and too ephemeral. Ironically, a passage of pachuco dialog, composed by Méndez and read aloud as an example of the language, tended to show also a special literary power.

Guest Lecturer: Salomón Baldenegro, Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Baldenegro is chairman of MALC (Mexican-American Liberation Committee), an "activist" group. He has been a University of Arizona student majoring in sociology. Mr. Baldenegro spoke informally about MALC and its activities in Tucson. Most newsworthy was a student walk-out from Tucson High School, in a mixed Mexican-American, Negro and middle-class to affluent anglo area. Some of his main topics were: the "inside" of a chicano student movement; how a walkout works; repercussions; long-term results; analysis of drop-out statistics; MALC's campaign among drop-outs--". . . to help us change the system"; the barrio as a positive factor; creative separatism (his notion of cultural pluralism).

The reaction of the group was cautious and, for some, defensive. The latent question seems to have been, "Should the chicano student accommodate to fit the system or does the system need reform, given its failure with the chicano?" Overt questions were typified by such approaches as "Why don't you . . . ?, Have you tried . . . ?, But wouldn't it be better . . . ?" That is to say, the questioners did not see themselves as involved. From their vantage point they saw "you" (Baldenegro), "them" (the most difficult of the young people) and, by implication, "us" (the professional). They resisted his call to help "their people."

Guest Lecturer: Octavio Márquez

During his second talk Mr. Márquez amplified some themes of his first talk and answered several questions. What follows are translated excerpts from the report appearing in the institute newspapers.

"Certain tensions are created," said Márquez, "by means of newspapers such as ¡Coraje! which are involved in social protest. Unfortunately the public in general, the newspapers, and the professors turn in their anger against the students."

"Things do not get better," continued Márquez, "when they accuse these students of having Communist tendencies. Although the attraction is there, it is economic and not political."

According to Márquez, the schools have failed in the education of these students and it is our duty as professors to try to show them the difference between civil disobedience and peaceful and legal protest. "We have to take precautions that these student strikes do not turn into riots."

To do this we have to reach a mutual understanding with our students. We have to take into account their point of view, their needs, and their reasons for rebelling.

"After this," said Márquez, "a professor can do a number of things to remedy the situation. First, he should recognize the barrios. Then he can initiate various teaching programs, organize a Mexican-American PTA, or help one particular family."

***

Márquez explained that according to a Supreme Court decision, strikes are a manifestation of free expression. But it also stated that if a strike interrupts classes and school discipline, it is no longer within constitutional limits. The student strike at Tucson High was entirely within the legal limits.

***

The discussion terminated with various questions on the legality of wearing protest buttons, arm bands, and the distribution of literature in the schools.

Márquez assured us positively that all these cases fall within the decision handed down by the Supreme Court in the case of Tinker and they should not be prohibited in any part of the country.

Guest Lecturer: Charles J. Bustamante, Santa Clara County Office of Education, California

Mr. Bustamante is co-ordinator of Operation SHARE, a tutorial program funded under ESEA, Title III. He is also co-author of a text suitable for use in junior and senior high school, The Mexican-American and the United States.

Mr. Bustamante explained in summary fashion how children--all children--learn attitudes and values which are a part of the total culture. He pointed out dramatically the effect on the minority child in such areas as self-image, goal-seeking, deviant behavior, "radicalism," etc. His presentation was informal and hard-hitting, complete with a sprinkling of taboo (but well used) words. If his talk could be condensed it might be as follows: The "American system" does, in fact, include severe economic and social pressures which are applied unequally. Blacks and browns are victims of the most vicious oppression. You (as predominantly chicano professionals) have a clear duty to "your people" as well as to truth and justice.

The material presented--facts and inferences--as well as the attitudes implied, are hardly revolutionary or even novel. On the contrary, they represent what should be a part of any elementary course in Educational Sociology. Since his delivery was hard-hitting, and since it came from a chicano to a group of chicanos, perhaps the total effect was more stunning than if the same things had been said by an anglo academic.

Guest Lecturer: Rudolph Serrano, Tucson, Arizona

Mr. Serrano was a physics teacher at Modesto (California) High School. He is now a graduate student in the University of Arizona's

College of Education, where he is completing work for his doctorate. He has also helped design a new university course centered on the problems of educating the Mexican-American child.

Mr. Serrano began by apologizing for speaking in English! Though he is bilingual, his professional training has been entirely in English, and his Spanish is not adequate to the task (a result, of course, of monolingual education).

He then went on to outline some statistics concerning the Tucson scene. Median age of the Mexican-American population--19-20 years, of the anglo--30 years; median income--$2,500+; median school achievement--about 8 years; per cent of greater Tucson population--25%; per cent of University of Arizona enrollment--1+%.

Mr. Serrano also outlined briefly his idea of cultural pluralism, and suggested some characteristics of anglo and chicano cultures that others have mentioned. However, the bulk of his presentation was devoted to explaining a rational model of intellectual inquiry. Mr. Serrano wants to teach the child to think, especially the chicano child, so that he can consider adequately and then choose intelligently in all areas that affect him as a "culturally different" person. Mr. Serrano deprecated some approaches to teaching the deprived child as not going beyond the descriptive or labeling stage. (He made specific reference to a lecture by a representative of the SWCEL in Albuquerque.) The model he developed would lead the child through descriptive, analytical, and speculative considerations, and up through ontological, epistemological, and axiological levels. An objection from the floor noted that Mr. Serrano was developing a rational model but that he was attempting to test it in behavioral terms. Mr. Serrano conceded that he was indeed committing the discourse fallacy and that the question had caught him off guard.

In general, the participants were impressed by Mr. Serrano's presentation. The practical implications of his remarks were clearly accessible: (1) The culturally different person is faced with a special task of adaptation and/or re-enforcement. (2) The chicano teacher is in a special position to help chicano students understand their world. (3) A different language is only one part, not always the most important part, of the culturally different student's behavior. (4) Effective education begins by recognizing the child.

Showing of TV Films

For about two years the University of Arizona's Radio-TV Bureau, under contract with the Southwest Cooperative Educational Laboratory in Albuquerque, has been developing a series of video tapes, fifteen half-hour lessons in color using cartoon animation, live local actors, and a live actress-instructor in an attempt to teach English to adult Mexican-Americans exclusively via TV.

Since the institute participants are themselves language teachers, since many of them also teach English to speakers of Spanish, and since some work in adult education, I requested a showing of sample lessons. I expected the showing to generate a variety of remarks, both descriptive and critical, in the following areas: TV as a unique medium of instruction, TV and audience involvement, cartoon animation and the adult viewer, language teaching and language models, pattern drills and TV time costs, etc. Due to a number of only dimly foreseen circumstances, however, the events surrounding the showing took a different turn. After a series of bluntly put questions on funding, personnel policies, community and technical advisors, and teaching methods, the majority of viewers quietly left the room. The showing continued, followed by brief comments and some questions.

Meanwhile, two events transpired which gave greater impact to an otherwise minor but nevertheless embarrassing incident. The protestors happened to meet a newspaper reporter who was on the campus on a different story. This chance encounter yielded several articles in the local press and at least one AP dispatch. At the same time, some of the protestors sent a telegram to the U. S. Office of Education. This move resulted in the arrival of an investigating team composed of representatives from USOE and SWCEL in Albuquerque.

Guest Lecturer: Miguel Méndez

Mr. Méndez read from his own works, published and unpublished and commented on them. He also responded to questions from the group. Unfortunately, I was not present at the reading. Reports are that it was an outstanding performance. Unlike so many authors, Mr. Méndez is an accomplished interpreter of his own work. Further, his direct and open manner, his excellent command of both formal and informal Spanish, and his first-hand, non-academic knowledge, strikes immediately a responsive chord in his audience.

Film: Education and the Mexican-American. The story of Sal Castro and the Los Angeles school demonstrations.

This film came five days after many--most--participants had staged a walkout of their own. From their own teaching experience they were aware of inequities in the schools. From institute classes they had learned to clarify their thinking, not only regarding language, techniques, and materials, but also regarding politics and redress of grievance. The institute walkout, though not a part of the "curriculum," did serve as a laboratory experience--their own jobs were not involved--in which to galvanize their feelings. In short, the reaction to the film was quietly favorable; it was "old stuff" to them.

As indeed it should have been. The complaints voiced by Sal Castro are old and widespread. They need not be limited to schools in Mexican-American areas. The young child is naturally curious; he wants to learn. The child of a Mexican family has been taught to respect schools and teachers. Yet by grades 4 or 5 the Mexican-American child is, for the most part, significantly behind in school. Sal Castro suggests that the school, not the child, has failed.

This is no surprise to the moderately sophisticated educator. As Dr. Julián Nava suggested in the filmed discussion, traditional (middle class) schools have not produced equal education <u>even in the anglo population</u>. I might add that often teaching materials, including specifically reading texts, contain built-in "retardation factors" as regards the culturally different or deprived child.

For another audience, then, the film might have been threatening or subversive. For some new teachers it might have been an in-service teaching tool. For this institute it was largely routine.

<u>Guest Lecturer</u>: Lt. George Robles, Tucson, Arizona

Lt. Robles is Director, Community Relations Unit, of the Tucson Police Department. He began by noting that 20 years ago there were two Mexican-Americans on the police force. Now there are 22 (out of about 300). This is still not enough. He noted the low prestige rating of police in those last years, the reluctance of many to be police in their own home towns, and the special difficulties of the Mexican-American who becomes a policeman in his own barrio.

He noted that efforts to train police to understand the special problems of the barrio have not always been successful. Representatives of the Mexican-American community who have spoken before police groups

have been largely middle class and thus, he said, they know "next to nothing" about barrio life.

With reference to walkouts and demonstrations, he made a number of highly significant points. (1) They can be entirely legal. (2) They often represent a last resort. (3) To be effective, they must involve a significant proportion of the aggrieved sector. (4) The news media usually distort the picture. (5) The establishment tends to over-react. (6) On one occasion the police over-responded, sending too many cars. The TV cameras focused on this potentially sensational note. (7) In the case of the local student demonstrations, the Mexican-American students were orderly and peaceful.

Questions from the floor covered police recruiting and training, search and arrest procedures, police brutality and/or discrimination, and general bureaucratic inability to receive and act on Spanish language complaints.

Presentation by the Theater Group

The institute theater group was formed, under the direction of instructor Ríos, for the purpose of studying a dramatic work, not only from a literary standpoint, but also from those of the director and the actor. Before the play, Mr. Ríos explained to the group some of the problems and benefits of this type of study.

The play, Los desarraigados by J. Humberto Robles, won Mexico's "El Nacional" prize in 1955. Set in an American border town of the Southwest, it deals with such themes as anti-Mexican discrimination, the Mexican-American's stereotype of Mexico proper, and the decay of family solidarity--the generation gap--in the context of these factors.

Closing Ceremonies

On August 7, the next to the last day of the institute session, two participants paid a visit to the EPDA institute for counsellors directed by Prof. C. Patrick McGreevy at Arizona State University. They had intended to confer with some of the staff and to observe some of the classes. But at the invitation of the director, and apparently at the insistence of the participants, they dominated the entire morning session.

According to their enthusiastic report to me that evening, delivered immediately on their return, the ASU participants were greatly interested in the experience of the Tucson institute and bombarded the two representatives with questions. Apparently news of our group's frank and open discussion of racial and cultural matters, in a context where the minority was a majority, tapped hidden reservoirs of interest and/or frustration among the ASU group.

The following morning, as part of the closing ceremonies, I called on the two emissaries, Gerardo Garro of Lubbock and Joe Hernández of Abilene, to tell of their experiences. Once again their enthusiasm, along with their sense of work yet to be done for and by minority professionals, was contagious. Beginning as a report of a visit to a sister institute, the talk soon broadened into a sympathetic synthesis of our own institute experience from the participants' point of view. And most important, the report-synthesis then changed into a spontaneous exhortation to the graduating class.

It was the high point of the morning and, improvised and unplanned, deeply felt and highly appropriate, it was a fitting end to the most flexible institute I have known.

CONCLUSIONS

In the Plan of Operation I outlined five areas of innovation or improvement over past practice. I will recall them here, with pertinent comment.

(1) "Conducting the institute in Tucson instead of Guadalajara." There is absolutely no question that this was a positive step. I can see only two partial justifications for conducting an institute such as ours in, for example, Guadalajara: (a) to concentrate exclusively on language and non-U.S. culture, and (b) to isolate participants in a "laboratory situation" far from U.S. pressures. In my judgment, those justifications are less tenable with each year that passes.

(2) "Reduced size of group." Staff-participant contact was constant and intense. The small group facilitated class discussion, group action, and a feeling of unity. The logistics of scheduling, classroom availability, or staff utilization would allow a larger group, if that were desired.

(3) "Seminars." The seminars were not the regular, scheduled sessions that had been planned. Three types of activities took their place: (a) small group work sessions centered on such topics as the newspaper, the dramatic presentation, and the language of the borderlands; (b) discussions as a part of the two-week second phase; (c) normal spill-over from formal classes, i.e., informal and insistent discussions which filled lunch hours, coffee breaks, and hours and hours of dormitory nights. Institute staff participated in and reacted to many of these discussions.

(4) "Unorthodox scheduling." This was beneficial on the following counts: (a) it avoided the monotony of a traditional

concentrated summer session; (b) it allowed for relatively undistracted contact with high school students during a short period; (c) it apparently invited "active involvement and even healthy polemic."

(5) "Field work." Field work activity under Prof. Romano did not take the form of house-to-house surveys or interviews. But if "activism is the order of the day" (I quote my words from last year's final report), then field work there was. Participants consulted with Prof. Romano (and others) concerning such matters as curriculum change, community involvement, public dissent, and political organization.

Earlier in this report I noted that the institute instructors exerted an "almost exclusive influence over the institute." This is true in a sense, but it may be misleading. It is true, for example, that all visiting lecturers, films, etc., amounted to only 20-25 hours, scarcely 10% of the net class hours theoretically available. But statistics tell only part of the story. The staff dominated the formal program of the institute, as is proper and traditional in an educational institution. But staff and participants agreed that the special events were especially good and had a special impact. In part, certainly, their special impact was due to the fact that they were "specially" brought in and thus favored with a certain positive "halo" effect. Equally important, I think, was the unusual, non-academic nature of many of the events, such as a bricklayer lecturing on literature, a police officer defending student protesters, a young chicano lawyer originally from "a small mining town in the West," etc. A third element in the mix--added to the regular staff and the special events--was the participants themselves. I cannot stress this sufficiently. These people were highly motivated and loaded with questions. They eagerly absorbed what was presented in formal classes. They changed the direction of many

class hours. They reacted immediately to special events. And they carried out a number of activities on their own initiative: the trip to Huásabas, the newspaper, the theater group, the all-institute party, and the visit to the ASU institute.

In such a context, change is to be expected, can, in fact, hardly be avoided. I suggest the following areas of change.

Changes among the participants--.

(1) New knowledge of books and other materials suitable for the classroom. Such a simple thing; but the college teacher does not appreciate how little access the high school teacher has to new materials once teacher training is finished.

(2) New knowledge of programs in other districts, some with federal funding, designed for the Mexican-American.

(3) New awareness of Mexican-American publications, organizations, and activities across the Southwest. This new awareness of a new phenomenon has two main aspects: a sense of solidarity and support for minority teachers who have been bucking the dominant culture all their lives; and specific plans to subscribe to, associate with, or even react against these publications, organizations, and activities.

(4) A clearer idea of the nature of large scale public dissent and its repercussions, planned and otherwise, personal and organizational. It is not necessary to organize a walkout--or even participate in one--to be a teacher in a minority school. But this summer's experience must have helped participants to know how they will wish to respond if such a situation arises.

(5) For the anglos, a sharp awakening to what it feels like to be a minority, to have a different skin color, to not fully control

the language everyone else uses so freely, to have one's tentative opinions overwhelmed by the majority, and even to be picked on and disparaged before the whole class.

Change of attitude among the participants was not brought about by any one class or event, of course. But in the context of the total institute, certain events became, in retrospect, focal points. Thus Prof. Wilson's lectures, which might have been routine in a more passive institute, sparked a reaction which was still strong two weeks later. The newspaper, which could have been nothing more than an adolescent-style collection of smart remarks, served as focus and expression for many of the participants. And the video tape viewing, intended as the basis of a short question-and-answer period, developed into a lesson based on action but depending also on introspection.

I will dwell on the video tape viewing as an example of how an unscheduled event (the walkout) and non-institute material (the tapes) can be turned to advantage. The morning following the walkout a delegation of participants met with me to apologize for any embarrassment caused to the institute proper and to take up some related matters. I in turn asked them to consider what had happened and then to write a one-page essay explaining what they had "learned" from the experience. I think I did not predispose them greatly in their thinking. If anything, given my "establishment" position, I may have suggested they feel ashamed of their unseemly behavior.

Of course, personal results of the walkout experience varied, as did personal motivation. But by and large those who commented were convinced that the demonstration--and their own participation--had value. The following comments are representative.

This has been my first experience in any kind of demonstration, and I didn't like it very well, but I did participate because I didn't like the tape being shown at all.

I personally think that if these people responsible in the production of these tapes don't try to modify the program somehow, they should let the whole thing fade away, because it's not right for these people to spend the taxpayer's money to produce something without value.

***

It is difficult to evaluate my thoughts of the film which was presented last Thursday. The film possibly might have had some merit, but the failure of the directors of the film to answer questions made it very hard to comprehend. I am sure many were more interested in questioning him than anything else. I am reasonably sure that the walkout was not pre-planned as it might seem. I think they were infuriated by what they saw.

I learned also that possibly the only way for many of the minority groups to get anything going for them will be to speak up. Action was seen by the group who saw them march out. I guess this makes other groups think and therefore improve the situation or even remedy it.

***

Now that summer is about over, I can say that <u>one</u> of the climaxes was the famous or infamous (however it may be judged) walkout that occurred last week. The only objectionable aspect was the embarrassment caused to the person who knew the least of what I was doing and why I was doing it. The advantages? I don't know. To me, it was an

advantage to be able to object by peaceful means to something that I couldn't find the words to argue against. I had faced these people in the film, somewhere back in Texas. Not the same faces, perhaps, but the same menacing expressions that were trying to force from me a knowledge that I did not possess. The people doing the questioning in the film reminded me of the people that I once knew in my difficult days in school. I felt during the film the frustration that I felt before in the typing class in high school and also in the English class that I almost failed because I couldn't understand the terms of grammar. These are the things that I felt. Perhaps the walkout proved to me that I could do something if I didn't agree with it. I believe now that I can be a "yes" man just as much as a "no" man. Even now when I feel a spark of confidence in me, I hope that I am not just merely running blind.

***

For walking out of a viewing of some films by SWCEL concerning the teaching of English to adult Mexican-Americans I would like to take full credit. What I gained from this incident I will always regard as an invaluable experience. Most human beings are basically selfish and I am no exception. Perhaps this explains my feelings better. I am glad I was a part of what might bring some badly needed changes so that when my son grows up he will have the same opportunities to succeed as anyone else might.

Since the institute began everything had been pointing in one direction--that was to make each of us think out, search our souls, meditate, anything to finally make us realize and accept our position as teachers of Mexican-American students. I think I can truthfully

confess that Thursday forced me to take a stand and then be proud of it. Now I know exactly what I want in life for my family and me. I guess you could say my life has a more definite direction now. I am more sensitive now to the problems I will be facing as a teacher. Maybe for the very first time I feel proud to be who and what I am. My thinking has crystallized or taken a shape, which will influence my life from now on. If this was the purpose of the institute, I know it has been extremely successful.

***

The day of the walkout by the participants of the institute was truly an education to me. The lesson is as follows:

1. As a mexicoamericano and a foreign language teacher I felt insulted because of the presentation and the methods used.

2. The problems as to the indifference of certain members of the "dominant culture" to employ mexicoamericanos for positions which they are better qualified than Anglos has finally become a reality to me.

3. Some individuals in high educational positions can propose and receive grants for unique educational programs in order to get government funds and not for the purpose of educating people.

***

The exclusive information leading up to the viewing of the tapes designed for teaching basic English to Mexican-American adults, came from X. Not having viewed such films, my reaction was to find out for myself whether or not the latest opinions from local participants were true. I was not moved by the proceedings before the showing of the films because from past experiences, I've known people with negative attitudes who conduct themselves in the same manner as our local participants.

I walked out in the middle of tape number twelve. The use of such costly materials is not only an insult to the intelligence of the Mexican-American, but an affront to such authorities on modern language as Robert Lado, Robert Politzer, Charles Staubach, not to mention others.

***

I learned a great deal about people as a result of Thursday's walkout. Only a few of us had actually seen the films prior to Thursday and I would venture to say that 99% of us had already decided that they weren't any good. The indoctrination we received from "those who knew" left us little choice. When the agitators began the interrogation, they knew how the TV men would react--in other words, the agitators had proved their point. They left, and following them were a varied group: some of them behaved like sheep; others because they were bored; others for who-knows-what reason. The fact is that most of the people who left had never seen the films, and, as far as I'm concerned, were just taking somebody else's word for whether or not the films were effective teaching tools. I lost respect for most of those people because they allied themselves with the instigators, who were rude and belligerent.

I remained in the room, saw the films and came away satisfied because I got my questions answered and expressed my opinion in an intelligent manner. I didn't like the films and I agree with the statements that were made about the degrading effect, etc., but I would never go in for using tactics like those used Thursday.

I feel there are two important things I learned from the walkout last Thursday. First, I learned that when people get it into their heads to do something they will do it regardless of whose feet they step on. When they feel they've been wronged they set out to right this and will do it even if in turn they wrong someone else.

Secondly, I learned that many people are truly followers and will go along with the leaders or with the majority. This I believe to be true after talking to some of the people because they didn't have any real concrete reason for walking out.

I learned a third thing indirectly from the walkout. I learned not to believe newspaper reports. The reasons given for the walkout before it took place were hiring practices, programming activities, etc. They were displeased with the way the program in general had been carried out. According to the newspaper reports, the reason for the walkout was in protest of the film itself. I am sure this had something to do with it, but the people were screaming and carrying on even before they saw the films. In the newspaper report this was the only reason mentioned.

Changes in staff knowledge, attitudes, methods--. It is difficult to specify, but I will offer some possibilities. For the university based anglo (Anderson, Brown, Olstad) I am quite sure the institutes force a constant re-evaluation of our attitudes toward the Mexican-American. In case after case we have seen our own ex-students, once apparently passive and resigned, now master teachers in key positions, district leaders, and in-service trainers. Why couldn't we see this in them before?

For the Mexican-American staff there must also have been changes of attitude (which I am not competent to describe or even perceive). More clearly, there are changes of status and/or position which, while not perhaps brought about by the institute experience, are clearly related to it. One man leaves a sharply limited college teaching position for a decision-making post in a new junior college. Another jumps at the opportunity to plan and teach a new course in Mexican-American literature. Still another ponders job changes which could take him to South America or Spain. While a fourth is founder and officer of a new bicultural nursery school.

Institutional changes--. The following list of changes may be related to the institute experience, to certain institute personnel, and/or to the current emphasis on programs for minority groups.

1. A Mexican-American Studies program in the University of Arizona catalog. At present it is nothing more than a grouping of already existing courses. Clearly it represents only a token first step.

2. A new course (1969-70) in Mexican-American literature.

3. A new course (1969-70) in problems of Mexican-American education.

4. An upcoming study (1969-70) on the language of the Mexican-American pre-school child in Tucson, financed by university administered funds.

5. A larger study (in progress) of the oral Spanish of the Arizona-Sonora borderlands, begun as a sabbatical project.

6. University library acquisition of publications by Mexican-American groups, including specifically the often ephimeral "underground" newspapers.

7. A university vice-president's formal involvement in the Southwest Council for Bilingual Education.

8. Personnel changes at Tucson High School, the focus of recent public dissent.

I shall end my conclusions by citing again from essays by the participants. The Handbook for Directors (p. 56) requests that the director "candidly say what you really accomplished in your program." This summer's participants were both candid and appreciative. I prefer to use their words.

The following comments were selected from the volunteered final essays of the participants, fifteen out of thirty responding. The comments are a representative cross section. They correspond to the informal opinions expressed by the participants and the attitudes observed in them during the last days of the session. In retrospect, they reflect also a more positive overall attitude (less carping) than in any of our previous six institutes.

> It is in Mr. Guerrero's class that I began to feel the outward presence of an outstanding captivating leader in a quiet man. Perhaps what he instilled in me is a reinforcement of the things that I have done before in my own quiet secretive way. Professor Guerrero has given values to things that I had regarded before as things not belonging in the "superior" mind of the Anglo. What was outstanding in his class was his ability to project to me a feeling of importance that I as an individual had not felt before. The ideas given by Guerrero will remain in my mind as long as I have the ability to work in bilingual education.

The most interesting phenomenon was the fact that for the first time in my life I was part of the majority and that I now possessed some of the responsibilities that go along with that. I realize now that it is rather difficult to be partial to someone who is indeed part of the minority if a member of this group does not agree with you. I now feel the things that go on in a person's mind when he is dealing with a minority and its prejudices. Mind you, I have not yet learned to manipulate the system, but I have some idea now as to what rough experiences this noble establishment must be going through. These and other feelings were reinforced by persons such as Dr. Anderson and Miss Brown, and strengthened by Professor Ríos.

With the arrival of Dr. Romano, I was faced with the ideas of two forceful and deliberate leaders such as Romano and Guerrero. I have thought of these two people as persons with almost identical ideas, yet two distinctly different people. The problem arose as to which of the two was better. I believe now, after eight weeks of their lectures and personal private conferences that I have had with them, that it would not be just to believe in one and not the other. Both have become an integral part of my most inner thoughts from which I am sure to develop a good set of ulcers. I do not believe that the problem was in choosing one over the other. Instead, I have chosen a part of each man's thoughts to integrate into, and hopefully not take over, my own mode of thinking.

I think I can say that this is more or less a note of gratitude to the people I have known during the institute; the 29 fellow students for making it possible for me to realize that there are other truly bilingual pioneers; the professors, including Henry Oyama, and especially Guerrero and Romano, for giving a sense of

importance to what I already felt and for their ideas of realism and idealism. I cannot tell you what I am going to do when I get home as a result of this institute, because I would much rather write to you about real accomplishments whenever they may occur. (From a chicano.)

***

This institute has really been a learning experience. In one sense, it was a disappointment--I came here with certain goals in mind and never really reached them. However, now I can see that these "goals" were rather superficial when I compare what I wanted to know with what I found out. The only way I can express the way I feel about the eight-week session is to say that we "got down to the real nitty-gritty."

I am grateful for the Methods and Writing classes because I'm leaving with some concrete things that will help me as an "instructor." The Literature class and Discussion class were of particular interest because I am, by nature, a lover of literature. I was introduced to new authors, and I intend to follow-up on them next year.

Culture Conflict had a profound effect on me, and dramatic as it may sound, changed my life! At first I hated Romano because he put me on the defensive. Now, I'm glad he did because I was forced to sit down and analyze how I felt about La Raza. I want my students to be accepted by themselves and by others because of their own merit, not simply because it's "invite a Mexican-American home to dinner tonight" kind of thing. (From an anglo.)

***

This institute has to be the greatest educational experience I've ever had. The informal atmosphere was such that one wanted to try harder. Each member of the staff should be complimented on truly outstanding jobs. It is difficult to say which class or activity was most outstanding. The methods class by Guerrero gave me all the materials I needed for my native classes. The literature classes with Anderson taught me to evaluate literary works; something in which I had no training. The classes with Señorita Brown helped me with certain hang-ups I had in composition. Romano and Ríos helped me to identify myself and my place in the Chicano movement. Hank Oyama did a fine job at Wakefield and Pueblo, and especially his job as social director. (From a chicano.)

***

In my opinion the most effective or the outstanding impact of this institute affecting me as an anglo teacher, with less than outstanding success with native speaking students, has been a change of attitude toward, or new awareness of the feeling of the Mexican-American in the Anglo society. At times I have felt it was over done and often felt as "minority," as the Mexican-Americans must feel.

I realize that in order to thoroughly put across a point one must emphasize or exaggerate, and I think this was to some extent done by some of the participants and at least by one professor. These techniques I accept in the situation.

With the three Anglo Spanish teachers in our school, and no apparent change in sight to hiring native speaking teachers, it will be my goal to indoctrinate the other two a little--they are more stubborn about this new Chicano bit than I--and we will have to be

extra aware of the feelings and desires of the Mexican-American student. (From an anglo.)

***

I personally feel that I had many rewarding experiences that will enable me to approach the classroom of Mexican-Americans with positive ideas. As I mentioned in my application, I was guilty of not being able to reach the majority of Mexican-Americans, and I've found out that I was restraining my methods to the Castilian language, which such students do not appreciate or accept. The few moments that I could reach them was when I used Professor Guerrero's method of communication but I've never been consistent.

At first, it was not easy trying to adjust to the not so rigid schedule of this institute having been a participant in a totally different one at the University of Wisconsin. I soon found out that it was easier for me to communicate with professors and fellow participants. As far as I am concerned this type of program should be offered in future years. (From a chicano.)

POST SCRIPT

Several changes have been suggested if a similar institute is to be proposed for next year. I will list some of them here.

1. An institute for chicanos only, with an all-chicano staff. Such an institute could be developed, and there is no reason to think it would not be successful. Nevertheless, I do not propose an exclusively chicano institute on the following grounds. We are working within and trying to change a racist situation. While an all-chicano institute might allow uninhibited development of hitherto repressed talents, it could also be self-defeating. One of the consequences of racism is that the victim tends to accept the valuation placed upon him by the majority. Concretely, this summer at least one participant realized that he could be, not only "good--for a Mexican" but clearly good, on anyone's scale of values. A separatist institute would be isolated, a laboratory case. Any new and startling behavioral developments could be appreciated relative only to the "vacuum" in which they took place, a racist vacuum similar to the barrio or the segregated school. Thus reverse tokenism--a sprinkling of qualified anglos--can have a double effect: (a) strengthen an ethnic pride, but in the context of the total society; (b) channel the all too natural tendency toward retaliatory racism, the first response to racial discrimination.

2. One staff member makes this recommendation.

Two major changes from "normal" class procedure were the production of the institute newspaper and the staging of one act of Los desarraigados. These two changes reflect, in part, the preparation that I feel a teacher who teaches a significant number of Mexican-American youngsters should have. Mexican-American teachers in

particular are now under great pressure to work more directly with community organizations, out-of-school student groups, and to actively work to bring about major curriculum developments in their districts. The pressure will continue and possibly become much greater. The traditional college and university curriculum is not providing the training necessary to meet the many demands being made upon our teachers. Partial solution will be institutes such as this one as long as it is not simply "more of the same."

Such "extra-curricular" activities clearly have a place in the institute curriculum.

3. Bilingual education programs in the elementary and secondary schools should be studied and discussed.

4. University programs in Mexican-American studies (there are now some 40) should be examined. High school teachers (and counselors) of Mexican-American students need to know of these programs as soon as they develop.

5. Mexican-American literature, including plays, newspapers, and films, can become a part of the regular curriculum. It can be a basis for language study as well as for an examination of culture and culture conflict.

6. A more formal arrangement should be made for curriculum development. Many participants have been charged with that specific task by their districts. Such work can be a natural adjunct of the methodology class.

7. Participants might each write a "position paper" before coming to the institute. This paper could then be updated and revised once or twice during the session. It would serve as a kind of gauge of the summer's impact.

8. There should be more guest lecturers representing various viewpoints and perhaps delivering more than one lecture each.

9. Language study should be related more closely to its social context. "Socio-linguistics" is the name of the field whose relevance (and permanence) has now been established by inclusion beginning with the PMLA annual bibliography for 1968.

10. The traditional classroom approach might well give way to increased use of seminar--or even sensitivity and T-group--sessions.

11. The program need not be limited to teachers of Spanish. With some planning, it could accommodate teachers from other areas of the high school curriculum.

All these changes are now under consideration as planning begins for a program for the Summer of 1970. This summer's experience has demonstrated the possibilities of a flexible, locally based operation. It has also emphasized the value of a core of continuing classes (or similar activity) to give stability. For future programs, some combination of flexibility and predictability, of involvement and detachment, will be the elusive goal.