DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 199 FL 012 119

AUTHOR Fishman, Joshua A.; And Others
TITLE Non-English Language Resources of the United States (A Preliminary Return Visit). Final Report.
INSTITUTION Yeshiva Univ., New York, N.Y. Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences.
SPONS AGENCY Office of International Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
GRANT G007901816
NOTE 249p.; Parts may not reproduce clearly due to broken print. For related document, see ED 191 293.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Schools; Cultural Pluralism; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Groups; Ethnography; Folk Schools; *Language Maintenance; Language of Instruction; *Second Languages; Sociolinguistics

ABSTRACT

A preliminary report is offered on schools that offer all or a greater part of their instruction in a language other than English. Emphasis is laid on instruction geared toward the language maintenance of ethnic communities. Language reports include the approximate number of speakers and number, distribution, and basic characteristics of schools. Some detailed reports on individual schools are included, along with a certain amount of more extensive statistical information. The language reports are supplemented by three essays: (1) "Cultural Pluralism and the American School"; (2) "Whorfianism of the Third Kind: Ethnolinguistic Diversity as a Worldwide Societal Asset"; and (3) "Why Do Some Ethnic Community Schools in the USA Accomplish More than Others with Respect to Ethnic Mother Tongue Instruction?" (JB)

NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

(A Preliminary Return Visit)

Joshua A. Fishman, Ph.D.
Yeshiva University
New York
Principal Investigator

With the assistance of Maxine Diamond, Avrom Fishman, Dr. Michael Gertner, Esther G. Lowy, Barbara Markman, Dr. William Milán, Judith Petardi and Ellen Rosenblatt

Final Report to the Research Section, International Studies Branch, Department of Education, in connection with research supported under Grant G-00-79-01816

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

"It is not up to you to finish the work...(for) the day is short and the task is great." (Sayings of the Fathers, Chapter 2, verses 20 and 21)

In many respects much more has been accomplished in connection with this Grant than was anticipated. In some respects, however, certain anticipated goals were not attained. It is my considered opinion that the former far outweigh the latter and this Preface will attempt to present my views in this connection, as well as some of my hopes for future research dealing with the non-English language resources of the United States

My initial attempt to gauge the non-English language resources of the United States was made some 20 years ago and is reported in my Language Loyalty in the United States (1966). At that time, although I was almost an unknown quantity and the entire area of exploration dealing with non-English language maintenance in the United States was generally unappreciated, if not unheard of, I had the incredible good luck to be awarded a grant (and, as fate would have it, to be awarded that grant by the direct predecessor agency* of the very agency that has supported the research dealt with in this report) to gauge "the invisible continent" of the non-English languages of the country. I look back upon that attempt (now, retrospectively, referred to as Language Resources I) as a valiant effort to do the impossible.

*I will never cease to acknowledge and to be everlastingly grateful to A. Bruce Gaarder, then Director of the Language Research Section of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for his willingness to "take a chance" on me (as principal investigator) and for his deep sympathy for the topic to be researched. His continued interest in this area - and not only in research on it but in social policy and social action on behalf of it - deserves special mention and makes him a model for others to emulate.

I was unknown and my requests for information fell not only on deaf ears, but also on suspicious ears. In addition, it was not at all clear how or where to obtain the information that I sought on the magnitude of our non-English language resources as reflected by the periodical press, radio broadcasting, ethnic community schools and ethnic community churches. Nevertheless, I succeeded in gathering what seemed to be a huge amount of data of these four kinds, as well as in systematizing United States Bureau of the Census data on non-English mother tongue claiming, and in doing so in historical perspective, often going back to the beginning of the certury in order to show trend lines.

Now (1979-1980), on being given a rare opportunity to return to this topic and to update our knowledge of the state of language maintenance in the USA, the entire context of my efforts is appreciable different than it was in 1960. First of all, NIE enabled me to spend a year (1978-1979) warming up for the current endeavor via focusing solely on the ethnic community mother tongue schools of the country (Language Resources II). Secondly, NSF has enabled me to go beyond the current endeavor via content analyses (and linguistic analyses) of interviews with community leaders and the published contents of ethnic community periodicals. Via these two probes (Language Resources IV) it is hoped that internal views of current and future prospects for language maintenance in the USA will become clarified (at least for four of the six languages studied in depth in Language Resources I: French, Spanish, German and Yiddish). However, the above additional support is merely

symptomatic of the major differences between 1960-63 and 1979-82 insofar as studying the quantitative dimensions of the non-English resources of the United States (Language Resources III) is concerned. The topic as such has much greater visibility and credibility now than it had then; it is of interest to at least a good handful of researchers and granting agencies, as well as to a not-insignificant sector of the citizenry and of the legislative and executive branches of government. In addition, the nearly two decades that have elapsed between 1960-63 and 1979-80 have witnessed my own professional growth, precisely in this very area of endeavor, so that when I was given another opportunity to gauge several of its quanititative dimensions, it was still a hugely complicate charge, but hardly an unprecedented one. What data to seek, where to look for it and what volunteer aid to enlist were not only far simpler tasks than they had been in the early 60's, but they were greeted with encouraging responses and truly heartening assistance from many of the very individuals, agencies, organizations and communities without whose active cooperation little if any exhaustive research could be accomplished on this topic.

Looked at from one point of view, therefore, Language Resources III, herein being reported upon, has been a huge success. This success is reflected in the facts that more claimants of non-English ethnic community mother tongues and more non-English ethnic community periodical publications, broadcasts, churches and schools have been confirmed for 1979-1980 than were originally confirmed for 1960-63. The upward

trend with respect to non-English mother tongue claiming per se is analyzed in Chapter 3 of this report and seems to be reliably attributable to the huge increase in the rate of third generation (or native born of native born parents) non-English mother tongue claiming as of 1970.* However, the success of Language Resources III is primarily reflected in the sharply increased numbers of units of the four kinds whose "discovery" was strictly speaking our own responsibility (ethnic community press, boradcasting, churches and schools using a language other than/in addition to English), units that neither government agencies nor private agencies have been exhaustively locating. Nevertheless, this success has cost us heavily in our ability to examine certain substantive aspects of these units that we had originally agreed to examine (particularly relative to their utility for language teaching efforts under non-ethnic auspices at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels). The outpouring of information with respect to locating units of these four kinds was a veritable avalanche and it literally swamped the staff available (two part-time assistants and a part-time secretary) to such an extent that even at this writing, almost three months after the statutory completion of the project, we have not yet fully caught up even with the enumeration of the units that have been located (particularly insofar as churches are concerned). As

*Comparable 1980 data of this kind has yet to be released by the United States Bureau of the Census.

a result, the figures and trends discussed in Chapter 3 must be considered to be preliminary indeed. It will require a modicum of additional time and additional support in order to accomplish the completion of these two unfinished aspects of Language Resources III. The qualitative data pertaining to the availability/utility of ethnic language resources for the general language teaching enterprise is available in our files and requires coding, punching, running, analysis and write-up. The full enumeration of our quantitative data and the full intercorrelation of these data also await a modicum of additional time and funds, but, fortunately, the NSF support mentioned earlier (for Language Resources IV) should be usable for this purpose. The importance of completing our quantitative efforts can hardly be exaggerated because if this is not done, then future investigations of the non-English language resources of the United States will be faced by most of the same problems that we face ourselves in trying to render our 1960-63 to 1979-80 trend lines understandable. It does not seem reasonable that all trend lines should be rising (even if non-English mother tongue claiming has nearly doubled in the same time period). It is more reasonable to assume that a good part of the seeming increase (e.g., in the press) is due to the fact that an inexperienced investigator studying what was a difficult, touchy and unpopular topic in 1960-63, could not locate all of the units that existed at that time. If the very same problem is not to plague the future researcher interested in non-

English resource trends in the USA, then everything we can possibly do must be done to make sure that we have located all the non-English language using ethnic community periodicals, ethnic community broadcasts, ethnic community schools and ethnic community churches for the 1979-80 period. Once and for all, a full, reliable and valid count must be made or we will never really be able to know whether (or which) non-English language resources are rising, falling or remaining stable and in which part(s) of the country. It was my considered judgment that it was necessary to break out of this bind and that it was more important to do so here and now than to discontinue our demographic efforts in midstream for the purposes of undertaking and completing analyses and interpretations of the samples of qualitative data that we had also obtained but merely filed. It is true that this latter data now await "redemption," but we pray that such redemption will not be overly long in coming in terms of future grant support for what may yet come to be known as Language Resources V.

There is another reflection of the success of the efforts and the utility of the data that the current project supported and elicited. In 1963-64, when my analytic and interpretative efforts pertaining to Language Resources I were happily completed (I was then at the Center for Advances Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California), I was tremendously saddened by the fact that the thousands upon thousands of names and addresses of ethnic com-

munity non-English language using units that I had located were of no interest or concern to anyone. Within a few years my files became outdated as new units came into being and old ones died, moved or changed their names/amalgamated. An imcomparable data base, incomplete though it was, soon lost its value because there was no recognition of the need to continually update it. That which in other countries is an aspect of national bookkeeping was left in our country to the unpredictable whims of individual researchers and funding agencies. Even my efforts to simply store the data that I had accumulated were defeated by the limitations of university storage capacity and the all too real risks that during sabbaticals and field work periods abroad unauthorized "disposals" would be made by university dead storage custodians. Fortunately, this will probably not be the fate of Language Resources III data. The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education has agreed to enter our name and address data into its computer and to prepare printouts and directories (by language and/or by locality) to all who would care to have them at a nominal charge. This is a tremendous gain for all those who are concerned, as I am, in rational language planning and language use in the USA. In addition, NCBE has also agreed to provide some minimal support so that I can undertake to update these unit files at least once (Language Resources VI: 1981-1982) and perhaps twice (again in 1983-84) in the near future. This/these future update/s will also be available on-line from NCBE.

Two swallows do not make a summer, but they are far better than no swallows at all. Actually, however, what is needed is a permanent data collecting, analyzing and information providing Research and Development Center on the Non-English Language Resources of the USA. Such a CONELR is long overdue, is indispensable for future language planning and language policy efforts in the USA, and can have no other conceivable data-based point of departure than the Language Resources III data herin reported.

On concluding this project and its report - non-definitive though they both are if for no other reason than that good research always points to necessary further studies - I would like to acknowledge and wholeheartedly thank those students, assistants and associates who worked so hard along with me, often on a volunteer basis, on behalf of Language Resources III: Maxine Diamond, Avrom Fishman, Dr. Michael Gertner, Esther G. Lowy, Barbara Markman, Dr. William Milan, Judith Petardi and Ellen Rosenblatt. I have been extremely fortunate to have such a competent and dedicated "crew" at my side on this enjoyable but exhausting effort to plumb resources that were far greater than any of us had initially imagined. Finally, my sincerest and heartfelt gratitude are hereby expressed to Anne Bucknam of the Yeshiva University Grants Office, whose aid was so vital in enabling me to apply for support for Language Resources III, and, above all, to Julia Petrov of the International Studies Branch, Education Department, whose understanding and encouragement have

long motivated me to go beyond whatever point I had reached in my study of the non-English language resources of the United States.

Joshua A. Fishman, Ph.D.
November, 1980

P.S. Since the completion of our efforts in conjunction with Language Resources III, two fine references, one "old" and, unfortunately, hitherto unknown to me, and one "new" and therefore unavailable to me, have come to my attention. The former is Wayne Miller's unbelievably exhaustive Comprehensive Bibliography for the Study of American Minorities (2 volumes!), New York, New York University Press, 1976. This reference tool will now be updated at regular intervals. The "new" reference, referred to above, is, of course, The Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1980), for which I have written the longish essay on "Language and Ethnicity." Both of these works should be consulted for more detailed insight into particular non-English language resources in the United States, e.g. in connection with the material presented in Chapter 4 of this report on any one or another language group. It is, indeed a pleasure to have two such invaluable tools as are the above-names volumes for use in furthering knowledge and appreciation of the non-English language resources of our country.

CHAPTER 1

CULTURAL PLURALISM AND THE AMERICAN SCHOOL

Joshua A. Fishman
Yeshiva University*

I will not say much about either Title VII (The Bilingual Education Act) or Lau. The former has been refunded twice (1974, 1979) after its initial adoption (1969) and is probably "here to stay" as a demonstration effort to assist non-English language background children improve their English language skills. The latter is now, finally, on its way to being fully defined, via the Federal Register, as a Supreme Court ordered (1974) and Office of Civil Rights enforced requirement that justice ("equity") be done for such children, so that they do not fall behind educationally while their English skills are being improved. The fact that the one is a federally funded demonstration program and the other is a court mandated effort enforced by the executive branch of government are themselves fully indicative of the well nigh complete lack of American educational rank-and-file support for either of these ventures. Neither of them are accomplishments of the American School enterprise and to the extent that this enterprise is involved in either or both of them (this extent being still small but constantly, though slowly, growing) it was either enticed (bribed?) or forced into doing so. Indeed, if there has been any

* Prepared under grant No. G00-79-01816 Office of Education, International Studies Branch ("Language Resources Of The United States Revisited").

massive, authoritative, organized expression of action and opinion of "the American School" enterprise at the regional, state and local levels concerning Title VII and/or Lau it has been to oppose them, to harrass them and to sabotage them. Both AFT and NEA are good examples of the above and they are both outdone by local school administrations only in that the latter have found out how to take federal monies and even state and local tax levies meant for bilingual education with one hand while opposing it, harrassing it and sabotaging it with the other.

No, I will not say more about Title VII or Lau. They were not intended for the purposes of cultural pluralism (GAO 1974, Schneider 1976). They will not attain cultural pluralism, not even when they are naively misused on behalf of that very purpose by ethnic community educators and spokesmen. Indeed Title VII and Lau were intended for purposes opposite to cultural pluralism and, given sufficient assistance from societal factors that are far stronger than education -- economic and political factors to be precise -- they could both contribute to the total establishment effort in the direction of an evolving monocultural America (Gaarder 1970, Kjolseth 1973).

What is Cultural Pluralism?

Cultural pluralism must not be confused with biculturism. The latter is a euphemism for ephemeral exposure to a melange of marginal and discrete representation of cultural deiversity (Gay 1975, Baker 1976). Biculturism involves neither personal commitment nor societal participation on the part of the learner. It is constantly and even rapidly changing, fusing, reconstituting, and basically unifying or integrating the

kaleidoscopic American scene. America is very basically and deeply a bicultural phenomenon evolving slowly toward a socio-cultural unity based on many highly diverse ethno-religious heritages. This unity has, by and large, always been expanding during the past two centuries. It has hardly ever been questioned in terms of its supra-ethnic desirability. It has constantly been evolving, constantly been influenced somewhat by ingredients contributed to it by newer immigrant waves, and constantly been associated with the overarching English language, overarching democratic principles and processes and overarching social mobility aspirations. The melting pot is not dead!; in modern America the melting pot itself functions via biculturism. It will never make Boston Yankees of us all -- and it was a mistake to think that it would --but it will make us all "bicultural Americans", keeping other (less generally shared and more locally meaningful) aspects of our identies increasingly secondary and individualistic. Unless cultural pluralism is recognized our progress toward biculturism is merely a function of economic and immigrational pace.

So then what is cultural pluralism? Cultural pluralism is a societal arrangement. It is the societal protection of societal biculturism. It is societal (i.e. the stable, political and economic) support for ethnoculturally different homes, neighborhoods, communities and regions, on a permanent basis (i.e. on a basis far outlasting the three generation rule of thumb for immigrational biculturism), for those populations that seek to cultivate an authenticity of their own in addition to the generally shared American biculturism. That authenticity will also evolve, undergoing the inevitable transmutations

of culture change, just as will general American biculturism per se, but it will do so according to a different rythm and direction and these differences (always as additions to rather than as a substitute for the contours of generally shared American biculturism with which they will always be in contact and by which they will always be surrounded) will be considered to be matters of fundamental right, overarching value and universal positive concern. (Fishman 1980a. In this sense Switzerland represents cultural pluralism in accord with the "territorial principal and Norway or non-Gaeltacht Ireland in accord with the "personality principle" (McRae 1975). It is the "personality principle" which is the only one that might conceivably meld with America's tempo, its geographic mobility and its political institutions and traditions -- ethnically and linguistically innocent as they are. The personality principle is by far the weaker & the less stable of the two societal patterns for cultural pluralism but at least it is a principle. It sets pragmatic and voluntary requirements for cultural pluralism. Enough people have to want it, and if they do, they deserve it wherever they may be found in sufficient numbers to make it practically feasible to offer these individuals the societal support that they need in order implement their additional ethnocultural exposure and to do so as a societal desideratum defined to be in the public interest. In this sense there is no cultural pluralism in the United States today and "the American School" not only does nothing to encourage such pluralism but generally functions as a factor in opposition to the development of sentiments or practices on behalf of such pluralism (Lopez 1973, Epstein 1977).

Divisiveness vs. the Public Interest

The major initial impediment to cultural pluralism in the United States is undoubtedly that our non-English language background populations have generally neither been interested nor organized in pursuing it and, indeed, to the extent that some small proportion of them have been conscious of this area of discourse at all, they have more often than not been interested in avoiding cultural pluralism than in attaining it (Fishman 1966). However, were they to be substantially interested in cultural pluralism -- as a very few Hispanics and their spokesmen are today -- they would doubtlessly by -- and are -- accused of divisivness and of advocating a policy that is not in the public interest. As for the first accusation -- one that has already even been hurled at Title VII and at Lau, establishment creatures though they be! -- it is pure delusion; and as for the second, it is a self aggrandizing projection of the classical Freudian variety. American rank-and-file educators and educational spokesmen are among the major purveyors of both of these irresponsible charges (Shanker 1980).

The "divisiveness" label openly attached and covertly insinuated with respect to those few among our ethnocultural minorities interested in cultural pluralism -- and their even fewer mainstream supporters, e.g. Hunter 1973 -- is a particularly vicious one. It is completely unfounded. I have been studying American Hispanics, German-Americans, Franco-Americans and Jews for over two decades and Ukrainian-Americans, Hungarian-Americans, Native Americans, Chinese-Americans, Armenian Americans and Greek Americans for nearly that amount of time, and about the only thing that I have almost never come across in this

entire period is any manifestation of politicized divisiveness (secessionism, principled lack of support for and involvement in America's political system or rejection of the democratic values on which it is based, support for terrorism/sabotage of any kind or cooperation with foreign powers in opposition to American policies or interests). Puerto Rican terrorists, it should be remembered, have no aspirations vis-a-vis any section of the continental USA and even vis-a-vis the Island per se, they are an infinitesimally small minority. Indeed, our ethnocultural minorities tend to be the most appreciative Americans I have encountered, the most dedicated, the most self-sacrificing in times of trouble, the most protective of America when traveling abroad, the most consciously "involved" vis-a-vis their Americanness. Those who suspect them of being otherwise not only demean them unjustly but may be pursuing some impossible and unwholesome figment of sociocultural homogeneity that can never be satisfied by America's bicultural reality. For some teachers, non-Anglo ethnicity per se is suspect if not anathema. Such teachers have a serious problem. Such teachers do not understand America and the fact that there is no unitary American people in the sense that there is a Swedish or Portugues people (AACTE 1972). They see ghosts and they fight phantoms. There is no constitutionally specified or legally defined Anglo-American core, just as there is no constitutional or statutory definition of English as our national or only official language (Heath 1977). These lacks are not accidents. They reflect the abiding reality of American biculturism relative to the monoculturism that typifies so many other countries (Turi 1977). It is paranoid to charge those who implement their biculturism squarely and

solely within the framework of American constitutional and statutory law with being divisive. Indeed it seems to me that those who are most obviously rejective of American values in this connection are the very ones who charge ethnics with being rejective of America.

If the "divisiveness" charge vis-a-vis cultural pluralism is nothing short of an aberration, the related charge of being "contrary to national interest" is nothing short of self-serving partisanship. Teachers unions that may and do use strikes and political action as means of furthering their own interests do not view themselves as being divisive or in pursuite of parochial interests, whereas they do view ethnic cultural pluralists in this fashion. Marxists and liberals of all hues who may and do advocate class struggle and economic determinism do not define themselves as being divisive or as or in pursuite of "single issue politics", whereas they do seek to convince one and all that ethnic spokesmen and ethnic goals are characterizable in these very terms (Patterson 1977). Wonder of wonders: salvaging the vitality of the Chrysler corporation is widely regarded as being in the national interest wheras salvaging the cultural vitality of Chicanos or Cajuns or Navajos is not. Is this not a perfect reflection of the materialism, anti-intellectualism and parochialism of American educators and of American society? Is this not internal colonialism and imperialism -- or are these tendencies only to be decried outside of our boarders but never within? Whatever it is, it is a double standard, a self-serving standard, a false moral standard, which waxes eloquent while starving the weak and feeding one's self, which defines one's own interest as universal, general, good for all, while besmirching the interest

of competitors as petty and vile. No, I refuse to see the pursuite of cultural pluralism in the USA as anything other than ill-starred. We have succeeded in co-optingthe ethnics,not only against their own better interests but against the nations as well. That does not make cultural pluralism ill-conceived, nor does it excuse "the American School" for viewing it negatively and treating it shabbily. It is a legitimate pursuite for those who value it and a priceless national resource to which many can contribute and from which all can benefit.

The School as a Moral Arena

In modern America -- indeed, particularly in modern America with its diversity of creeds and its peripheralization of religion from the core of public debate -- the school has become a major (at times the major) moral institution. It was and is at the center of the modern struggle for civil rights. It was at the center of the opposition to the internally-conflicted war in Vietnam. It was and is at the center of affirmative action programs for minorities and women. It was and is related to all our programs for social amelioration (including, therefore, the programs for those who are of "non-English language background"). The fact that the school is not nearly as actively involved in the struggle for cultural pluralism is thus merely a reflection of the fact that the latter is generally not viewed as a moral issue of all-inclusive significance and, indeed, is less likely to be so viewed by schools than by courts, industries, museums, radio/television or other institutions of American life. Nonetheless, it is a moral issue: an issue of cultural democracy. It may well take a Supreme Court decision, one that

will be as epoch-making as the court's desegregation decision, before the generality of American educators will give it its due. To our shame, this was also the case (and generally remains the case) vis-a-vis desgregation. Cultural democracy is even less well understood and even less valued than is desegregation by the rank-and-file of American educators. If it were more valued by them then it would not be faced with the specious AFT argument that "it should be left to the home" or "it should be left to the church". Do we leave the rescue of the Chrysler corporation to individual donations? Are the collective-bargaining rights of teachers left to the mercies of local congregations? Would the advocates of ERA be satisfied to put their faith in individual homes and churches in order to accomplish their goals? Are sex-education or vocational training or health and welfare programs left up to individual homes and churches? Of course not! It is a reflection of the dismal failure of cultural pluralism as a moral issue that it has not been able to redefine itself widely to American teachers or to the public at large as being in the public interest and, therefore, as deserving of the societal political and economic recognition without which it cannot exist.

Were cultural pluralism to be recognized as the moral imperative of cultural democracy then more public schools might be oriented to cooperate with their local communities (basically: local parents but also local business and industry, cultural organizations, cultural leadership, mass media, etc.) on behalf of cultural pluralism. Most American schools would certainly still pursue nothing more than biculturism (which is to cultrual pluralism what art and music appreciation are to

genuine art and music) while others would be content with Title VII/Lau bilingualism (which are to societal diglossia (Fishman 1967) what brushing ones teeth from right to left or from left to right are to healthy dental care), but some would do more than that. Some would make it possible for still hidden ethnic dimensions of social identity to flourish in the sun and to do so in the public interest , societally respected, societally valued, societally supported, because they contribute to our country's language resources. It will then no longer be necessary to be ignorant of grandma's mother tongue before it can be legitimately taught-but-not-learned in school. Publically fostered cultural pluralism would contribute to our country's art, music, song, literature, dance (at a level infinitely more live and meaningful than "show and tell"). It would contribute to our country's sensitivity to the world and its ability to empathize with it, communicate with it and participate in it. I can think of no more moral thing for some American schools to do. When they begin doing so they will not only be schools-in-society, a redundancy if there ever was one in-so-far as public schools go), but schools-of-society as well (something much harder to be). We still have a long, long way to go before any number of American schools will get from where they are to where they should be in this connection.

What about English and Other American Educational Verities?

Can cultural pluralism be attained without lowering achievement in English, history, literature, science, etc.,etc.? My studies of the nearly 2000 all day bilingual schools under ethnic community auspices in the USA convince me that this is so (Fishman and Markman 1979).

These schools come as close as we come in the USA to cultural pluralism in the educational arena. Some of them are under secular auspices while others are under religious auspices. They serve the ethnic poor and the ethnic middle classes. Almost without exception their students are at or above the national norm on tests of English, mathematics, etc. Their students are overwhelmingly American born and their parent-bodies are primarily so (Fishman 1980b). They possess no pedagogic or motivational secrets and accomplish no miracles in these connections. They are plagued by fiscal problems, staff shortages, deficiencies in programs and materials, etc. , etc. However, come what may, they do not discontinue use of the ethnic mother tongue as a medium of instruction nor do they withdraw from literacy in the ethnic mother tongue throughout their 6 year, 8 year, or 12 year courses of study. Indeed, they seem to have intuitively hit upon the very same factors of prolonged biliteracy stress (i.e., continued literacy in both languages for at least 6 years) and maximal community involvement that typify the many successful Title VII and Lau - mandated schools that I have promised not to say anything further about in this paper (Cummins 1980, Leyba 1978, Troike 1978). All I will say is that when a few courageous American public schools and public schoolmen will finally push on beyond tepid biculturism to vibrant cultural pluralism they can expect to be evaluated ad nauseum only in terms of how much English (and other general subject matter) their children have mastered. They have nothing to fear in this connection. The "Anglos" aren't doing so well themselves! The bulk of the children performing below the norm in English and other school subjects are monolingual English speakers completely unmarred

by recent non-English ethnicity. While the mainstreams of American education is struggling with that issue -- an issue that cannot be blamed on the ethnics, on purported secessionist tendencies, or on lack of consensus as to what is in the public interest -- the side stream that will be committed to cultural pluralism as an addition to (not as a substitute for) and as an enrichment of the common American educational experience will be educating youngsters for an America in which societal bilingualism and societal biculturism are valued, fostered and protected as national resources and as democratic rights, for those who want them and who are lucky enough still to be engaged in them on a societal basis. When (and if) such a side-stream of American education comes into being it will inevitable have to turn to ethnic America and its educational materials, practices and experiences in order to function with as much sophistication and sensitivity as possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AACTE. No one model American. Journal of Teacher Education 1973, Winter, 264-265.

Baker, Gwendolyn C. Instructional priorities in a culturally pluralistic school. Educational Leadership. 1974, December, 176-182.

Cummins, Jim. The Cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. TESOL Quarterly. 1980, 14, 187-188.

Epstein, Noel. Language, Ethnicity and the Schools. Washington, George Washington University Institute for Educational Leadership, 1977.

Fishman, Joshua A. Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague Mouton, 1966.

Fishman, Joshua A. Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23(2) 29-38.

Fishman J.A. and Barbara R. Markman. The Ethnic Mother Tongue School in America: Assumptions, Findings, Directory. New York, Yeshiva University (Final Report to N/E on Grant G-78-033, Project No. 8-0860) 1979.

Fishman, Joshua A. Bilingualism and biculturism as individual and as societal phenomena. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 1980a, 1, 3-15.

Fishman, Joshua A. Ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA: dynamics and distributions. International Migration Review, 1980b, 235-247.

Gaarder, A.B. The first seventy-six bilingual education projects. Georgetown University Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics, 1970, 23, 163-178.

GAO (General Accounting Office). Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Washington, GAO, 1976.

Gay, Geneva. Organizing and designing a culturally pluralistic curriculum. Educational Leadership, 1975, December, 176-183.

Heath, Shirley B. Our language heritage: a historical perspective in June Phillips, ed. The Language Connection; From the Classroom to the World. Skokie, National Textbook Co., 1977, 23-52.

Hunter, Wm. Cultural pluralism: The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Journal of Teacher Education, 1973, 24, 262-264.

Kjolseth, Rolf. Bilingual education programs in the United States: for assimilation or pluralism? in P.R. Turner, ed., Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson, University of Arizona Press, 1973, 3-27.

Leyba, Charles F. Longitudinal Study: Title VII Bilingual Programs Santa Fe Public Schools. Los Angeles, National Dissemination and Assessment Center, 1978.

Lopez, Thomas R. Jr. Cultural pluralism: political hoax? Educational need? The Journal of Teacher Education, 1973, 24, 277-281.

McRae, Kenneth D. The principle of territoriality and the principle of personality in multilingual states. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 1975, 4, 33-54.

Patterson, Orlando. Ethnic Chauvinism: The Reactionary Impulse. New York, Stein and Day, 1977.

Schneider, Susan. Revolution, Reaction or Reform: The 1974 Bilingual Education Act. New York, Los Americas, 1976.

Shanker, Irving. New York Times, August 23, 1980. Weekly column in the "Review of the Week" section.

Troike, R. Research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education. NABE, 1978, 3,13-24.

Turi, Giuseppe. Les Dispositions Juridico-Constitutionneles 147 Etats en Matiere de Politique Linguistique. Quebec City, CIRB 1977.

CHAPTER 2

WHORFIANISM OF THE THIRD KIND: ETHNOLINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AS A WORLDWIDE SOCIETAL ASSET

(The Whorfian Hypothesis: Varieties of Validation, Confirmation and Disconfirmation II)*

Joshua A. Fishman
Yeshiva University

Abstract

Two hypotheses associated with Benjamin Lee Whorf, W_1 or the linguistic relativity hypotheses and W_2 or the linguistic determinism hypothesis, have overshadowed a third, W_3 , that champions ethnolinguistic diversity for the benefit of pan-human creativity, problem solving and mutual cross-cultural acceptance. With respect to W_3 Whorf is a disciple of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) with whom he shares many themes and basic perspectives. Although basic methodological and philosophy of science differences, particularly those that distinguish linear, quantitative experimentalism from the reborn wholistic and ethnographic stress on meaning, may ultimately make it just as difficult to conclude what has been empirically demonstrated with respect to W_3 as it already is with respect to W_1 and, particularly, W_2 , nevertheless, W_3 has a valuable humanizing and sensitizing effect on the language-related disciplines. Indeed, in that respect it may well have value above and beyond its scientific validity.

Key words: Whorfian hypothesis, Johann Gottfried Herder, multilingualism/multiculturalism, methodology theory relationships in the language sciences.

We are currently witnessing a revival of Whorf in linguistics and anthropology and it is a wonderous sight to behold (see, e.g., Alford 1978, Friedrich 1979, Silverstein 1979). This revival is all the more a phenomenon worth pondering given that previously some two generations of researchers (primarily working within research traditions that come closest to replicating natural science paradigms within the social sciences) had overwhelmingly passed negative judgements upon what were widely considered to be the most crucial as well as the most stimulating hypotheses of Benjamin Lee Whorf. Indeed, for some 25 years (at least from the late 50's to the late 70's) it was exceedingly hard to find a good word on behalf of Whorf in hardnosed, quantitative, experimental social science circles per se or in the philosophical-theoretical circles derived from and influenced most directly by them. During many of these years only a few courageous stalwarts (Dell Hymes first and foremost among them (1966)) among the leading lights of the language related disciplines, held the fort and kept the faith in so far as Whorf and Whorfianism are concerned; but even they obviously did so in conjunction with more wholistic and non-quantitative "poetic" perspectives than the empirical tradition of American hypothetico-

deductive science is either accustomed to, comfortable with or impressed by. What was generally overlooked during this long period of widespread skepticism or outright rejection of Whorfianism was that his defenders and his detractors were not always reacting to the same facets of Whorf's thinking, were not apparently always concerned with exactly the same theories and, finally, were, therefore, not impressed by the same data, proofs or tests.

Methodological Differences: Interpretational Differences

Now, as the worm turns (or begins to do so), it seems clear to me that for a quarter century so many of us in the language related disciplines have been so mesmerized (positively or negatively) by two theories so commonly associated with Whorf (The linguistic relativity hypothesis, which I will call W1, i.e. "Whorf-sub-one", and the linguistic determinism hypothesis, which I will call W2, i.e. "Whorf-sub-two")[1] that the rest of Whorf remained correspondingly obscured. It was all the more difficult to recognize that much of Whorf himself was being substantially neglected in the process, when not only where W1 and W2 recurringly found wanting but when they were so found by what was then a new breed of researchers who themselves initially represented and expressed a significant expansion of what the language related disciplines had been before their arrival on the scene. Let us remember that the 50's and 60's (and even the 70's) constitute a time in which a definite methodological tradition matured and diversified within the language related disciplines: the tradition of quantitative experimentation following classical independent

variable - dependent variable lines of inquiry, proof and argumentation. This tradition, let us also remember, was drastically different from the more text-analytic, descriptive-anecdotal, ethnographic, holistic and non-linear commentary and analysis that Whorf himself had employed and that most of his adherants preferred and prefer to this very day. Given these major differences as to the nature of evidence and as to the nature of proof that obtained between Whorf and his critics (and, more recently, between his staunchest defenders and his critics), it is now evident, insofar as W1 and W2 are concerned, that not only do the critics and the defenders disagree as to what has been proven but that they also disagree as to what Whorf's hypotheses were to begin with.

Clarification of the latter (what Whorf "really" meant) is no easy matter. It is complicated by the fact that Whorf died in 1941 at the regrettably early age of 44. All of his professional writing transpired between 1925 and 1941. Thus, he has now been dead for almost two and a half times as many years as he had available to clarify and finalize his own hypotheses. Even during his own life time he was aware of some doubts and misunderstandings -- even in the circle of his friends and admirers, including Sapir -- and began to revise, restate and reinterpret his own views and the inconsistencies that inevitably were to be found among them given the fact that they were always evolving rather than fixed and final in his own mind. Nevertheless, he was granted very little time for such revisions and emendations as he may have had in mind, and, as a result, he left us only the equivalent of one slim volume of professional writings (totaling under 300 pages). Interpretations, tests and evaluations of W1 and W2 are by now obviously much more voluminous

than Whorf's work itself. Although he has become a legend (hero or failure, as the case may be) that status has added nothing to either the clarity of his own writings or to the uniformity of interpretations to which they have been subjected.

The critique of criticism

Increasingly, current-day defenders of Whorf attack his detractors as either (a) never having read or (b) vulgarizing him. The "never having read Whorf" criticism siezes upon the extensive anti-Whorf literature and accuses the critics of having largely read each other, thereby merely contributing exegeses to each other's texts, rather than of having had recourse to Whorf's original views. Whether justified or not in this particular case, there is an obvious danger for methodologically different traditions to be ideologically disinclined to read each other. This disinclination stems not only from the formalized and avowed higher level differences that separate them, but from the fact that reading each other's literature is often a truly aggravating and unenlightening experience, given that it is accompanied every step of the way by lower level disagreements as to what is data, what is interpretation and what is demonstration. The "vulgarization of Whorf" criticism is also highly precedented in the anals of cross-methodological and cross-philosophical/ideological debate. Not unlike criticism of Marx of Freud, much criticism of Whorf has been labeled simplification, reductionism, atomization, distortion, etc. (e.g., note Alford's 1979 criticism of Brown 1976, Berlin and Kay 1969, Cole and Scribner 1974, Slobin 1971 and others; on the other hand, note the critiques of Whorf in each of the above-mentioned sources. For an exhaustive list of quantitative-experimental criticisms of Whorf in

connection with W2 in particular see Sridhar 1980). Similarly, the defenders of Whorf have not escaped unscathed, having been dubbed mystics, romantics, dogmatists and anecdotalists.

The underlieing point that I am trying to make is one that is of wide significance, its implications going far beyond Whorfian hypotheses W1 and W2 and even beyond linguistics or the language related disciplines. The problems sketched above with respect to defining and confirming may be expected to multiply rather than to diminish, precisely as a by-product of disciplinary growth and inter-disciplinary stimulation. The broader and the more inclusive a field of inquiry becomes-- and the language related disciplines taken together are certainly among those to have experienced the most remarkable flowering and expansion during the past quarter century -- the more likely just such problems are to arise. What is data, what constitutes proof, what is disconfirmation, indeed, just what is the problem, these all become less consensual rather than more so as inter-disciplinary perspective increases. Indeed, this is the price that we pay, and that work on the Whorfian hypotheses has paid, whenever we focus disparate methodological perspectives on the same problem. Different methodologies are different languages. They are not duplicates of one another. They intertranslate only roughly rather than exactly. They are different weltanschauungen and, therefore, rather than articulate in any fine-grained manner they are immediately valuable precisely because they highlight different aspects of reality. Ultimately, a type of bilingual/bicultural accommodation may be attainable between them but that takes more time, effort and

good will than science or scientists can frequently spare. W1 itself would have predicted that maximally different methodological languages would be maximally divergent in defining and discussing W1 and in deciding on its validity accordingly.

Quite understandably the rise (or return) of ethnography, wholism, linguistics of intent and anthropology of meaning during the past decade has resulted in a new view of Whorf's work and in new hope among those who are "attuned" to him intuitively or philosophically, not to mention those few who stood by him during the long dry spell from the 50's through to the late 70's. For many others, however, the recent change in zeitgeist (Methodengeist?) has left the basic issue either unresolved or in a distinct state of contention -- and particularly so with respect to W2 -- not only as to the truth of the matter (i.e., as to what has or has not been proven), but even with respect to the issue per se (i.e. as to what Whorf himself did or did not claim in that connection). While I will not dwell upon my own views on these matters here,[2] I will briefly reiterate my considered opinion that regardless of what our personal (or posterity's) judgment with respect to the above matters may be the past quarter century's intellectual struggle with these hypotheses has been eminently worth-while. Not only have W1 and W2 been re-examined and possibly rehabilitated but, more importantly, the struggle has stimulated and even fathered a number of related fields of unquestioned worth and vitality. Such fields as language universals (at least in their Greenbergian realizations, viz. Ferguson 1978), ethnosciences (including ethnotypologies and ethnocognition as a whole)

and sociolinguistics per se might all be weaker today if some of their leading formulators and adherants had not quite consciously been either struggling with or for Whorf (i.e., with or for W1 and/or W2) as they rightly or wrongly understood him. Even if W2 in particular were ultimately to be discarded as untenable the stimulation that it will have provided, both to its erstwhile supporters and its erstwhile detractors -- not unlike the stimulation provided by certain unconfirmed hypotheses of Freud and Marx -- will have resulted in permanent gains for the very disciplines that considered it most seriously, pro and con. This too should be a lesson to us for the future: the interaction between Zeitgeist in methodology of the social sciences, on the other hand, and Zeitgeist in the sociology of knowledge, on the other hand, inescapable though it may be may nevertheless be worthwhile. Every orthodoxy, being simultaneously an orthodoxy in both of the above respects (i.e. in respect to what is known and in respect to how knowledge may be pursued) -- whether this be Chomskyism, ethnomethodologism, ethnographism, or natural scientism in the language related disciplines -- leads away from certain topics, sensitivities and questions as well toward others topics sensitivities and questions. If we are lucky the gain may equal or exceed the loss, and if we are wise: no orthodoxy --not even our own-- will remain unchallenged for very long.

Yet another side to Whorf: the value of ethnolinguistic diversity.

As mentioned earlier, inter-disciplinary and inter-methodological struggles with and about W1 and W2 have tended to obscure from sight another aspect of Whorf. I am referring to Whorf as a neo-Herderian

champion -- linked to Herder by the usual intellectual linkage system of students to teachers and the teachers, in turn, to their teachers, and in this particular case via Sapir, Boaz, Wundt and von Humboldt (this complete linkage system not yet being fully confirmed but quite clearly reasonable (Y.M. 1974)) -- of a multilingual, multicultural world in which "little peoples" and "little languages" would not only be respect but valued (Fishman 1978). The advisability of such a world order has long been a bone of contention in the Euro-Mediterranean world in which for some three and a half thousand years opposing distinctly polar views with respect to this issue have been recurringly restated and reexamined. The two poles mentioned above were occupied, on the one hand, by ancient Hebrew and Greek prophets and social philosophers, and, on the other hand, by spokesman for the Western Roman Empire and The Western Catholic Church. The former conceived of the world ethnocentrically, (Patterson 1977) perhaps, but yet ethno-pluralistically, viewing ethnolinguistic diversity as part and parcel of the fundamental nature of human society and viewing ethnolinguistic stability or the intactness of any ethnolinguistic collectivity as sanctified (and, if "properly" enacted, i.e. enacted in accord with the divine mission or design that existed for each and every people, as eternal). In accord with this view, transethnification and translinguification were viewed as cataclysmic tragedies whereas ethnolinguistic intergenerational continuity --if "properly" enacted -- was viewed as its own reward: ennobling, authentic, fulfilling. This tradition, initially encoded via classical Judaism, Eastern Orthodox Christianity and early Islam -- all of which yielded systems of thought and valuation which are still generally in accord with these views to this very day -- first reached Central Europe via Slavic (i.e. Eastern Orthodox)

influences on Czech and German medieval social philosophiers (Jakobson 1945). It is then subsequently available -- with ever-increasing stress on a language aspect of authenticity -- to become an ingredient of early Reformation thinking and, subsequently, has numerous Western as well as Central and Eastern European spokesmen and defenders (Deutsch 1942).

Meanwhile, the Western Empire and the Church that it adopted and that finally became its major hier, had developed a theory of language and ethnicity more in accord with their own needs, opportunities and much greater technical capacities. From their point of view small and localized ethnolinguistic collectivities were quite natural, and even desirable, early stages of social organization, but as no more than that. As greater opportunities, rewards, understandings and benefits (spiritual as well as material) became available, populations were expected to naturally reethnify and relinguify accordingly, in pursuite of their own best interests. Thus, except for lags attributable to temporary break-downs in the reward-system and to the self-seeking stubbornness of local leaders (afraid of being deprived of their prerogatives) what the East viewed as sanctified and eternal the West viewed as open, changeable and reward-determined. Any particular ethnolinguistic boundary came to be viewed in the West as no more than a functional and possibly temporary reflection of the authoritative flow of rewards in the past, and, therefore, as naturally and even joyfully invalidated by newer, more effective, more beneficial reward arrangements. The outer limit of this process -- both for the Western Empire/Church and its more modern, secular substitutes and replacements -- was a unified mankind within a single unified realm, subscribing to a universal value system

and --as a result of all of the foregoing -- speaking a universal language. Thus, what has come to be viewed as the epitome of rational self-interest and enlightened pan-human concern for some -- including predominant present-day liberal, statist, Marxist, and neutralist sociological schools of thought -- is viewed by others (usually operating on a more local and intimate scale) as the epitome of dehumanization and self-destruction. Many modern societies -- including the USA and the USSR -- have simultaneously inherited major segments of both of the above traditions and, therefore, are internally conflicted rather than merely being conflicted with viewpoints from outside their own borders. In this respect --as in many others-- Whorf is an avowed Easterner rather than a Westerner. To show this clearly requires another brief detour in order that we may review Herder's major premises.

Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803): praeceptor slavorum[3]

Herder's unique contribution to the above sketched arena of competing values and purposes was to sidestep either extreme --or to co-opt them both-- via the view that the entire world needs a diversity of ethnolinguistic entities for its own salvation, for its greater creativity, for the more certain solution of human problems, for the constant rehumanization of humanity in the face of materialism, for fostering greater esthetic, intellectual and emotional capacities for humanity as a whole, indeed, for arriving at a higher stage of human functioning. It is precisely in order to arrive at this higher stage and in order to participate more fully in it that less powerful ethnolinguistic collectivities must be protected, respected and assisted, because it is they who have

the most vital contribution to make to these desirable goals.

While he shared the Hebreo-Greek view that loyalty to one's authentic tradition is a sine qua non that inevitably brings its own rewards, he went beyond that tradition in two major respects. Within any authentic tradition he stressed its authentic language as constituting the very center on which all else depended. Furthermore, the rewards of fidelity to language and way of life he considered to be available not only to the community in which these originated but to all of mankind. For Herder, and for genuine pluralists since Herder, the great creative forces that will inspire all humanity do not derive out of universal civilization but out of the individuality of separate ethnic collectivities --most particularly, out of their very own authentic languages. Only if each collectivity contributes its own thread to the tapestry of world history, and only if each is accepted and respected for making its own contribution, can nationalities finally also be ruled by a sense of reciprocity, learning and benefiting from each other's contributions as well. In this fashion Herder encompasses both the particular and the universal. He considers political and economic arrangements that unite and that transcend individual peoples as possible and as desirable, but only if they are built upon and derive from a genuine prior cultivation of ethnolinguistic individuality, because it is only the latter that can render the constituent parts active, creative, contributing, self-respecting and other-accepting members of any supra-national design. For Herder the two levels, the smaller and the larger, are ultimately simultaneously ongoing, rather than the latter displacing the former.

Even from the above brief paraphrasing it should be clear how much of current thinking (and how much more of current feeling) in the

language related disciplines is Herderian in origin. Members of these disciplines are often deeply saddened to learn of mother-tongue-loss and of cultural assimilation on the part of small and powerless ethnolinguistic entities. Indeed, in deeply unconscious and pre-scientific ways, convictions such as these are among the very ones that brought many of us to linguistics, to anthropology, to bilingual education and to a variety of ethnic studies. It is Herder who most clearly and forcefully formulated these views. He did not wince at their romanticism, as many of us do now, for, unlike us, rationalists at least in our professional guises, he firmly believed that it was at the level of the intuitive or pre-rational that the most profoundly human and creative experiences were to be encountered. Nevertheless, though our science clothes our pre-rationality far more fully than did Herder's literary, esthetic and folkloristic interests, most of us can still recognize in him hidden parts of ourselves. If we are attracted to Whorf too on some pre-rational, intuitive level, it is because Whorf too is an unabashed Herderian. Via his hypotheses W1 and W2 he seeks to control and tame or discipline the Herderian passions within him, but the passions are there nonetheless, and, scientific or not, it is high time we looked at that part of Whorf directly rather than indirectly.

Whorf and Herder: overlooked similarities in basic values

Herder's defense of backward Slavic Europe, a defense which stresses the untutored refinement and wisdom of peoples that have not capitulated to the massive blandishments of Western materialism, who experience life and nature in deeply poetic and collectively meaningful ways, are paralleled in Whorf by the latter's defense of Native Americans in particular

and of non-Western wisdom and perspective in general. However, while for Herder the specter of uniformation hovering over Europe appears in a French guise, insofar as Whorf is concerned the danger that approaches is predominantly Anglo-American and English in nature. It is not only that he views the Hopi language as revealing

> "... a higher plane of thinking, a more rational analysis of situations than our vaunted English... (which) compared to Hopi is like a bludgeon compared to a rapier (1956 (1930), 85)."

but that he recurringly finds the West in general and the English-fostering West in particular to be inferior conceptually, biased intellectually and overly proud, even haughty, interculturally. Whorf's view that the Greeks "debased" linguistics after the Hindus (Panini) had founded it at an exceptionally advanced level (1956 (1940), 232) is too well known to require citing here. Less well known is his view that

> "... the ideal of worldwide fraternity and cooperation fails if it does not include ability to adjust intellectually as well as emotionally to our breathern of other countries. The West... has <u>not</u> bridged the intellectual gulf; we are no nearer to understanding the types of logical thinking which are reflected in truly Eastern forms of scientific thought or analyses of nature. This requires...the...realization that they have equal scientific validity with our own thinking habits (1956 (1941), 21)."

Here we find not only Herder's theme that the universal is a fraud, a mask for the self-interest of the dominating over the dominated, but an insistance on putting the case precisely in terms of science itself. This, indeed, is one of Whorf's major themes: that science itself must accept the non-West as an equal and must come to view itself as no more obviously rational and objective than the so called mysterious East. Indeed, the West is highly irrational in Whorf's eyes, and Western science along with the rest, since it tends to confuse power with insight and understanding.

> "...(Do) our cultivated wheat and oats represent a higher evolutionary stage than a rare aster restricted to a few sites in the Himalayas(?). From the standpoint of a matured biology it is precisely the rare aster which has the better claim to high evolutionary eminence; the (Western) wheat owes its ubiquity and prestige merely to human economics and history. The eminence of our European tongues and thinking habits proceeds from nothing more (1956 (1936?), 84)."

As with Herder, therefore, there is a sharp anti-establishment bite to Whorf. Herder attacked French and Francofied interests in Europe as a whole and among Germans in particular; Whorf points his finger at the West as a whole and at Anglo-American-English imperialism in particular. In so doing, both Herder and Whorf not only are opposing long standing (taken for granted) intellectual assumptions but they are also foregoing

the safety and patronage that normally come from siding with the social and political establishment. Whorf's digs at English are particularly noteworthy if we consider that Anglo-American and other Western linguists were (and often still are) hard-put to detach themselves from its purported superiority.[4] Not only was Whorf completely free of any such popular wisdom vis-a-vis English but he was particularly dubious concerning schemes to foster Basic English or some other natural or artificial auxiliary language as the basis of world unity. There was no easy road to world unity, as far as Whorf was concerened, and the best that native speakers of English (particularly scientists who were native speakers of English) could do in pursuit of that goal was to supplement their English with "the point of view of multi-bilingual awareness (1956 (1941), 244)". More generally put, he warned:

> "Those who envision a future world speaking only one tongue, whether English, German or Russian, or any other, hold a misguided view and would do the evolution of the human mind the greatest disservice. Western culture has made, through language, a provisional analysis of reality and, without correctives, holds resolutely to that analysis as final. The only correctives lie in all those other tongues which by aeons of independent evolution have arrived at different but equally logical, provisional analyses (1956 (1941), 244)."

Although Whorf's overriding interest in language and cognition permeates all of his writing -- even most of that which is of a semi-popular or

lay nature (and which we also tend to overlook today, even though he was immensely involved in such writing as a public service) - his Herderian stress on diversity, on "all those other tongues", on genuine universality being attainable only via a "multilingual awareness" which accepts and utilizes the languages and perspectives of non-Western peoples, shines through and underlies all that he writes. Like Herder he believes that the world's little languages and peoples are a treasure-trove of wisdom and refinement. Only if this human treasure is valued and shared can biases be set aside and a genuine (rather than a self-serving imperialistic) universal perspective be attained. Is it any wonder that among American linguists Hymes has been the most outspoken opponent of the impovrishment that would result from seeking universals based on English alone (1971 [1974]), doing so precisely by invoking Herder.

As a neo-Herdian this side of Whorf, the Whorf of W3, is directly linked to much of the social consciousness of the language-in-society related disciplines. As such he is related to pluralistic language policies, to cultural democracy and language maintenance efforts, to enrichment bilingual education and to sympathy and assistance for the Third World in efforts to attain pan-human sanity and salvation. Whorf died still hoping against hope that a bilingual awareness might arise to reform the misguided Western world before it was too late, before "the impending darkness" (1956 [1942], 270) that he feared would decend upon us all -- including the world of science -- without such an awareness. It is Whorf's abiding faith in the benefits of linguistic diversity that attracted many of us to him and to the language related disciplines and that may well continue to do so regardless of the fate of W1 and W2.

Coming full circle: the scientific status and methodological implications of W3.

Can the Herder-Whorf vision of a better world based upon sharing a multiplicity of little languages and appreciating a variety of little peoples be tested, confirmed or revised and refined? Does it have a scientific rather than "merely" a humanistic or philosophical future? I think so, because even though neither Herder nor Whorf were marked by much econopolitical sophistication they might nevertheless both have been right (or wrong) on an empirical socio-psychological level alone. Much of the recent and ongoing work on global consciousness and international understanding has consistently demonstrated that active and advanced multilingualism is a significant independent variable in their prediction (Barrows, Clark and Klein 1980). (In addition, much of Wallace Lambert's work on the greater cognitive flexibility of bilingual (1962, 1973) is in direct agreement with the W3 school of thought. There has thus far been no explicit link between W3 and either of the above research endeavors but that is largely because W1 and W2 have substantially hidden W3 from sight. However, if that were no longer to be the case and if a veritable ground swell of interest in W3 were to develop I would predict that the consequences would be manifold, quite independently of their directionality in any substantive sense.

Some W3 researchers will doubltessly seek to render the status of this hypothesis more precise by operationalizing quantitative measures of its independent and dependent variables and by assigning subjects to randomly constituted, maximally contrasted treatment groups for the

purposes of controlled experimental comparison. Other researchers, however, will quite definitely take a quite different and more qualitative route toward testing W3. The two approaches may well disagree with respect to some of their findings, interpretations, and, indeed, with respect to their claims of fidelity to the original W3 hypothesis. Still other researchers will continue to believe (or, indeed, to disbelieve) in W3, entirely as a matter of devotion, as a value, regardless of what the findings might be, since the language related disciplines, like all disciplines, are themselves also value systems and, as such, they are protective of kindred values and of those who subscribe to them. Finally, midway between the more internally consistent approaches to W3 mentioned above, there will be those who will seek to combine both this world and the next, i.e. to refine their "values" via "science" and to guide their "science" via "values". The hypothesis as such is necessarily too broad ("necessarily" because it derives not from science per se but from values more basic than science) and science as an enterprise is too variegated to entertain only a single interpretation, operationalization or formulation thereof. It is consistent with the entire spirit of W3 to conclude that such must be its fate in any free scientific climate.

The legacy of W3 for linguistics as a science

The past quarter century's experience with W1 and W2, and the coming quarter century's experience with W3 can serve to remind linguistics -as-a- science that linguistics is also very significantly a humanities field and an applied field as well. As a result, even more so than were linguistics to be a science and only a science, it corresponds to

certain pervasive, soul-satisfying, meaning - and - value needs of its "members". These needs can also have dignifying and protective value for the discipline qua science. Our frequent advocacy of the weak and as yet unappreciated peoples and languages upon which W3 focuses, dignifies not only them but us, safeguards not only them but us, for it keeps us from following (or straying) in the footstep of Hitler's professors (Weinreich 1946) along a path which glorified W1 and W2 without experiencing the tempering impact of W3.

Certainly, linguistics as a science and linguists as scientists cannot and should not try to escape from the values and loyalties, dreams and intuitions, visions and sensitivities that move them and that touch them. If these pre-rationalities are not self-aggrandizing, and neither Herder's nor Whorf's were, if they lead to greater assistance, appreciation and dignity for the world's little peoples and little languages, then these are prerationalities to be proud of. If we will but each carry them on our sleeves <u>in our country</u> rather than merely in someone else's --whether our own country be the USA or Israel, Egypt or Mexico, Canada or Yugoslavia, China or the USSR -- then these are prerationalities that will be good for us as individuals, good for linguistics as a discipline, and good for mankind as our common concern. That, ultimately was the very kind of linguistics that Whorf envisioned.

FOOTNOTES

* This paper constituted my "Linguistic Society Of America Professor" address at the meeting of The Linguistic Society Of America, University of New Mexico, August 3, 1980, and was prepared under Grant G-00-79-01816 from the Research Section, International Studies Branch, Department of Education ("Language Resources Of The United States Revisited").

1. I do not consider it necessary at this late date to more than mention the well documented fact that neither W1 nor W2 were hypotheses original to Whorf. Not only were there others in Whorf's immediate circle of colleagues who had acknowledged interest and sympathy for these views prior to Whorf's focus upon them, and not only had such views been articulated for approximately a century by various European (particularly German) thinkers (e.g. Herder, von Humboldt, and Wundt to name only a few), but the basic notions in one or both of these hypotheses occur several times throughout two and a half thousand years of Euro-Mediterranean language related speculation (Culjak 1968, Fishman 1980) and are probably of at least similar vintage in India, China and perhaps even elsewhere. Nevertheless, we not only parsimoniously but also rightfully call these hypotheses "Whorfian" today because it was precisely Whorf's stimulating focus upon them that returned them to modern debate and inquiry, particularly in the United States.

To call these hypotheses Whorfian is, therefore, as technically mistaken as to call the Western Hemisphere The Americas (after Amerigo Vespucci) but, at the same time, it is also equally justified and, by now, equally traditional to do.

2. My documented view (Fishman 1960, 1977, 1980) is that Whorf did entertain both of the hypotheses here referred to as W1 and W2, although he was considerably less certain and less consistent with respect to the latter than with respect to the former. Furthermore, my documented evaluation of the empirical literature leads me to the conclusion that W1 has been confirmed over and over again, not only by Whorf and since Whorf but prior to Whorf, whereas W2 has not been confirmed as a stable phenomenon at the lexical level by methods that recognize the independent variable-dependent variable distinction and the canons of publically confirmable reliability and validity. Even less confirmation of W2 has been forthcoming in accord with the above research paradigm at levels higher than the lexical. (See Haugen 1977 for recent further confirmation of this conclusion) If investigators following ethnographic, wholistic and non-linear research strategies were to become fully convinced of the validity of W2 (I do not sense any such conviction among them at this time; indeed, I sense a tendency among such researchers to ascribe W2 not to Whorf himself but, rather to those who misunderstand him, e.g. Alford 1978, Silverstein 1979), I would conclude that the two different interpretations/operationalizations of the hypotheses involved were responsible for the difference in findings. These methodological differences

might or might not prove reconcilable. As long as they were not, I would tend to consider the hypothesis contested or unconfirmed (but, hopefully, in a state of productive tension) regardless of my own preferences in the matter.

3. Since a paper on Whorf is hardly the right place for extensive quotations from Herder I will satisfy my urge to bring just such quotations by summarizing Herder's views on various topics and referring the reader to the sources where these views can be found in Herder's own words. The best account of Herder's life is Haym 1877-85. For a fine account and interpretation of Herder's manifold direct and indirect interests in language and ethnicity/nationality - see Ergang 1931. It is directly to Herder's Sammtliche Schriften (1877-1913) that the reader must turn for the full treatment of the view that: there is nothing more central than language in the life of any ethnic collectivity (Volk)(see e.g. xi 225, xvii 58, xviii 337 and 384); neither individual nor collective creativity are possible if the authentic ethnic language is lost (see e.g. xvi 46, xvii 59 and 288-89, xviii 387); learning from other peoples and languages poses no problem if one does it without forgetting or dishonoring one's own (see e.g. vi 217, i 407, viii 336); early and consistant education in the mother tongue is a necessity regardless of whatever else one learns (see e.g., i 380-381 and 406, iv 301, xxx 129); the universal can be participated in fruitfully (rather than slavishly) only through the authentic (see e.g. xiv 448, xvii 211-212, xviii 248). A typical formulation of the latter view urges: "Let us contribute

to the honor of our nationality ---and learn incessantly from and with others --- so that together we can seek the truth and cultivate the garden of the common good (xvii 211-212)"; also "Let us, therefore, be German, not because German is superior to all other nationalities, but because we are Germans and cannot well be anything else and because we can contribute to humanity at large only by being German (Ergang 265)".

4. Whorf's lack of positive hyperbole with respect to English is all the more remarkable given sentiments such as the following which were nurtured by linguistic culture prior to his time: (a) "The Anglo-Saxon language is the simplest, the most perfectly and simply symbolic that the world has ever seen... (B)y means of it the Anglo-Saxon saves his vitality for conquest instead of wasting it under the juggernaut of cumbersome mechanism for conveyance of thought" (McGee 1895). (b) "The English language is a methodical, energetic business-like and sober language that does not care much for finery and elegance, but does care for logical consistancy and is opposed to any attempt to narrow-in life by police regulation and strict rules, either of grammar or of lexicon. As the language is, so is the people...It must be a source of gratification to mankind that the tongue spoken by two of the greatest powers of the world is so noble, so rich, so pliant, so expressive and so interesting (Jespersen 1905)". Ironically, the latter author's lauditory view that "as the language is, so is the people" would probably be characterized in recent days as revealing "extreme Whorfianism", whereas Whorf's sharply critical views insofar as English is concerned have nevertheless not spared him from being similarly characterized.

REFERENCES

Alford, Danny K.H. (1978). The demise of the Whorf hypothesis (A major revision in the history of linguistics). Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 485-499.

Barrows, Thomas, John Clark and Stephen Klein. (1980). What students know about their world. Change 12: no.4, 10-17 and 67.

Berlin, Brent and Paul Kay. (1969). Basic Color Terms. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brown, Roger. (1976). Reference: in memorial tribute to Eric Lenneberg. Cognition 4: 125-153.

Cole, Michael and Sylvia Scribner. (1974). Culture and Thought: A Psychological Introduction. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Culjak, Milan. The Theory of Linguistic Weltanschauung and B.L. Whorf's Hypothesis: Historical Sources and Critical Assessment. University of Delhi, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1968.

Deutsch, Karl W. (1942). The trend of European nationalism: the language aspect. American Political Science Review 36: 533-541.

Ergang, Robert R. (1931). Herder and the Foundations of German Nationalism. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1978). Historical background of universals research. In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson and Edith A. Moravcsik (eds.), Universals of Human Language. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 8-31.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1960). The systematization of the Whorfian hypothesis. Behavioral Science 5:323-379.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1977). The sociology of language: yesterday, today and tomorrow, in Roger W. Cole (ed.). Current Issues in Linguistic Theory. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 51-75.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1978). Positive bilingualism: some overlooked rationales and forefathers. In Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978. James E. Alatis (ed.) Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 42-52.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1980). The Whorfian hypothesis: varieties of valuation, confirmation and disconfirmation I. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 26: 25-40.

Freidrich, Paul. (1979). Poetic language and the imagination: a reformulation of the Sapir hypothesis. In his Language, Context and the Imagination. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 441-512.

Haugen, Einar. Linguistic relativity: myths and methods, in Wm. C. McCormack and S.A. Wurm, eds., Language and Thought: Anthropological Issues. The Hague, Mouton, 1977, 11-28.

Haym R. (1877-1885). Hereder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken dargestellt. 2 vols. Berlin.

Herder, Johann G. (1877-1913). Sammtliche Werke. B. Suphan, E. Redlich et al. (eds.). 33 volumes. Berlin.

Hymes, Dell, (1966). Two types of linguistic relativity (with examples from Amerindian ethnography). In William Bright (ed.). Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964. The Hague: Mouton, 1966. 114-157.

Hymes, Dell. Bilingual education: linguistic vs. sociolinguistic bases. Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 1970, 23, 69-76. (Revised in his Foundations in Sociolinguistics. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974. 119-124).

Jakobson, Roman. (1945). The beginning of national self-determination in Europe. The Review of Politics 7: 29-42.

Lambert, Wallace E. and Elizabeth Peal. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. Psychological Monographs 76: No. 27 (Whole No. 546).

Lambert, Wallace E., G. Richard Tucker and Alison d'Anglejan. (1973). Cognitive and attitudinal consequences of bilingual education. Journal of Educational Psychology 65: 141-159.

Patterson, Orlando. (1977). Ethnic Chauvenism: the Reactionary Impulse. New York: Stein and Day.

Silverstein, Michael. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistics Society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society. 193-247.

Slobin, Dan I. (1971). Psycholinguistics. Glenview (Ill.): Scott, Foresman.

Sridhar, S.N. (1980). Cognitive Determinants of Linguistic Structure: A Cross-Linguistic Experimental Study of Sentence Production. Ph.D. Dissertation. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois.

Weinreich, Max. (1946). Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People. New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute-Yivo. (Yiddish version: 1947).

Y.M. (1974). Editorial comment: a Herder-Humboldt-Sapir-Whorf hypothesis? Romance Philology 28: 199.

CHAPTER 3

THE NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES A PRELIMINARY RECONNAISANCE*

Joshua A. Fishman, Michael Gertner and Esther G. Lowy

Yeshiva University
New York City

The general paucity and rarity of United States Bureau of the Census data on the non-English languages (NEL) of the country are a reflection of a long-standing underlying assumption that these were only surface rather than deep structure phenomena. Given that they were expected to be ephemeral there was no need to count them with particular care or great frequency or to intercorrelate such counts as were performed with a large variety of other variables that might tend to clarify differential rates of mother tongue claiming, non-English use claiming or the compatability between non-English skills, on the one hand and English skills, on the other. Since the late '60's, however, the above traditional view has begun to change. More language related counts and more different kinds of counts have been undertaken in the past few years (since the beginning of the '70's) than at any other time in American history. Obviously, both the magnitude and the longevity of non-English language claiming and/or use in the USA has assumed proportions that were not previously anticipated.

* Prepared with the support of the International Studies Branch, Division of International Education, ED (Grant # G007901816).

Federal programs and federal funds have come to be associated with these magnitudes and, accordingly, it has become ever so much more important to understand much more precisely than ever before how large the numbers involved are, where they are to be encountered, and what factors contribute to their differential growth.

Mother Tongue Claiming 1970

With respect to the above issues the 1970 census may well mark the end of a research tradition. Since 1910 the United States Bureau of the Census (USBC) has repeatedly (except for 1950) asked about mother tongue (MT) (usually defined as "the language most commonly spoken in your home during your early childhood"). Unfortunately, the generations included for study have not always remained constant. The second generation was included in USBC enumerations only in 1910, 1920, 1940 and 1970, and the third, only in 1940 and 1970. Only the foreign born -- obviously the focus of interest -- were included on all of these occasions. Starting with 1980 (or, more precisely, with two inter-decennial studies in 1975 and 1976) the USBC's emphasis has switched to "non-English language background" (NELB) in view of various federal programs pertaining to the health, education and welfare of populations of such "background".[1] Thus, except for a small and generally not-to-be-released bridge study in

[1] Technically speaking "non-English language background" (NELB) is defined (NCES 1976) as "evinced by persons whose usual or second household language is not English, or, if over 14 years of age, whose mother tongue is other than English (whether or not the latter usually speak that mother tongue)". Although NELB is, therefore, a mixed index, the consequence of the above definition is to focus somewhat more on actual current use than on early childhood household use alone. The 1980 census specifically asked about NEL use rather than NEL background.

1979-80, that seeks to link non-English mother tongue claiming and non-English language background claiming, future USBC studies of the NEL situation in the USA will probably be transferred to a new track that is not easily comparable with the research on the first seventy years of this century. Although the new research tradition that such a transfer will foster may certainly be a worthwhile one, it is important also to fully appreciate the old one that is now probably coming to a close. While it has long been recognized that mother tongue claiming has a somewhat larger than usual standard error of measurement associated with it, it is also undeniably true that mother tongue claiming has served rather admirably in conjunction with a secondary function with which it has always been associated, namely, as an indicator of the claimed ethnolinguistic affiliation of the American population for a three generational time span. Given this function it is instructive to note from Table 1.0 that some 35 million people claimed (or would have so claimed had they been queried) non-Anglo ethnicity in 1970. This magnitude corresponds to some 17% of the total USA population of 203 million and nearly 20% of the non-Black population of 181 million in that year. These are high numbers, both absolutely and relatively, and what Table 2.0 reveals is that their rate of change has undergone noteworthy quickening in the past decade or two.

Quickening Rate of NEMT Claiming

Whereas the total U.S. population increased by some 13% between 1960 and 1970 the English mother tongue component thereof increased by only some 8% while the non-English mother tongue component

thereof increased by some 71%! Spanish alone increased by 134% in this decade (after having increased by 79% from 1940-1960)! However, even without the clearly exceptional case of Spanish the other 22 (mostly European) languages for which there is historical comparitive data from 1910 onward increased by 50% from 1960 to 1970. Obviously, something unexpected happened to non-English mother tongue claims in the 60's because from 1940 to 1960 they were (with a few easily explained exceptions) generally on the decrease. By 1970, however, they were almost all on the increase. That, indeed, is exactly what is amazing about the 1970 USBC mother tongue figure: almost all of them show an increase relative to their 1960 estimates[2]. As a result, mother tongues whose immigrational history is as dissimilar as Norwegian (high-point in the latter part of the 19th century), Slovak (high-point just prior to World War I) and Arabic (high-point after World War II) all show about the same proportion of increase from 1960 to 1970. Obviously, we are dealing here with a Zeitgeist phenomenon. By 1970 the spirit of the times was such that many individuals who had long ceased to claim (or, perhaps, who had never claimed) a non-English mother tongue were, it would seem, doing so (or doing so again).

Generational Composition and Magnitudes of NEMT Claiming 1970

The differential magnitudes of NEMT's claimed in USA are also considerable. Although the "big six" in 1970 remain the same languages as were the big six in 1960 (Spanish, German, Italian, French, Polish and Yiddish) -- not necessarily in the same order as they occupied at that

---

[2]The 1960 estimates are derived from Fishman and Hofman 1964. They may be overly low, but, on the other hand, they are the medium rather than either the high or the low estimates arrived at by that study. Even if a 1940-1970 comparison is preferred it is clear that NEMT claiming is on the increase (overall) relative to its 1940 status.

time -- only Spanish among them is still demographically growing. Actually, Spanish is the major European derived language that is both numerically strong (indeed, it is huge, accounting by itself for roughly a quarter of all non-English mother tongue claiming in the USA in 1970) and demographically young, Greek, Italian and Portuguese being small examples of this type. Otherwise, the most rapidly growing non-English mother tongues in the USA in 1970 were all non-European: Chinese, Korean, Tagalog, Hindi, Turkish. Vietnamese was not even mentioned then because the Indochinese influx had not yet begun.

Obviously, the various non-English mother tongues claimed in 1970 differ greatly as to their generational composition, on the one hand, and as to the reasons for that composition, on the other hand. This is due, in part, to the fact that the majority of Scandanavian Americans, e.g., arrived in the USA prior to the majority of Slavic Americans. As a result, more of the former will now be native-of-native-born (i.e. 3rd generation or beyond) than will be the case with respect to the latter. Of course other factors may also be involved in generational composition differences across mother tongue groups. Those groups who have succeeded in holding on to more of their post-immigrational children and grandchildren (in terms of mother tongue claiming continuity) will show up with larger 2nd and 3rd generation components. Finally, groups that are significantly indigenous rather than immigrational in origin will show up as largely native-of-native-born (i.e. 3rd generation), simply because that is all they can be (e.g. American Indians, Cajuns and many Mexican-Americans), regardless of what their recent attrition has been.

Examining Tables 3.0 and 3.1 we see that the variation in generational structure is huge, from less than 20% native-of-native-born for such old time immigrant groups as Swedes and Danes (with similarly low proportions for such still young groups as are the mother tongue claimants of Greek, Portuguese and Chinese) to much larger proportions for Spanish, French, German -- all of which have substantial non-immigrational ("colonial") roots in the USA.

Why Did NEMT Claiming Increase in 1970?

The purpose of the above generational and magnitudinal excursus is to pursue the relationship between the previously noticed quickening of non-English mother tongue claiming in 1970 and the generational structure of the 1970 claimants. Clearly the rate of increase for non-European languages in the USA was, on the whole, significantly greater than it was for European languages. However, that itself cannot account for the total rate of increase shown in Table 3.0. The non-European mother tongues in the USA were simply too few in their total number of claimants to carry the field on their own. Obviously, the brunt of the increase in rate of non-English mother tongue in 1970 was due to European languages, even to European languages other than Spanish, indeed, even to European languages that had experience little if any immigrational growth in the past 20-30 years.

It is doubtlessly true that from 1960 to 1970 most non-English languages in the USA gained in numbers as a result of immigration. However, it is probably even truer that in the case of the European subset of these languages they probably lost more due to natural demographic factors (namely, the demise of former immigrants many of whom

are now their 70's) than they gained due to immigration. At any rate it is absolutely clear from Table 4 that immigrants and immigration cannot be the reason why the total rate of NEMT claiming increased so dramatically from 1960-1970 (and even from 1940 to 1970). In that same decade only a handful of languages increased in their claiming rate due to the first (i.e. the immigrant) generation. Indeed, on the whole, particularly if Spanish is set aside as clearly a special case ,that generations claiming rate decreased both from 1960 to 1970 as well as from 1940 to 1970. Thus we will have to look to American born claimants, rather than to foreign born ones, in order to shed light on the surprising increases that Table 2.0 reveals.

The Native Born Claimants of Native Born Parentage

Both the native born of foreign parents and the native born of native parents increased their NEMT claiming in 1970 relative to 1960 (and to 1940). However, in the case of the 2nd generation this increase is both meager and unpredictable from one language to the next. On the other hand, in the case of the 3rd generation the increase is both huge and across the board. Interestingly, as Table 5 reveals, the increases are generally even greater for languages other than Spanish than they are for Spanish. With Spanish included the 1960-1970 increase is some 279% (!) and with Spanish excluded the 1960-1970 increase is some 328%. Thus the rise in total NEMT claiming from 1960 to 1970 (and, to some extent, even from 1940-1970) is not only not due to immigrants but its also not unduly due to Spanish either. Nor is it due to non-European languages or to any other

easily formulatable sub-group of languages. It is a truly "across the board" phenomenon and one that is distinctly related to the American born of American born parents (i.e. the third generation and beyond).

Non-English Language Use

In subsequent analyses we will undertake to examine and reveal the extent to which the increase in NEMT claiming that occurred in th USA has (or has not) been accompanied by a corresponding increase in NEL use (at least to the degree that NELB is reflective of such use). At this point, given that the above mentioned demonstration will not be presented here, let us agree on two matters: (a) that even if NEL use has not increased at the same rate or is not nearly at the same level as was NEMT claiming in 1970 -- and, quite frankly, it has not (Veltman 1979) -- that NEMT claiming too is indicative of something meaningful. It is a statement related to identity (to "part identity" rather than to "whole identity", that is, to a part of the entire identity repertoire rather than to all of it) and, as such, it can well have ethnic mother tongue consequences other than use as well as in addition to use. Or, if use per se is to become the touchstone of future NEL research in the USA, we will have to agree on a broadening of the concept of use if we are to obtain a true picture of the language resources of the USA.

Using a non-English language in church-related behavior is also language use although it may not be the kind that gets picked

up by NCES or USBC statistics. Using a non-English language within an ethnic community school or in an ethnic community radio/t.v. broadcast or in an ethnic community periodical publication -- these are all definitely NEL use. Indeed, they are particularly crucial kinds of use if our nation's non-English language resources are being considered because the above examples of "use" represent community-imbedded use of non-English languages, language in society, language use in accord with societal allocation of functions, and, therefore, language use which can attempt to secure intergenerational continuity. Since neither NCES nor USBC have shown any interest in such kinds of use (probably because they are not indicative of lack of English mastery in other uses) it was necessary for such data to be gathered by the current investigators themselves.

Four Institutional Language Resources: 1980

As of 1980 the United States was a country of huge institutional language resources within its ethnic communities including[3] at least 762 periodical publications, 2470 radio/t.v. broadcasts, 5414 ethnic community schools and 7203 local religious units ("congregations"). As Table 6 reveals these resources are far from evenly distributed. Some language groups are particularly blessed with institutionalized language resources -- in fact even some quite small groups can be described in this fashion -- whereas others (even some fairly large groups) have few such resources. No state is without such resources (Table 7.0) and some have them in very great numbers. All in

[3] All numbers cited here, particularly those for churches, are quite preliminary and are still being revised upward almost daily.

all these resources appear to exist in larger numbers today than they did in 1960 (Fishman et al 1966). Both their qualitative and their quantitative characteristics deserve ample additional study. At this early date in our realization of the riches that are at our command (and, indeed, that have been entrusted to us) it is already possible to indicate that certain institutionalized areas of language use are much more interdependent than others (Table 8). Thus, whichever way they are viewed, across states or across languages, local religious units and ethnic community schools are highly related to each other (r_a=.96 and r_b=.92) whereas broadcasts and schools are not (r=.82 and .21). Further correlations between the resource distributions (by language or by state) and various demographic and sociolinguistic indices will doubtlessly yield further understanding of the underlying support-systems upon which they depend. In an earlier study (Fishman 1980) it was already shown that the number of ethnic community schools across states is more closely related to the total NELB population of the states than it is to the school-age NELB population alone. All in all, this is indicative once again, of the fact that we are not dealing with a vanishing immigration-based experience but with a language-and-ethnicity experience that has succeeded in indigenizing itself in ethnic community life in the USA. Just as NEMT claiming has become primarily a third generation affair so institutionalized ethnic community language resources are largely independent of the number of foreign born. Every aspect of these developments cries out for further research and, fortunately, the

puzzle is being put together little by little.

One clear finding revealed in Table 8 is that languages differ more widely from each other with respect to their inter-institutional activity than do states. This is a very direct indication of the demographic concentration of America's non-English language communities. They tend to cluster together in the same states and this clustering is actually an aid to their institutional vitality since not only is an atmosphere of non-English language institutions created thereby but many of these institutions (e.g. radio/t.v. stations but even schools, churches and publishers) serve several different language communities at the same time. The societal structure of non-English language resources in the USA has obviously been established in accord with some very American historical and demographic factors.

REFERENCES

Fishman, Joshua A. Ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA: dynamics and distributions. International Migration Review, 1980, 14, 235-247.

Fishman, Joshua A. and John Hofman. Mother tongue and nativity in the American population, in J.A. Fishman, et al. Language Loyalty in the United States.

Veltman, Calvin J. The Assimilation of American language Minorities: Structure, Pace and Extent. Washington, D.C., National Center for Education Statistics, 1979.

National Center for Educational Statistics (Dorothy Waggoner). Geographic Distribution, Nativity and Age Distribution of Language Minorities in the United States. Washington, NCFS, 1976.

Table 1: Estimated English and Non-English Mother Tongue Claiming Totals, 1970, by Nativity and Parentage

		Total	Native of Native	Total Foreign Stock	Total N of FP/MP	NFP=Native of Foreign Parentage	NMP=Native of Mixed Parentage	Foreign Born	
(1)	Total for column	203,210,158	169,634,926	33,575,232	23,955,930	12,902,976	11,052,954	9,619,302	(1)
(2)	Not reporteds in that column	9,317,873	8,873,081	444,792	348,645	177,288	171,357	96,147	(2)
(3)	(1) - (2)=Total reporteds in that column	193,892,285	160,761,845	33,130,440	23,607,285	12,725,688	10,881,597	9,523,155	(3)
(4)	English claimants for column	160,717,113	149,312,435	11,404,678	9,706,853	3,170,411	6,536,442	1,697,825	(4)
(5)	(3) - (4)=Non-English reporteds	33,175,172	11,449,410	21,725,762	13,900,432	9,555,277	4,345,155	7,825,330	(5)
(6)	(5)/(3) = % Non-English reported of total reporteds	17.11%	7.12%	65.58%	58.88%	75.09%	39.93%	82.17%	(6)
(7)	Same % as in (6) applied to (2)	1,594,298	631,938	291,679	205,289	133,119	68,425	79,006	(7)
(8)	(5) + (7) = Lower limit of total Non-English (minimum estimate)	34,769,470	12,081,348	22,017,441	14,105,721	9,688,396	4,413,580	7,904,336	(8)
(9)	(8)/(1) = % Non-English for columns (minimum estimate)	17.11%	7.12%	65.58%	58.88%	75.09%	39.93%	82.17%	(9)

TABLE 2

Mother Tongue Claiming:

1940-1960-1970 TOTALS FOR 23 LANGUAGES[a]

Language	1940 Total	1960 Total (est)	1970 Total	Change: 1940-1960 n	%	Change: 1940-1970 n	%	Change: 1960-1970 n	%
Norwegian	658,220	321,770	612,860	- 336,450	- 51.12	- 45,360	- 6.89	+ 291,090	+ 90.47
Swedish	830,900	415,600	626,100	- 415,300	- 49.98	- 204,800	- 24.65	+ 210,500	+ 50.65
Danish	226,740	147,620	194,460	- 79,120	- 34.89	- 32,280	- 14.24	+ 46,840	+ 31.73
Dutch	289,580	321,610	412,630	+ 32,030	+ 11.06	+ 123,050	+ 42.49	+ 91,020	+ 28.30
French	1,412,060	1,043,220	2,598,410	- 368,840	- 26.12	+ 1,186,350	+ 84.02	+ 1,555,190	+149.08
German	4,949,780	3,145,770	6,093,050	- 1,804,010	- 36.45	+ 1,143,270	+ 23.10	+ 2,947,280	+ 93.69
Polish	2,416,320	2,184,940	2,437,940	- 231,380	- 9.58	+ 21,620	+ 0.95	+ 253,000	+ 11.58
Czech	520,440	217,770	452,810	- 302,670	- 58.16	- 67,630	- 12.99	+ 235,040	+107.93
Slovak	484,360	260,000	510,370	- 224,360	- 46.32	+ 26,010	+ 5.37	+ 250,370	+ 96.28
Hungarian	453,000	404,110	447,500	- 48,890	- 10.79	- 5,500	- 1.21	+ 43,390	+ 10.74
Serbo-Croatian	153,080	184,090	239,460	+ 31,010	+ 20.26	+ 86,380	+ 56.43	+ 55,370	+ 30.08
Slovenian	176,640	67,110	82,320	- 111,530	- 62.43	- 96,320	- 53.92	+ 15,210	+ 22.66
Russian	585,080	460,830	334,620	- 124,250	- 21.24	- 250,460	- 42.81	- 126,210	- 26.39
Ukrainian	81,600	252,970	249,350	+ 169,370	+202.60	+ 165,750	+198.27	- 3,620	- 1.43
Lithuanian	272,680	206,040	292,820	- 66,640	- 24.45	+ 20,140	+ 7.39	+ 86,780	+ 42.12
Finnish	230,420	110,170	214,170	- 120,250	- 52.19	- 16,250	- 7.05	+ 104,000	+ 94.40
Rumanian	65,520	58,020	56,590	- 7,500	- 11.45	- 8,930	- 13.63	- 1,430	- 2.46
Yiddish	1,751,100	964,410	1,593,990	- 786,490	- 44.91	- 157,110	- 8.97	+ 629,380	+ 65.25
Greek	273,520	292,030	458,700	+ 18,510	+ 6.77	+ 185,180	+ 66.97	+ 166,670	+ 39.95
Italian	3,766,820	3,673,140	4,144,320	- 93,680	- 2.49	+ 377,500	+ 10.02	+ 471,180	+ 12.83
Spanish	1,861,400	3,335,960	7,823,580	+ 1,474,560	+ 79.22	+ 5,962,180	+320.31	+ 4,487,620	+134.52
Portuguese	215,660	181,110	365,300	- 34,550	- 16.02	+ 149,640	+ 69.39	+ 184,190	+ 5.52
Arabic	107,420	103,910	193,520	- 3,510	- 3.27	+ 86,100	+ 80.15	+ 89,610	+ 86.24
Total for 23 Languages	21,786,340	18,356,400	30,434,870	- 3,429,940	- 15.74	+ 8,648,530	+ 39.70	+12,078,470	+ 65.80
Above Total minus Spanish	19,924,940	15,020,440	22,611,290	- 4,904,500	- 24.61	+ 2,682,350	+ 13.58	+ 7,590,850	+ 50.54
Total U.S. Population	132,165,129	179,325,671	203,210,158	+47,160,542	+ 35.68	+71,045,029	+ 53.75	+23,884,487	+ 13.32
Total English M.T.	93,039,640	149,219,776	160,717,113	+56,180,136	+ 60.38	+67,677,473	+ 72.74	+11,497,337	+ 7.70
Total Non-English M.T.	22,036,240	19,381,786	33,175,172	- 2,654,454	- 12.05	+11,138,932	+ 50.55	+13,793,386	+ 71.17

a) Sources: U.S. Census of Population, 1970, Report PC(2)-1B, National Origin and Language (Referred to in the following Tables as PC(2)-1A, 1940 and 1960 data are from Language Loyalty in the U.S.A., Fishman et al. 1966, where original sources are cited and estimation procedures described. The 23 languages included in this table are the only ones for which 1940-1960-1970 data are available.

TABLE 3: MOTHER TONGUE OF THE POPULATION, 1970: NATIVITY AND PARENTAGE FOR 39 LANGUAGES[a]

		FOREIGN BORN		NATIVE/FOREIGN OR MIXED		NATIVE/NATIVE	
	Total	Proportion	(1st gen)	Proportion	(2nd gen)	Proportion	(3rd gen)
Total	203,210,158	.0473	9,619,302	.1179	23,955,930	.8348	169,634,926
English	160,717,113	.0106	1,697,825	.0604	9,706,853	.9290	149,312,435
Celtic	88,162		45,459		32,969		9,734
Norwegian	612,862	.1540	94,365	.5118	313,675	.3342	204,822
Swedish	626,102	.2099	131,408	.6094	381,575	.1807	113,119
Danish	194,462	.2994	88,218	.5510	107,155	.1496	29,089
Dutch[b]	412,627	.3602	148,635	.3907	161,225	.2491	102,777
French	2,598,408	.1619	410,580	.2801	727,698	.5619	1,460,130
Breton	32,722	.3066	10,031	.4718	15,439	.2216	7,252
German	6,093,054	.1972	1,201,535	.3944	2,403,125	.4084	2,488,394
Polish	2,437,938	.1722	419,912	.5528	1,347,691	.2750	670,335
Czech	452,812	.1561	70,703	.5149	233,165	.3289	148,944
Slovak	510,366	.1618	82,561	.6679	340,855	.1704	86,950
Hungarian	447,497	.3603	161,253	.5231	234,088	.1166	52,156
Serbo-Croatian[c]	239,455	.3469	83,064	.5525	132,296	.1006	24,095
Slovenian	82,321	.2330	19,178	.6572	54,103	.1098	9,040
Albanian	17,382	.4331	7,528	.4765	8,283	.0904	1,571
Russian	334,615	.4461	149,277	.4622	154,673	.0917	30,665
Ukrainian	249,351	.3875	96,635	.5216	130,054	.0909	22,662
Lithuanian	292,820	.3251	95,188	.5563	162,888	.1186	34,744
Finnish	214,168	.1788	38,290	.5498	117,754	.2714	58,124
Rumanian	56,590	.4604	26,055	.4483	25,369	.0913	5,166
Yiddish	1,593,993	.2749	438,116	.6183	985,703	.1068	170,174
Greek	458,699	.4223	193,745	.4537	208,115	.1239	56,839
Italian	4,144,315	.2476	1,025,999	.6063	2,512,696	.1461	605,625
Spanish	7,823,583	.2168	1,696,240	.2501	1,956,293	.5331	4,171,050
Portuguese	365,300	.3841	140,299	.4455	162,749	.1704	62,252
Armenian	100,495	.3813	38,323	.4818	48,414	.1369	13,758
Persian	20,553	.7778	15,986	.1753	3,602	.0470	965
Hebrew	101,686	.3551	36,112	.4512	45,883	.1936	19,691
Arabic[d]	193,520	.3806	73,657	.4862	94,097	.1332	25,766
Turkish	24,123	.6900	16,646	.2349	5,666	.0751	1,811
Hindi	26,253	.8386	22,017	.1138	2,987	.0475	1,249
Korean	53,528	.6492	34,748	.2994	16,024	.0515	2,756
Japanese	408,504	.2891	118,090	.5080	207,528	.2029	82,886
Chinese[d]	345,431	.5508	190,260	.3602	124,407	.0890	30,764
Thai/Lao	14,416	.8113	11,695	.1070	1,543	.0817	1,178
Tagalog	217,907	.6998	152,498	.2619	57,073	.0383	8,336
Algonquin	19,909	.0321	640	.0598	1,190	.9081	18,079
Navajo	91,860	.0000	120	.0000	648	.9916	91,092

a) Only languages with at least 10,000 claimants are listed here. See table 3.1 for smaller languages as well as for language "families," "all others" and "not reported."
b) Includes Flemish
c) US Census figures are not reported separately for either Serbian or Croatian.
d) Summary figures across all varieties or dialects

Table 3. 1 Mother Tongue of the Population by Nativity and Parentage: 1970

[Data based on 15-percent sample, see text. For meaning of symbols, see text]

United States

	Total	Native of native parentage	Foreign stock			
			Total	Native of foreign or mixed parentage		
				Total	Foreign parentage	Mixed parentage
Total	203 210 158	169 634 926	33 575 232	23 955 930	12 902 976	11 052 954
English	160 717 113	149 312 435	11 404 678	9 706 852	3 170 411	6 536 442
Celtic	88 162	9 734	78 428	32 949	25 635	7 314
Norwegian	612 862	204 822	408 040	333 675	191 929	121 746
Swedish	626 102	113 119	512 983	381 575	283 569	98 006
Danish	194 462	29 089	165 373	107 155	75 914	31 241
Dutch	350 748	90 713	260 035	133 201	86 463	45 738
Flemish	61 889	12 064	49 825	29 924	21 648	7 275
French	2 598 408	1 460 130	1 138 278	727 698	333 993	393 705
Breton	32 722	7 252	25 470	15 439	8 963	6 476
German	6 093 054	2 488 594	3 604 660	2 403 125	1 466 715	936 410
Polish	2 437 938	670 335	1 767 603	1 347 691	1 085 031	262 650
Czech	452 812	148 944	303 868	223 165	163 704	59 461
Slovak	510 366	86 950	423 416	340 855	279 213	61 642
Hungarian	447 497	52 156	395 341	334 086	195 556	138 530
Serbo-Croatian	239 455	24 095	215 360	133 296	109 [illegible]	83 [illegible]
Slovenian	82 321	9 040	73 281	54 103	47 [illegible]	6 [illegible]
Dalmatian	9 802	3 038	6 764	4 748	3 201	1 547
Albanian	17 382	1 571	15 811	8 283	6 730	553
Finnish	214 168	58 124	156 044	117 754	91 730	26 024
Lithuanian	292 820	34 744	258 076	162 888	142 297	19 591
Other Balto-Slavonic dialects	19 748	1 231	18 517	8 309	6 846	1 663
Russian	334 615	30 665	303 950	154 673	131 793	22 880
Ukrainian	249 351	23 662	226 689	130 054	115 982	14 072
Georgian	757	179	578	157	120	37
Rumanian	56 590	5 166	51 424	25 369	21 809	3 560
Yiddish	1 593 993	170 174	1 423 819	985 703	845 484	140 219
Gypsy (Romani)	1 588	1 252	336	180	79	101
Greek	458 699	56 839	401 860	208 115	146 897	61 218
Italian	4 144 315	605 625	3 538 690	2 512 696	1 927 001	585 695
Spanish	7 823 583	4 171 050	3 652 533	1 956 293	958 628	997 665
Portuguese	365 300	62 252	303 048	162 749	111 922	50 827
Basque	8 108	1 852	6 256	4 087	3 034	1 053
Armenian	100 495	13 758	86 737	48 414	38 930	9 484
Persian	20 553	965	19 588	3 602	697	1 905
Other Persian dialects	3 370	590	2 780	1 437	1 110	327
Hebrew	101 686	19 691	81 995	45 883	34 036	11 847
Arabic (n.e.c.)	123 744	14 055	109 689	52 902	38 704	14 198
Egyptian	891	33	858	79	49	30
Iraqi	2 413	509	1 904	758	435	323
Near Eastern Arabic dialects	66 064	10 952	55 112	40 306	31 672	8 634
North African Arabic dialects	408	217	191	52	16	36
Southern Semitic	1 354	380	974	216	78	138
Hamitic	948	445	503	217	125	92
Swahili	3 991	2 040	1 951	812	384	428
Libyan	410	265	145	86	29	57
Niger-Congo (Chari-Nile)	6 537	1 055	5 482	1 221	653	568
Eastern Sudanic	2 543	336	2 207	1 347	953	394
Turkish	24 123	1 811	22 312	5 666	3 826	1 840
Other Uralic	15 191	765	14 426	3 016	2 347	669
Altaic	974	306	668	251	206	45
Hindi (Hindustani)	26 253	1 249	25 004	2 987	1 944	1 043
Other Indo-Aryan	22 939	731	22 208	2 342	1 740	602
Dravidian	8 983	635	8 348	813	578	235
Korean	53 528	2 756	50 772	16 024	7 328	8 696
Japanese	408 504	82 886	325 618	207 528	137 373	70 155
Chinese (n.e.c.)	337 283	29 244	308 039	122 000	80 [illegible]	41 683
Mandarin	1 697	651	1 046	314	175	139
Cantonese	5 819	703	5 116	1 937	1 [illegible]	664
Other Chinese dialects	632	166	466	156	106	50
Tibetan	352	183	169	50	23	27
Burmese	1 581	248	1 333	177	51	126
Thai (Siamese), Lao	14 416	1 178	12 238	1 543	464	1 079
Malay (Indonesian)	6 253	826	5 427	817	311	506
Other Malayan	4 042	1 193	2 849	544	382	162
Tagalog	217 907	8 336	209 571	57 033	35 581	21 452
Polynesian	20 687	12 006	8 681	3 725	2 132	1 593
Algonquin	19 909	18 079	1 830	1 190	274	916
Navaho	91 860	91 092	768	648	174	474
Other Athapaskan	18 528	17 497	1 031	451	173	278
Uto-Aztecan	245	152	93	55	23	32
Other American Indian	137 663	128 039	9 624	5 193	1 860	3 333
All other	880 779	350 126	530 653	341 483	236 504	104 979
Not reported	9 317 873	8 873 081	444 792	348 645	177 288	171 357

TABLE 4: MOTHER TONGUE OF THE FOREIGN BORN FOR 26 LANGUAGES, 1910 TO 1970, WITH PERCENT INCREASE (DECREASE) 1940-1970 AND 1960-1970[a]

Mother tongue	1970	1960	1940	1930	1920	1910	1940-1970 Change	1940-1970 % Increase (Decrease)	1960-1970 Change	1960-1970 % Increase (Decrease)
Total	9,619,302	9,738,143	11,109,620	13,983,405	13,712,754	13,345,545	- 1,490,318	(-13.41)	- 118,841	(- 1.22)
English	1,697,825	1,852,992	2,506,420	3,097,021	3,007,932	3,363,792	- 808,590	(-32.26)	- 155,167	(- 8.37)
Norwegian	94,365	140,774	232,820	345,522	362,199	402,587	- 138,455	(-59.47)	- 46,409	(-32.97)
Swedish	131,408	211,597	423,200	615,465	643,203	683,218	- 291,792	(-68.95)	- 80,189	(-37.90)
Danish	58,218	79,619	122,180	178,944	189,531	186,345	- 63,962	(-52.35)	- 21,401	(-26.88)
Dutch[b]	148,635	123,613	102,700	133,142	136,540	126,045	45,935	44.73	25,022	20.24
French	410,580	330,220	359,520	523,297	466,956	528,842	51,060	14.20	80,360	24.34
German	1,201,535	1,278,772	1,589,040	2,188,006	2,267,128	2,759,032	- 387,505	(-24.39)	- 77,237	(- 6.04)
Polish	419,912	581,936	801,680	965,899	1,077,392	943,781	- 381,768	(-47.62)	- 162,024	(-27.84)
Czech	70,703	91,711	159,640	201,138	234,564	228,738	- 88,937	(-55.71)	- 21,008	(-22.91)
Slovak	82,561	125,000	171,580	240,196	274,948	166,474	- 89,019	(-51.88)	- 42,439	(-33.95)
Hungarian	161,253	213,114	241,220	250,393	268,112	229,094	- 79,967	(-33.15)	- 51,861	(-24.33)
Serbo-Croatian	83,064	88,094	70,600	109,923	125,844	105,669	12,464	17.65	- 5,030	(- 5.71)
Slovenian	19,178	32,108	75,560	77,671	102,744	123,631	- 56,382	(-74.62)	- 12,930	(-40.27)
Russian	149,277	276,834	356,940	315,721	392,049	57,926	- 207,663	(-58.18)	- 127,557	(-46.08)
Ukrainian	96,635	106,974	35,540	58,685	c	d	61,095	171.91	- 10,339	(- 9.66)
Lithuanian[e]	95,188	99,043	122,660	165,053	182,227	140,963	- 27,474	(-22.40)	- 3,855	(- 3.89)
Finnish[f]	38,290	53,168	97,080	124,994	133,567	120,086	- 58,790	(-60.56)	- 14,878	(-27.98)
Rumanian	26,055	38,019	43,120	56,964	62,336	42,277	- 17,065	(-39.58)	- 11,964	(-31.47)
Yiddish	438,116	503,605	924,440	1,222,658	1,091,820	1,051,767	- 486,324	(-52.61)	- 65,489	(-13.00)
Greek	193,745	173,031	165,220	189,066	174,658	118,379	28,525	17.26	20,714	11.97
Italian	1,025,994	1,226,141	1,561,100	1,808,289	1,624,998	1,365,110	- 535,106	(-34.28)	- 200,147	(-16.32)
Spanish	1,696,240	766,961	428,360	743,286	556,111	258,131	1,267,880	295.98	929,279	121.16
Portuguese	140,299	87,109	83,780	110,197	105,895	72,649	56,519	67.46	53,190	61.06
Japanese	118,090	95,027	g	g	g	g	-	-	23,063	19.53
Chinese	345,431	89,609	g	g	g	g	-	-	100,651	112.32
Arabic	193,520	49,908	50,940	67,830	57,557	32,868	142,580	279.89	143,612	287.75
Total Non-English							- 1,244,149	(-15.14)	421,134	6.14
Total Non-English - Spanish							- 2,512,029	(-32.24)	- 508,145	(- 8.34)

a. 1910-1960 data derived from U.S. Census of Population 1960: General Social and Economic Characteristics, United States Summary. Final Report PC(1)-1C, Table 70 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962). 1970 data derived from PC(2)-1A (1970). Population figures for 1910 to 1940 apply to whites only.

b. Includes Flemish in 1960 and Frisian in 1910 and 1920.

c. 1920 figure not reported in 1960. Reported as 55,672 (including Ruthenian) in 1920.

d. 1910 figure not reported in 1960. Reported as 25,131 (including Ruthenian) in 1910.

e. Includes Lettish (1910-1920).

f. Includes Lappish (1910-1930) and Estonian (1910-1920).

g. Not available

Table 4.1 Mother Tongue of the Foreign Born Population for Regions & Divisions: 1970

UNITED STATES REGIONS DIVISIONS	Number											Percent distribution by language within region/division										
	Total foreign born	English	French	German	Polish	Russian	Yiddish	Italian	Spanish	All other	Not reported	Total foreign born	English	French	German	Polish	Russian	Yiddish	Italian	Spanish	All other	Not reported
United States	9,619,302	1,697,825	410,580	1,201,535	419,912	149,277	438,116	1,025,994	1,696,240	2,483,676	96,147	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
REGIONS																						
Northeast	4,119,681	767,937	241,529	456,611	217,661	75,609	294,290	715,950	383,814	922,132	44,148	42.8	45.2	58.8	38.0	51.8	50.6	67.2	69.8	22.6	37.1	45.9
North Central	1,873,561	308,039	48,753	346,245	152,566	24,759	53,846	154,162	139,987	628,134	17,070	19.5	18.1	11.9	28.8	36.3	16.6	12.3	15.0	8.3	25.3	17.8
South	1,316,205	213,905	47,850	152,481	23,076	13,714	45,331	53,871	520,496	231,106	14,375	13.7	12.6	11.7	12.7	5.5	9.2	10.3	5.3	30.7	9.3	15.0
West	2,309,855	407,944	72,448	246,198	26,609	35,195	44,649	102,011	651,943	702,304	20,554	24.0	24.0	17.6	20.5	6.3	23.6	10.2	9.9	38.4	28.3	21.4
DIVISIONS*																						
Northeast																						
New England	929,192	225,990	136,958	51,278	51,638	11,278	28,038	145,555	28,960	241,974	9,523	9.6	13.3	32.9	4.3	12.3	7.6	6.4	14.2	1.7	9.7	9.9
Middle Atlantic	3,190,489	541,947	106,571	405,333	166,023	64,331	266,252	570,395	354,854	680,158	34,625	33.2	31.9	26.0	33.7	39.5	43.1	60.1	55.6	20.9	27.4	36.0
North Central																						
East North Central	1,583,570	264,225	41,550	275,897	144,217	20,771	45,757	141,666	122,498	512,934	14,055	16.5	15.6	10.1	23.0	34.3	13.9	10.4	13.8	7.2	20.7	14.6
West North Central	289,991	43,814	7,203	70,348	8,349	3,988	8,089	12,496	17,489	115,200	3,015	3.0	2.6	1.8	5.9	2.0	2.7	1.8	1.2	1.0	4.6	3.1
South																						
South Atlantic	870,754	164,293	36,234	104,057	18,974	11,771	40,751	42,552	283,461	166,739	9,922	9.1	9.7	8.8	8.7	4.5	7.9	9.3	4.1	16.7	6.7	10.3
East South Central	59,690	14,148	2,869	13,869	1,048	516	1,529	3,375	5,151	16,317	848	.6	.8	.7	1.2	.2	.1	.3	.3	.3	.7	.9
West South Central	377,761	35,464	8,747	34,555	3,054	1,407	3,051	7,944	231,884	48,050	3,605	3.9	2.1	2.1	2.9	.7	.9	.7	.9	13.7	1.9	3.7
West																						
Mountain	246,338	47,893	9,140	42,668	4,032	2,261	3,040	10,482	63,950	60,436	2,436	2.6	2.8	2.2	3.6	1.0	1.5	.7	1.0	1.8	2.4	2.5
Pacific	2,063,517	360,051	63,308	203,530	22,577	32,934	41,609	91,529	587,993	641,868	18,118	21.4	21.2	15.4	16.9	5.4	22.1	9.5	8.9	34.7	25.8	18.8

*In accord with U.S. Census usage, "Divisions" are defined as follows: New England=Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut; Middle Atlantic=New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania; East North Central=Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin; West North Central=Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas; South Atlantic=Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, East South Central=Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi; West South Central=Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas; Mountain=Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada; Pacific=Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii.

TABLE 5: MOTHER TONGUE OF THE NATIVE OF NATIVE PARENTAGE FOR 25 LANGUAGES, 1940 TO 1970, WITH PERCENT INCREASE (DECREASE) 1940-1970 AND 1960-1970

Mother Tongue	1940	(Estim) 1960	1970	Change 1940-1970	1940-1970 % Increase (Decrease)	Change 1960-1970	1960-1970 % Increase (Decrease)
Total	84,124,840	145,275,265	169,634,926	85,510,086	101.65	24,359,661	16.77
Northwestern Europe:							
English	78,352,180	-	149,312,435	70,960,255	90.57	-	-
Norwegian	81,160	40,000	204,822	123,662	152.37	164,822	412.06
Swedish	33,660	17,000	113,119	79,459	236.06	96,119	565.41
Danish	9,100	6,000	20,089	19,989	219.66	23,089	384.82
Dutch	65,800	74,000	102,777	36,977	56.20	28,777	38.89
French	518,780	383,000	1,460,130	941,350	181.45	1,077,130	281.23
Central Europe							
German	925,040	588,000	2,488,394	1,563,354	169.00	1,900,394	323.70
Polish	185,820	87,000	670,335	484,515	260.74	583,335	670.50
Czech	81,760	34,000	148,944	67,184	82.18	114,944	338.07
Slovak	29,260	10,000	86,950	57,690	197.16	76,950	769.50
Magyar (Hungarian)	13,180	16,000	52,156	38,976	295.72	36,156	225.98
Serbo-Croatian	5,200	7,000	24,095	18,895	363.37	17,095	244.21
Slovenian	5,780	3,000	9,040	3,260	56.40	6,040	201.33
Eastern Europe							
Russian	13,980	18,000	30,665	16,685	119.35	12,665	70.36
Ukrainian	2,780	10,000	22,662	19,882	715.18	12,662	126.62
Armenian	1,880	-	13,785	11,905	633.24	-	-
Lithuanian	9,400	8,000	34,744	25,344	269.62	26,744	334.30
Finnish	14,880	4,000	58,124	43,244	290.62	54,124	1353.10
Rumanian	2,060	2,000	5,166	3,106	150.78	3,166	158.30
Yiddish	52,980	39,000	170,174	117,194	221.20	131,174	336.34
Southern Europe							
Greek	6,160	12,000	56,839	50,679	822.71	44,839	373.66
Italian	125,040	147,000	605,625	480,585	384.35	458,625	311.99
Spanish	718,980	1,291,000	4,171,050	3,452,070	480.13	2,880,050	223.09
Portuguese	11,380	7,000	62,252	50,872	447.03	55,252	789.31
All other							
Arabic	3,720	4,000	25,765	22,045	592.61	21,765	544.13
Total Non-English	2,917,780	2,807,000	10,646,702	7,728,922	264.89	7,826,017	278.80
Total Non-English minus-Spanish	2,198,800	1,516,000	6,475,652	4,276,852	194.51	4,945,867	328.41

TABLE 6: INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE RESOURCES OF USA ETHNIC COMMUNITIES: 1980

	Broadcasting	Local Religious Unit	Press	Schools
Albanian	4	18	10	1
(Amerindian)	92	15	4	110
Arabic	18	11	11	3
Aramaic	5	3	5	1
Armenian	17	89	32	83
Basque	3	-	1	-
Bulgarian	1	-	2	1
Byelorussian	-	-	2	1
Cambodian	1	-	11	-
Carpatho- Rusyn	-	62	5	-
Chamorro	3	-	2	13
Chinese	29	45	31	142
Croat	18	17	9	16
Czech	18	30	22	12
Danish	2	6	6	3
Dutch	8	-	5	1
Estonian	2	5	4	15
Finnish	14	69	10	2
French	133	161	16	103
German	190	141	51	807
Greek	99	476	21	445
Haitian Creole	5	8	-	1
Hawaiian	3	-	-	-
Hebrew	19	3002	6	2425
Hindi	19	-	-	3
Hmong	1	-	2	2
Hungarian	32	130	23	58
Indonesian	1	-	-	-
Irish	25	1	3	-
Italian	170	256	40	61
Japanese	34	103	14	130
(Jewish)	11	-	-	-
Korean	17	18	14	37
Lao	2	-	4	1
Latvian	5	17	1	46
Lithuanian	27	52	32	41
Macedonian	5	-	-	-
(Micronesian)	-	6	-	-
Norwegian	5	12	11	5
Pali	-	-	-	1
Persian	6	-	1	1
(Philippine)	22	9	7	4
Polish	235	448	41	105
Portuguese	73	45	20	35
Punjabi	1	-	-	1
Romani	-	-	-	2
Rumanian	10	23	5	2
Russian	15	105	18	6
Samoan	3	-	-	-
Sanskrit	-	-	-	2
Serbian	15	-	3	3
Sinhalese	1	-	-	-
Slavonic (Old Church)	-	3	-	-
Slovak	21	119	23	14
Slovene	10	6	9	13
Spanish	932	1422	104	423
Swahili	1	-	-	-
Swedish	17	12	14	12
Tamil	1	-	-	-
Thai	-	-	-	5
Tibetan	1	2	-	2
Turkish	3	-	2	-
Ukrainian	32	210	29	80
Urdu	3	-	-	-
Vietnamese	12	42	38	6
Welsh	-	2	2	-
Wendish	-	2	-	-
Yiddish	13	-	36	128
(Yugoslav)	-	-	-	-
Totals	2470	7203	762	5414
#languages/ categories	59	41	48	50

( ) = exact language name requires further clarification

TABLE 6: INSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE RESOURCES OF USA ETHNIC COMMUNITIES: 1980

	Broadcasting	Local Religious Unit	Press	Schools
Albanian	4	18	10	1
(Amerindian)	92	15	4	110
Arabic	18	11	11	3
Aramaic	5	3	5	1
Armenian	17	89	32	83
Basque	3	-	1	-
Bulgarian	1	-	2	1
Byelorussian	-	-	2	1
Cambodian	1	-	11	-
Carpatho-Rusyn	-	62	5	-
Chamorro	3	-	2	13
Chinese	29	45	31	142
Croat	18	17	9	16
Czech	18	30	22	12
Danish	2	6	6	3
Dutch	8	-	5	1
Estonian	2	5	4	15
Finnish	14	69	10	2
French	133	161	16	103
German	190	141	51	807
Greek	99	476	21	445
Haitian Creole	5	8	-	1
Hawaiian	3	-	-	-
Hebrew	19	3002	6	2425
Hindi	19	-	-	3
Hmong	1	-	2	2
Hungarian	32	130	23	58
Indonesian	1	-	-	-
Irish	25	1	3	-
Italian	170	256	40	61
Japanese	34	103	14	130
(Jewish)	11	-	-	-
Korean	17	18	14	37
Lao	2	-	4	1
Latvian	5	17	1	46
Lithuanian	27	52	32	41
Macedonian	5	-	-	-
(Micronesian)	-	6	-	-
Norwegian	5	12	11	5
Pali	-	-	-	1
Persian	6	-	1	1
(Philippine)	22	9	7	4
Polish	235	448	41	105
Portuguese	73	45	20	35
Punjabi	1	-	-	1
Romani	-	-	-	2
Rumanian	10	23	5	2
Russian	15	105	18	6
Samoan	3	-	-	-
Sanskrit	-	-	-	2
Serbian	15	-	3	3
Sinhalese	1	-	-	-
Slavonic (Old Church)	-	3	-	-
Slovak	21	119	23	14
Slovene	10	6	9	13
Spanish	932	1422	104	423
Swahili	1	-	-	-
Swedish	17	12	14	12
Tamil	1	-	-	-
Thai	-	-	-	5
Tibetan	1	2	-	2
Turkish	3	-	2	-
Ukrainian	32	210	29	80
Urdu	3	-	-	-
Vietnamese	12	42	38	6
Welsh	-	2	2	-
Wendish	-	2	-	-
Yiddish	13	-	36	128
(Yugoslav)	5	-	-	-
Totals	2470	7203	762	5414
#languages/ categories	59	41	48	50

( ) = exact language name requires further clarification

TABLE 8: CORRELATIONS OF PRELIMINARY TOTALS

(a) By State

	Broadcasting	Local Religious Unit	Press	Schools
Broadcasting	-	.72	.84	.82
Local Religious Unit		-	.90	.96
Press			-	.92
Schools				-

(b) By Language

	Broadcasting	Local Religious Unit	Press	Schools
Broadcasting	-	.43	.80	.20
Local Religious Unit		-	.34	.92
Press			-	.22
Schools				-

CHAPTER 4

LANGUAGE-RELATED ETHNIC COMMUNITY SCHOOLS IN THE USA: A CATALOG OF SCHOOL-IN-SOCIETY LANGUAGE RESOURCES*

Yeshiva University
New York City

Introduction

There are probably well over 6000 ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA today, many of them still unenumerated by any effort to gauge the language resources of the country. A quarter of the total number consists of all day schools that are obviously, officially and directly engaged in bilingual education, the rest being involved in this same enterprise more indirectly, in that their students are primarily English speaking and, therefore, English is often (if not usually) employed in school efforts to educate and to influence the parents and pupils with which they are involved. However, above and beyond their involvement in bilingual education these schools are involved in language maintenance and in community maintenance efforts. So little attention has been paid to them in the past that until now

* Initially drafted under NIE Grant G-78-0133 (Project No. 8-0860) and completed and updated under OE Grant G-007901816.

TABLE I - Ethnic-community mother-tongue-schools in the USA 1980-81 - by language and state

	Albanian	Arabic	Aramaic	Armenian	Bulgarian	Byelorussian	Chamorro	Chinese	Creole	Croatian	Czech	Danish	Dutch	Estonian	Filipino	Finnish	French	German
NORTHEAST (9)																		
New England																		
Maine																	10	
New Hampshire																	5	2
Vermont																	6	
Massachusetts				11				8						1			20	
Rhode Island				3													3	
Connecticut				4				1						2			6	4
Middle Atlantic																		
New York				13				14	1	1	3			3			12	15
New Jersey				8		1		14						2			1	25
Pennsylvania				4				4		1							3	10
NORTH CENTRAL (12)																		
East North Central																		
Ohio		1		1				5		3								9
Indiana																		1
Illinois				5				7		5	7	1		1			1	14
Michigan	1		1	4	1			3		1							2	9
Wisconsin				3				1		1						1		3
West North Central																		
Minnesota								1				2				1	1	1
Iowa																	1	4
Missouri																		2
N. Dakota																		
S. Dakota											1						1	2
Nebraska										1	1						1	1
Kansas																		
SOUTH (17)																		
South Atlantic																		
Delaware								2										1
Maryland				1				9						2			2	2
Dist. Col.		2		1				1					1				1	
Virginia				2				2							2			
W. Virginia																		1
N. Carolina																	2	
S. Carolina																		
Georgia																		
Florida				1													2	
East South Central																		
Kentucky																		
Tennessee																	2	1
Alabama																	3	
Mississippi																	1	
West South Central																		
Arkansas																		
Louisiana																	4	
Oklahoma																	2	
Texas									3									6
WEST (13)																		
Mountain																		
Montana																		
Idaho																		
Wyoming																		
Colorado																	1	2
Arizona																		
New Mexico									1									1
Utah																		
Nevada																		1
Pacific														1	1		1	6
Washington																		1
Oregon																		
California				22					60		3			3	1		9	57
Alaska																		
Hawaii									6									
Puerto Rico								12										
Guam								1										
Marianas																		
Totals	1	3	1	83	61	1	13	142	1	16	12	3	1	15	4	2	103	171
NORTHEAST				43		1		41	1	2	3			8			66	46
NORTH CENTRAL	1	1	1	13	1			17		11	9	3		1		2	7	46
SOUTH		2		5				17					1	2	2		19	11
WEST				22				67		3				4	2		11	68
Other							13											
TOTALS	1	3	1	83	1	1	13	142	1	16	12	3	1	15	4	2	103	171

	German Sects	Greek	Hebrew	Hindi	Hungarian	Indochinese	Italian	Japanese	Korean	Lao	Latvian	Lithuanian	Native American	Norwegian	Pali	Persian	Polish	Portugese
NORTHEAST (19)																		
New England																		
Maine		4	9										1					
New Hampshire		12	8															
Vermont	1	1	3															
Massachusetts		40	122		1		2				1	3					11	11
Rhode Island		3	15				2										2	3
Connecticut		13	95		6		3				2	3					8	3
Middle Atlantic																		
New York	19	56	621		8		27	8	7		8	3	2				36	8
New Jersey		23	219		11	1	2	2	6		2	1					6	7
Pennsylvania		33	213		2		1		1		2	3					9	2
NORTH CENTRAL																		
East North Cen																		
Ohio		22	94	1	10		5	2	1		5	4					4	
Indiana	62	6	34								2	2						
Illinois	6	33	94		4		11	4	2		3	14					4	
Michigan	13	19	44	1	3		1	1	2		5	3	2				22	
Wisconsin	29	7	31								2		2				1	
West North Central																		
Minnesota	7	4	19			1					2		1	3				
Iowa	21	6	16								1							
Missouri	39	3	26		1		1	1										
N. Dakota	4	2	5										2					
S. Dakota	33	1	3										9					
Nebraska	1	4	7								2	1						
Kansas		2	6															
SOUTH (12)																		
South Atlantic																		
Delaware	6	1	7								2							
Maryland	5	7	61				2		4		1	2						
Dist. Col.		2	6		1			1	2						1			
Virginia	5	9	40				1		4							1		
W. Virginia		6	10															
N. Carolina		10	27										2					
S. Carolina		3	14															
Georgia		3	29						1									
Florida		21	113										2					
East South Central																		
Kentucky	6	2	11															
Tennessee	7	4	23															
Alabama		4	18										4					
Mississippi		1	12															
West South Central																		
Arkansas	1	3	7															
Louisiana		2	15		4			1										
Oklahoma		2	7										1					
Texas		12	49					2										
WEST (13)																		
Mountain																		
Montana	22	2	2										21					
Idaho		2	2															
Wyoming		4	2										3					
Colorado		2	13										1					
Arizona		2	21										21					
New Mexico		1	5										11					
Utah		3	3															
Nevada		4	3															
Pacific																		
Washington	3	5	16					2			3		2	1				
Oregon		1	8					1			1			1				
California		30	210		7		3	42	5	1	2	2	1				2	1
Alaska			1					3					22					
Hawaii		1	1					59										
Puerto Rico																		
Guam								1										
Virgin Islands				1														
Totals	636	445	2425	3	58	2	61	130	37	1	46	41	110	5	1	1	105	35
NORTHEAST	242	185	1305		28	1	37	10	16		15	13	3				72	34
NORTH CENTRAL	339	109	379	2	16	1	18	8	5		22	24	18	3			31	
SOUTH	30	94	449		8		3	4	11		3	2	9		1	1		
WEST	25	57	292		7		3	107	5	1	6	2	82	2			2	1
Other								1										
TOTALS	636	445	2425	3	58	2	61	130	37	1	46	41	110	5	1	1	105	35

	Punjabi	Roman	Rumanian	Russian	Sanskrit	Serbian	Slovak	Slovene	Spanish	Swedish	Thai	Tibetan	Ukrainian	Vietnamese	Yiddish	School Totals
NORTHEAST (19)																
New England									1							25
Maine																27
New Hampshire																11
Vermont									3	5			1		1	242
Massachusetts									1							32
Rhode Island									2				5			158
Connecticut																
Middle Atlantic				1			3		28	1	1		20		107	1026
New York									11				14		6	352
New Jersey							5	1	11				13	1	4	545
Pennsylvania																
NORTH CENTRAL (12)																
East North Central			2				1	5	7				5		2	313
Ohio									2							109
Indiana		2		2		2	3	5	18	1	1		5	1	1	257
Illinois						1		1	4				7		2	153
Michigan									2					1		84
Wisconsin																
West North Central									4	3			3		1	54
Minnesota									2							51
Iowa																73
Missouri																13
N. Dakota																50
S. Dakota																20
Nebraska									1							8
Kansas																
SOUTH (17)																
South Atlantic									1				2			22
Delaware							1		9	1	1		3		1	114
Maryland									5					1		26
Dist. Col.					1									1		68
Virginia							1									16
W. Virginia																40
N. Carolina																21
S. Carolina																33
Georgia																168
Florida									29							
East South Central																19
Kentucky																38
Tennessee									1							25
Alabama																18
Mississippi																
West South Central																13
Arkansas									2							28
Louisiana									2							14
Oklahoma									2							
Texas									59					1		132
WEST (13)																
Mountain																47
Montana																4
Idaho																9
Wyoming																29
Colorado								1	3		1					53
Arizona									8				1			32
New Mexico									13							6
Utah																8
Nevada																
Pacific										1		1				43
Washington																13
Oregon																526
California	1			3	1				54		1	1	1		3	26
Alaska																68
Hawaii									1							137
Puerto Rico									137							14
Guam																1
Virgin Islands																5414
Totals	1	2	2	6	2	3	14	13	423	12	5	2	80	6	128	2418
NORTHEAST				1			8	1	57	6	1		33	1	11	1185
NORTH CENTRAL		2	2	2		3	4	11	40	4	1		20	2	6	795
SOUTH					1		2		110	1	1		5	3	1	864
WEST	1			3	1			1	79	1	2	2	2		3	152
Other									137							5414
TOTALS	1	2	2	6	2	3	14	13	423	12	5	2	80	6	128	

there has been no central source of information for finding, utilizing or helping them. This language-by-language guide, supplemented by the name and address directory upon which it is based (this directory being accessible to all upon request) aims at finally making these schools into a functioning resource for all who need them.

ALBANIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 17,382)**

The bulk of Albanian speakers in the United States are relatively recent arrivals, most adults having arrived not only since the end of World War II but even during the past two decades. Current estimates indicate that some 20,000 have settled in the New York metropolitan area alone (roughly half of these in the Bronx, NY) during this period. The total number of individuals of Albanian descent in the USA today is roughly 50,000.

Albanians are generally either Moslem or Eastern Orthodox. Only one Albanian ethnic community mother tongue school has thus far been located, although it is likely that several more such have been established in connection with the various religious institutions (churches and mosques) of

** Census figures and "estimates of usual speakers" cited throughout this report are generally from Kloss, H. and G.D. McConnell Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World, v.2: North America. Quebec City, Laval University Press, 1978.

Albanians in the USA. Further information may be obtained from the Free Albania Committee, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. Source materials on Albanian-Americans are available at The Immigration Hisotry Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55114.

AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGES, see Native American languages

ARABIC (Total mother tongue claimants in the 1970 Census of the United States (CUS 1970): 193,520)

Among the roughly 2,000,000 Moslems in the USA today approximately 10% are of Arabic speaking descent. Thanks largely to them the use and study of classical and classicized Arabic in Moslem religious and cultural efforts has greatly increased in recent years. The nationwide development of ethnic consciousness -- as well as the nationwide debate concerning Near Eastern policy -- have also prompted more vigorous Arab-American participation in American Islamic affairs, including a stress on Arabic.

The recent significant growth of Arabic-speaking students in Southeastern Michigan has led to the establishment of the Arabic Language Bilingual Materials Development Center at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor). "The Center's major theme -- is the interrelationship of the students' two cultures" via the preparation of bilingual elementary curricula and materials. Little corresponding Arabic ethnic community effort with a clear language-and-tradition-maintenance

thrust has come to our attention thusfar, but it seems more than likely that various Mosques (and some Eastern Orthodox, Maronite and Meskite churches) in most larger American cities conduct a variety of weekend and/or weekday afternoon schools, both to teach Arabic as well as to use it as a medium of instruction.

For further information contact The Islamic Center, 2551 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington DC, 20008, as well as Arab information centers in Chicago, New York, San Francisco, etc.

References: (a) Lois Gottesman, Islam in America, New York, American Jewish Committee, 1979; (b) Kayal, P. The Role of the Church in the Assimilation Process of Catholic Syrians in the United States. Ph.D dissertation. Fordham University 1970.
Source materials for the study of Arabic speakers in the USA are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55114.

ARAMAIC

Variously referred to also as Aramic, Assyrian, Neo-Aramaic and Chaldean we are concerned here with a group that is generally associated either with the Western Catholic Church, via institutions that follow the Chaldean Rite, or with a branch of the Syrian Orthodox church. In both instances, schools have been established to teach Aramaic to community members -- adults as well as children -- as well as to teach

in that language.

Aramaic, as referred to here is, of course, not to be confused with (Judeo-)Aramaic (also referred to as Aramic), a language which progressively displaced Hebrew as the vernacular of Palestinian Jewry over 2000 years ago (Weinrich 1979), a regional variety of which has survived to this very day (Garbell 1965).

References: Garbell, I. The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Persian Azerbaijan. The Hague, Mouton, 1965.

Weinreich, M. History of the Yiddish Language. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980 (=English translation of volumes 1 and 2 of the 1973 four volume Yiddish original), 56-72.

ARMENIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 100,495)

A network of church related schools -- allday, weekday afternoon and weekend -- has been established in the USA, thanks to the efforts of (the Eastern and Western divisions of the Diocese of the Armenian Church in America, and the Eastern and Western divisions of the Armenian Prelacy) the branches of the Armenian Apostolic Church functioning in the USA, the Armenian General Benevolent Union, and several associations of Armenian educators as well as other fraternal and coordinating bodies. One tertiary institution has also been established under Armenian auspices, namely, The American Armenian International College in LaVerne, California.

The Diocese of the Armenian Church (630 Second Ave., New York, NY 10016) maintains an Armenian Language Laboratory and Research Center for students and teachers in Armenian schools in the USA. All in all some 2000 students attend the Armenian day schools and roughly twice that number attend schools of the other two types. Most day schools have been established during the past 20 years and some additional growth in their number is still expected. For further information also contact Armenian National Education Committee, 138 East 39th St., New York, N.Y. 10016 (associated with the Prelacy) or the Diocese of the Armenian Church (address listed above).

A Visit to an Armenian Day School:

The various types of schools currently maintained by Armenian Americans serve both 2nd and 3rd generation parents and pupils as well as a goodly number of recent arrivals from Turkey, Lebanon, Bulgaria, Roumania and France. The schools, particularly all day schools like the Holy Martyrs School in Queens, are commonly related to (supported by, affiliated with, or in some other way attached to) an Armenian church. The school and the church tend to become magnets for newly arriving families and the cultural-religious-educational-social activities that they sponsor provide both a sense of fellowship and of security for those that participate in them. In addition they

provide an arena where the newcomers "re-Armenianize" many of the 2nd and 3rd generation parents and pupils, while the latter help the former over the rough spots with which American life temporarily confronts them. School and church are also curricularly interrelated. The day schools teach Armenian for an hour a day in every grade. In addition, they also devote time to Armenian singing and to religion. The churches conduct masses in old (ecclesiastic) Armenian and provide sermons in modern Armenian (as well as in English). The schools are vital means of providing the 2nd and 3rd generations with access to church rituals and the churches help provide a strong rationale for the language emphases of the schools. The churches are also the meeting places for Saturday language schools (for children who do not attend all day Armenian schools) as well as for Sunday school classes.

The Diocese's Language Laboratory and Research Center has helped the schools by providing curricula, materials and texts for Armenian-American schools. In addition some diocese (e.g. that in Detroit) have also prepared curricula and materials that are rather widely employed. Finally, Soviet Armenia itself is also a source of texts, particularly since it has begun to prepare "diaspora" oriented texts written in Eastern Armenian (rather than in the Western Armenian standardized for use in

Armenia per se). Children in the all day schools generally begin to read both English and Armenian in the first grade (having gone through reading readiness programs for both languages in Kindergarten). "Newcomer" children and "old settler" children are usually co-present in the same classes, with teachers giving one group extra help in English and the other extra help in Armenian. All children are usually co-present in the same classes, with teachers giving one group extra help in English and the other extra help in Armenian. All children are fluent in English and in Armenian by the time they complete the 6 to 8 year programs that most schools offer. Armenian concern for their language is quite palpable, a special day being set aside for Sts. Sahag and Mesrob who devised the Armenian alphabet and translated the scriptures into Armenian. Unfortunately the total Armenian-American population is small and there are very few Armenian high schools at which further studies can be pursued beyond the eighth grade. The fact that a few colleges and universities offer Armenian instruction does not at all make up for the fact that most students have all too few opportunities to speak Armenian or to socialize with other Armenian speaking youngsters once their elementary schooling is completed. While Armenian Americans are aware of the fact that their parents have overcome many hardships in the past, and while they are determined to find ways of not permitting the peace

and plenty of America to be their ethno-religious undoing, they are, nevertheless, currently experimenting with linguistically less demanding programs in several of their schools, in order to see whether a stress on Armenianness-through-English might not be generally more successful than the difficulties posed by the traditional stress on Armenianness-via-Armenian.

References: (a) Fraser, James H. Armenian language maintenance in the United States and literature for children. Phaedrus, 1979, Spring, 79-81; (b) Matossian, Lou A. The Armenian language in America. Penn Review of Linguistics 1980, 4, Spring, 66-73.

ASSYRIAN, see Aramaic

BASQUE

The Boise, Idaho area is the Basque capital of the United States, with Reno, Nevada, and a few other locations extending as far to the Southwest as Bakersfield, California, constituting other areas of appreciable settlement. The Basque Study Center at The University Of Nevada, in Reno, is a major resource for research on Basque language maintenance in the USA. No community maintained schools have thus far been located but are to be expected in connection with Catholic churches in which Basques predominate.

BULGARIAN (also Macedonian)

Although only one community school has been located thusfar it seems reasonable to expect that several others will ultimately be located in Orthodox Church contexts. The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn. 55114, contains resource materials on Bulgarians/Macedonians in the USA.

BYELORUSSIAN (Estimated number of immigrants of Byelorussian origin 1961: 10,000)

Also (decreasingly) referred to as White Russian and White Ruthenian, schools teaching and teaching in Byelorussian are generally associated with and sponsored by the Byelorussian Orthodox Church. Unfortunately, our list of these schools is still practically non-existant at this time.

For further information contact Archimandrite Joseph Strok, 2544 W. Lemoyne St., Chicago, IL 60622. In view of the galloping "planned attrition" of Byelorussian in the Soviet Union (Wexler 1979) the future of Byelorussian in the USA is of particularly great concern to Byelorussian community leaders and members alike. The estimated total number of individuals of Byelorussian ancestry in the USA today is roughly 25,000.

Resource: Resource materials pertaining to Byelorussians in the United States are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Mirnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55114.

Reference: Wexler, Paul. The rise (and fall) of the modern Byelorussian literarcy language. Slavonic and East European Review, 1979, 57, 481-508.

CAJUN, see French (d)

CAMBODIAN, see Khmer

CAPE VERDEAN

Also referred to as Crioulo and Cape Verdean Crioulo, this variety's status as a separate language derives from Cape Verde's establishment as an independent Republic in 1975. At the present time it does not appear that there are any community sponsored ethnic mother tongue schools in Cape Verdean. If and when such are established they may, indeed, be bilingual (or trilingual since English too might be employed), utilizing both Cape Verdean and Portugese as media, as do several of the Title VII programs for Cape Verdean children in the greater Boston area (Gonsalves 1979). Some 20,000-25,000 strong (and increasing steadily) Cape Verdeans are not yet fully unanimous as to whether Cape Verdean (a) is or is not a separate language, (b) if it is, whether it should be written and used as a medium of instruction, and (c) if so, how radical the ausbau from Portugese should be. These issues all deserve attention during the years immediately ahead.

Reference: Georgette E. Gonsalves. On Teaching Cape Verdean Children: A Handbook for Administrators and Teachers. Rosslyn (VA). National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1979. For further information contact Ms. Gonsalves, 125 Chiswick Rd., Apt. 310, Boston, Mass., 02135.

CARPATHIAN/CARPATHO-RUSYN/CARPATHO-RUSSIAN/(SUB-)CARPATHO-RUS/CARPATHO-RUTHENIAN/CARPATHO-UKRAINIAN

Also referred to (decreasingly) as Lemko, Rusyn, Rusniak, Ruthenian, etc., this language has recently experienced a rebirth of interest. Although there are no ethnic community mother tongue schools that utilize it as a medium, there are a number of church-related classes that teach it to young and old, a number of texts and other materials for learning the language and a growing English literature relating the experiences of Carpatho-Rusyns during the past few centuries. Only in Czechoslovakia (briefly) and in Yugoslavia (to date) has a standard written form of the language been developed for all modern purposes. While assimilation policies have led to a serious weakening of the language in the USSR and in Czechoslovakia, (in both settings Ukrainian having been declared to be the written standard corresponding to spoken regional varieties of this language) efforts to foster it in the USA have attracted the support of secular intellectuals, Byzentine Rite Ruthenian

Catholic spokesmen, as well as rank-and-file members of the community, many of whom had been unaware, until comparatively recently, of the separate status of their mother tongue.

For further information contact Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center, 355 Delano Place, Fairview, New Jersey 07022.

References: Magocsi, R. The Shaping of a National Identity, Cambridge, Harvard University Press,

Carpatho-Rusyn American (Newsletter), published four times a year by the Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center (see above).

Resources: Resource materials concerning Carpatho-Rusyns are available both at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55114 and The Ukrainian Research Center at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

CHALDEAN, see Aramaic

CHAMORRO

A language with some 60,000 speakers (chiefly in Guam and others of the Mariana Islands, but,with migration, also represented increasingly in Hawaii and on the mainland), Chamorro is currently in a state of turmoil. Some Guamians have recorded their disinclination with respect to maintaining it and a 1972 sociolinguistic survey found that a majority of Guamian parents were no longer speaking it to their children.

On the other hand, language loyalists have begun a campaign to make Guamians aware of the importance of their language, both for the sake of their own cultural dignity and creativity as well as for the sake of Guam's "local color" for purposes of tourism. The local Catholic authorities have strongly supported maintaining Chamorro language and culture. As a result, a substantial proportion of the local Catholic nursery-kindergarten, elementary and secondary schools are engaged in maintenance oriented bilingual education so that "Chamorro culture . . . will last forever" (Bishop F.C. Flores of the Agana Diocese quoted by Miguet, How much of the past will be brought into the future? Pacific Dateline (Guam), 1974, Sept. 13, p.7).

CHINESE (Estimated numbers of persons of Chinese language "background" 1976: 537,000 (Waggoner 1978). Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 345,431).

The proud possessors of one of the world's classically great literary traditions the Chinese communities throughout the USA support a large number of schools under varying auspices, with varying curricula and attaining varying degrees of success in teaching some form of Chinese, from the regional pronunciation of transliterated ("Latinized") texts all the way through to classical Mandarin reading of the Mandarin classics. Given the regions of origin of most Chinese in the USA most schools teach a classicized Cantonese pronunciation of the characters while conducting their classes in modern

"city Cantonese". After decades of complete decentralization and disinclination to cooperate (due, in part, to sharp religious, political, region of origin and generational differences among the diverse teachers, parents, and sponsors of the various schools) a neutral interschool communication/assistance organization was finally established in 1978: The Association of Chinese Schools. Established thanks to a grant from The Ethnic Heritage Studies Program the ACS publishes a Newsletter, convenes an annual conference, seeks to gather information on Chinese education in the USA, and to give advice on a range of curricular-pedagogic fronts.

For further information write to (a) Association of Chinese Schools, c/o Becky T. Hsieh, 601 Stacy Court, Baltimore, MD 21204, (b) Council of Chinese Schools of Southern California, 12094 Wagner Street, Culver City, California 90230, (c) Mr. Gordon Lew, East-West, 838 Grant Avenue, Suite 307, San Francisco, California 94108, (d) A useful bibliography on Chinese education in Hawaii and other pertinent offprints are available from the Hawaii Chinese History Center, 111 N. King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817.

Visits to Chinese Community Schools

Chinese Community Schools

Schools supported by various sectors within the Chinese-American community function in most larger urban areas. Since the community itself is so varied (with respect to social class, recency of immigration or post-immigrational generation, languages spoken at home, etc.) the schools also differ greatly. In San Francisco the full gamut of this internal variation can be readily noted.

a) At the Chinese Children's Community Centers (CCCC) roughly a dozen teachers, almost as many of them being Anglos as Chinese, provide a pre-school/nursery program for roughly 50 children, some 10% of whom are not of Chinese ethnicity but who live in the immediate area of the school. Most of the children come from immigrant homes in which Chinese (usually a variety of Cantonese) is spoken and most of the Chinese school-personnel speak "City" Cantonese to the children and do so freely and almost continuously. Chinese songs, games and reading readiness activities alternate with parallel English activities. Most pupils are bilingual upon arrival at the school but are clearly Cantonese dominant at that point. Most children are called by Anglo-American names and the school provides a cheerful bilingual-bicultural atmosphere in which a good bit of English is acquired under Chinese auspices. Approximately 80% of the school's budget is provided from state funds and the bureaucratic regulations and uncertainties related to these funds

is a constant source of trials and tribulations for the staff and director.

Several other nurseries, roughly similar to CCCC, are found in the general area which is densely populated by young Chinese families. Many of these families are recent arrivals from Hong Kong and Taiwan (a constant stream of additional new arrivals being expected from the mainland proper with further normalization in diplomatic relationships). The nurseries provide them with bilingual child care (ennabling both parents to work during the day), guidance/referral services pertaining to the various welfare and social service programs for which they might qualify (e.g. the Kai Ming Head Start school), and, more rarely, orient them toward and involve them in explicitly language and culture maintenance activities and responsibilities (e.g. the Wah Mei School). All of these bilingual programs are directed by American-trained Chinese personnel.

b) St. Mary's (Chinese) Catholic School is a well known and long established Chinatown landmark offering a daily half hour period of Chinese instruction in grades 1-6. Grades 7-8 have received no such instruction during the past few years since "by then the children are too high-school-oriented to be interested". Viewed by critics as a "golden ghetto" for the upwardly mobile middle class, many children nevertheless seem to be quite fluent in Chinese as they reply to questions put to them by their teachers, make up sentences for new words,

etc. The texts employed are from the Lo series, specially prepared for American born Chinese youngsters, in which both English translations and distinctly a traditional Romanized transcriptions are employed. Even so, some traditional Chinese school characteristics are quite evident: decorum, conventions (traditional class salutations to teachers upon arrival and departure) and appreciable time spent in copying and chanting of characters. The school's general and Catholic activities (and its predominantly non-Chinese staff) operate within a physical setting that is decoratively Chinese (even Christ and other Christian holy figures are presented pictorially as Chinese). Although few families observe Catholicism the school represents one avenue among many via which Chinese are introduced to Christianity and a Christian-Chinese-American amalgam comes into being.

c) In the very same building, after St. Mary's Catholic School has dismissed its classes, a traditional afternoon Language School convenes. Although it does not have the huge enrollment it once boasted it still serves several hundred children, a small number of which complete all twelve years of study. All classes meet five afternoons a week for an hour and a half per day. The curriculum emphasizes reading and writing of the characters. Almost all pupils come from Cantonese speaking homes. Textbooks are from Hong Kong (considered to be easier than Taiwanese texts on the one hand, and less "untraditional" than the Lo series on the other). Classes engaged in considerable repetition, unison reading,

copying of characters. Discipline is strong, children are constantly working and admonished if they have not learned what is expected of them. The drop out rate is substantial after three or four years of study. Those few who remain thereafter get to study history and geography of China, the Chinese classics (finally studied in Mandarin per se) and the writing of "formula letters". Graduates of the full program may still read only haltingly in Mandarin but their reading of the characters in Cantonese is fluent for most adult level material. Although naturally, there is inter-school variation, (e.g., some afternoon schools do employ Taiwanese texts, since these are not only more inexpensive as a result of the governmental subsidies that apply to them, but they are also considered to be ideologically/politically preferable), almost all of these schools derive their new teachers from Taiwan. Most teachers work during the day at various occupations and then teach roughly 15 hours per week in the evenings for $130/month. The schools are largely self supporting from the $5/month tuition paid by each student. Some schools are also supported by one or another Chinese economic-fraternal organization.

d) Another frequently available type of school is the Saturday School. One large school of this type in Chinatown has 200 students. Most commonly these schools cater to 2nd and 3rd generation students -- or to the children of recently arriving and highly mobile professionals. Many also come from English speaking suburban homes. These schools are

often under parental auspices and many are unstable and do not last for more than a few years. Often criticized for their minimalistic goals and incohate programs (e.g., linguistically they may aim at no more than a few utilitarian phrases and simple characters), these schools nevertheless teach subjects generally ignored elsewhere, e.g., Chinese music, art, drama, dance, singing and caligraphy.

Attempts at educational experimentation are not uncommon in Chinatown, particularly for 2nd and 3rd generation children whose parents may be equally unhappy with the "social segregation" of the parocial school, the "unbending traditionalism" of the afternoon school and the "minimalism" of the Saturday school. There have been attempts to start day schools under parental (rather than Christian church) auspices. Chinese studies programs in local colleges have contributed to the emotional and to the intellectual development of students who dropped out of or never received any childhood Chinese education. Subsidized summer camp programs in Taiwan have made it possible for many middle class children to spend at least eight weeks a year in a completely Chinese (and Chinese speaking) environment. There have been attempts to foster reading and writing in modern (rather than in archaic) Cantonese. There have been materials produced by Title VII materials centers that have appealed to children attending community supported schools or attending no Chinese schools at all. Although some 50% of 2nd and 3rd generation children may be receiving no Chinese education at all, the large number of new

arrivals may once again delay attention to the curricular needs of the more Americanized. The number and quality of English publications by and for Chinese Americans is growing with the involvement of American born and/or trained young intellectuals. Many of the latter are employed in Title VII, Unified School District, or University related work and are bringing a new sophistication, a new synthesis, and a new leadership to the fore of communal educational and cultural efforts. All of this makes the Chinese school arena one of the most interesting among all American ethnic communities.

Many of the observations concerning Chinese schools in San Francisco are rather generalizable, as can be seen from an independent description of a Chinese school in New York City.

e) Transfiguration School is a small, Catholic parochial school located at the southern end of Manhattan, roughly 8 blocks from the foot of the Brooklyn Bridge. With a total registration of about 375 students in grades one through eight (only 75 of whom are Catholic) enrollment was, until recently, a mix of Chinese children (who lived in or had parents working in Chinatown) and Italian youngsters (drawn from nearby Little Italy). However, the recent growth of New York City's Chinatown and subsequent shrinking of Little Italy have resulted in a student body that is approximately 95% ethnic Chinese. Approximately 5% of the Chinese students are recent immigrants from Hong Kong, the vast majority of

the remainder of the students being American-born children of immigrant parents. The mother tongue and home language of most students is some variety of Cantonese, although there is the occasional child who is a native speaker of Mandarin.

As is the case with most of the Catholic schools across the country, English is the primary language of instruction at Transfiguration School. In the nearby Pre-Kindergarten program which eventually feeds into Transfiguration, children are permitted to use Chinese in the classroom; by Kindergarten, the use of English is strongly encouraged, and from first grade on it is essentially required. The teaching staff at Transfiguration School and in the affiliated Kindergarten are Anglo, and function exclusively in English. An ESL specialist spends three days a week at the school, working with students who are having difficulty in English. In addition, a Title VII-funded full-time bilingual paraprofessional is available for English remediation work. Both the ESL specialist and the paraprofessional work with the children in small groups, on a "pull-out" (i.e., taking individual children out of class) basis; the children they deal with are, with few (older) exceptions, in Grades 1 through 4.

Three years ago the school, in an attempt to meet what it perceived to be the needs of its students, instituted a Chinese Language and Culture class for first graders. Each year since then, the program has been extended for the original class and introduced to a new group of first graders, with the result that Grades 1 through 5 were participating in the

program during the 1980-81 school year. The school plans to continue to introduce the program to a new group each year until the program is operative in all eight grades.

The Chinese Language and Culture class is an integral part of the curriculum for all members of a given class, be they ethnic Chinese or not. Once a week, a Chinese instructor, assisted by the school's bilingual paraprofessional, takes over the students' regular classroom for an hour. Both adults speak mainly Cantonese during that hour; they use English when they find that it is needed, and some of the children use English when responding to questions.

The subject matter of the classes is ethnocultural material: Chinese folk tales, legends, festivals are all topics around which lessons are organized. Part of the class time is devoted to oral group work; the instructor introduces the topic for the day, writes pertinent characters on the blackboard, discusses the topic with the children, has the children recite the characters as a group, etc. The rest of the lesson involves individual, written work, i.e., children are required to practice writing characters and/or to draw pictures relating to the day's lesson. Although homework is given, it is kept to a minimum, since the Chinese class is also viewed by the School as an opportunity for the children to "relax" and enjoy themselves in a language in which they are comfortable.

The school building, in addition to housing the allday,

predominantly English speaking school, serves as a community center for residents and workers of Chinatown: a weekend Chinese school, which is also attended by many of Transfiguration's students, runs 4 separate sessions in the schools classrooms. Local chapters of unions hold their meeting in the building and church groups hold meetings and bazaars on the premises, and so forth, so that the building's Chinese efforts are just some of its many outreach and community involvement endeavors.

References: Lee, Betty Sing. Statistical profile of the Chinese in the United States: 1970 Census. New York, Arno Press, 1975.

Steiner, Stan. Fusang: The Chinese Who Built America. New York, Harper, 1979.

Lai, H.M. and Choi, P.P. History of the Chinese in America. San Francisco, Chinese American Studies Planning Group.

CRIOLE, see Haitian Creole

CRIOULO, see Cape Verdean

CROATIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 9802; Serbo-Croatian: 239,455)

Croatians are traditionally Western Catholics but most of their schools in the USA are conducted under secular communal auspices. This may be largely due to generational

factors, the most recent wave of Croatian immigrants (whose children are served by these schools) being less traditional in orientation than the "old-timers" who arrived in the USA during the period 1880-1920 and whose schools generally were (and remained) under Church auspices. Another factor at work here may also be the inability or unwillingness of the Church to take a sufficiently strong position here on the Serbian vs. Croatian issue. Yugoslav national policy has consistently sought to fuse these two languages (viz: Serbo-Croatian and, increasingly, "Yugoslavian"), counteracting Croatian nationalistic linguistic ausbau (and political separatism) sentiments and going so far (via constitutional provision for "freedom of languages and alphabets") as to encourage the writing of Serbian in Latin (rather than in Cyrilic) characters so as to vitiate the visible distinction between the two languages. As a result language maintenance is very much at the forefront of the agenda of Croatian-Americans, many of whom reject the notion of Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian as a sham. Unfortunately, the total community is small in numbers, limited in numbers and lacking sufficient institutions under its own control.

Reference: Magner, T.F. Language and nationalism in Yugoslavia. Canadian Slavic Studies, 1967, 1, 333-347.

Brozovic, D. O problemima varijanata (On the problem of variants). Jezik, 1965, 13, 33-66.

Lenok, R.L. and T.F. Magner. The Dilemma of the Melting Pot: The Case of the South Slavic Languages. University Park (PA). The Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976 (Note: Treats Serbs and Croatians as Serbo-Croatians. Also treats Slovenians. Does not treat Macedonians or Bulgarians contrary to implication of title).

Henzl, Vera M. Slavic languages in the New Environment, in Shirley Heath and C.A. Ferguson (eds.) Language in the USA. New York, Oxford, 1980.

For further information contact (a) The Croatian Academy of America, P.O. Box 1767 Grand Central Station, New York, NY 10017, (b) Croatian Ethnic Institute, Inc., 4851 S. Drexel Blvd., Chicago, Illinois 60615 and (c) Croatian Fraternal Union of America, 100 Delaney Dr., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15235.

Resources: Resource materials concerning Croatians in the United States are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St.Paul, Minnesota 55114.

CZECH (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 452,812)

As the number of local ethnic community schools (religious and secular) teaching and teaching in Czech has slowly but steadily decreased over the years, increased effort has

gone into introducing the language into American colleges and universities as a foreign language. At present 45 institutions of general higher education do 50 (as do two Benedictine seminaries), encouraged by organizations such as Slavonic Benevolent Order who help cover the expense of such efforts. This is a good example of the prestige elevation experienced by many once-lowly ethnic mother tongues in the USA in post World War II years (an elevation first experienced by German, Norwegian and Swedish some 3 or 4 generations ago). Note, however, that the prestige elevation is also accompanied by de-ethnization, i.e. the language generally loses its ethnic - community functions. It is increasingly taught by professionals, to an ethnically diverse student body, studying it for ethnically unrelated reasons. The ethnic studies programs introduced into American colleges and universities since the mid-60's include a goodly number of such language (and language-and-culture) courses. It remains to be seen whether they can avoid the community detachment ("routinization") and sheer professionalism experienced by their predecessors and remain "in service to" their ethnic origins rather than scholarly exercises alone. Thus, it is a balanced combination (and mutual enrichment) of two responsibilities that elevation of ethnic mother tongues to college level instruction requires. Seemingly it is a difficult balance to maintain, not just in the case of Czech but in the case of

many, many other ethnic mother tongues as well. When the necessary balance is lost one possible extreme consequence is the complete de-intellectualization of the learning experience so that it becomes nothing but an ethno-emotional experience, an exercise in passion, in heat without light. The opposite extreme consequence is equally real, however, namely the complete ossification of the experience as it becomes an antiquary "science" for academic specialists in recondite knitpicking while the ethnic community that gave birth to the language program (and that often funded it and perhaps continues to do so) whithers and disappears. While some of the more recently elevated ethnic mother tongues (in terms of introduction into American colleges and universities) may stand closer to the first extreme, most of those introduced to the campus prior to World War II are now faced by the dangers of the second extreme. While Czech currently stands smack in the middle of these two dangers it is the latter that is already the greater of the two.

Reference: Henzl, Vera M. Slavic languages in the new environment, in Shirley B. Heath and C.A. Ferguson, eds. Language in the USA. New York, Oxford, 1980.

For further information contact: National Alliance of Czech Catholics, 2057-59 S. Lawndale Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60623.

Resource: Resource materials on Czechs in America are available at The Immigration History Research Center, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55114.

DANISH (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 144,462)

Our remarks pertaining to the de-ethnization of language learning on college campuses (see Czech, above) apply also to Danish, but with a vengeance. Danish has apprently even "graduated" from reliance on campuses and is now generally available through commercially published textbooks, records, dictionaries, cassettes, etc., in addition to courses at some 20 institutions of higher education (including Dana College, Blair, Nebraska, initially established by Danish-Americans). On the other hand, neither the Danish Sisterhood nor the Danish Brotherhood in America sponsor ethnic community mother tongue schools (although many of the lodges of the Brotherhood still offer informal language classes for their members). This state of affairs is in agreement with Einer Haugeh's observation of some 35 years ago (Haugen 1953) that the Danes were less language-retentive in the USA than either the Norwegians or the Swedes, both because of their smaller numbers and because of their greater dispersion throughout the USA.

For further information concerning the few remaining ethnic community mother tongue schools, contact either the Danish Brotherhood in America, 3717 Harney Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68137, or the Supreme Lodge of the Danish Sisterhood, 3438 North Opal Avenue, Chicago, IL 60634. For information concerning college level courses and commercial materials for the study of Danish consult listings of the Cultural Section,

Royal Danish Embassy, 3200 Whitehaven St., NW, Washington, DC 20008. A useful reference is Askey, D.E., G.G. Gage and R.T. Rovinsky, Nordic Area Studies in America: A Survey and Directory of the Human and Material Resources (1976) which originally appeared as the June 1975 issue of the journal of Scandinavian Studies.

DUTCH (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 452,800)

Although the number of speakers is rather substantial there seem to be almost no ethnic community mother tongue schools in this language at the present time. Over 80% of the Dutch mother tongue population is now American born and, seemingly, rather completely anglified in language.

DZHUDEZMO, see Judezmo

ESTONIAN

Like the Danes the Estonians in the USA (some 25,000 in all) are few in number and scattered throughout the country. Nevertheless, they support a network of schools and an Estonian Educational Society. The relatively recent immigrant status of Estonians and their ongoing ethnolinguistic struggle for survival under Soviet rule are probably both responsible for this phenomenon. It should be noted, however, that all of the schools are weekend (Saturday and/or Sunday schools), and, in keeping with the secular nature of the post World-War II

migration, few if any of them are church related or affiliated. These two characteristics may not bode well for the long-range future of Estonian ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA, however much the current scene may be one of considerable activity and apparent accomplishment, unless renewed immigration from Estonia becomes possible.

For further information contact: (a) Estonian Houses in various cities, e.g. Estonian House, 243 East 34th Street, New York, NY 10016. The Estonian Educational Society, Inc., may be contacted at the same address; (b) Estonian Archives, 607 E. 7th Street, Lakewood, N.J. 08701.

References: (a) Pennar, Jaan (ed.). The Estonians in America, 1627-1975, Dobbs Ferry, Oceana Publications, 1975; (b) Koiva, Enn C. Using Estonian/American Based Culture Models for Multi-Cultural Studies. Andover (Conn.), ELACM, 1979.

Resource: Resource materials on Estonian-Americans are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St.Paul, Minnesota, 55114.

FILIPINO/PILIPINO (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 217,907; Total estimated "usual home speakers" Census Population Studies (=CPS) 1975: 322,000)

Also often referred to as Tagalog, this language (with greater purism vis-a-vis English influences (=Pilipino) or with lesser emphasis on purism (=Filipino), with greater fidelity to the speech of the Manila region (Tagalog) or with more stress on a semblance of multi-regional representativeness

(=Pilipino/Filipino)) is the national and co-official language of the Philippines. As its speakers continue to increase (and rapidly so) in the USA and as dissatisfaction with Title VII programs in whatever variant of this language also increases, efforts to establish ethnic community mother tongue schools, now just beginning, are bound to multiply. Similar efforts may also be expected on the part of speakers of various regional languages of the Philippines (e.g. Cebuano, Ilicano, etc.) who have, thus far, received only scant attention from Title VII authorities, many of whom may be unaware of the plethora of mother tongues in the Philippines or who may be convinced that the basic similarities between most of these languages are great enough for all children to be effectively served via Filipino/Pilipino/Tagalog. Whether or not this is indeed the case (or will be interpreted as being the case) is also, to some extent, dependent on the ethnolinguistic attitudes and identity self-concepts of the speakers of the regional languages involved. At the moment no organized local (as opposed to national) language sentiments are visible in the Philippines proper. Whether such sentiments will develop given the greater freedom and ethnic contrastivity of the USA remains to be seen (but should be expected).

The discrepancy between the relatively large number of first generation children from the Philippines now in the USA (as well as the concomitant growth in second generation children of this background), on the one hand, and the small

number of ethnic community mother tongue schools on the other hand, brings to mind the more general fact that this discrepancy generally obtains for recent (post-World-War II) immigrants that lack a literacy-based ethno-religious tradition uniquely their own. Like the Filipinos, the Indochinese, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics have established relatively few ethnic community mother tongue schools of their own, whereas Chinese and Arabic speakers have (or have continued to do so). The absence of modern language-and-nationality movements in their countries of origin may be an additional contributory factor to their inactivity on this front since their arrival here. Under these circumstances and given their recency of arrival and relative poverty they have tended to rely disproportionately on Title VII for language maintenance purposes, a reliance they may ultimately (and sooner rather than later) come to regret.

For further information concerning possible Filipino ethnic community mother tongue schools contact Filipino Federation of America, Inc., 2289 W. 25th St., Los Angeles, California 90018; Philippino Association, 501 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022; Filipino-American Coordination Committee, 2741 Fruitridge Rd., Sacramento, California 95820; and Philippine-Americans for Community Action and Development, 9323 Old Mt. Vernon Rd., Alexandria, Virginia 22309.

Reference: Breebe, James and Maria. The Filipinos: a special case in Shirley B. Heath and C.A. Ferguson (eds.), Language

in the USA, New York, Oxford University Press, 1979.

Kim, Hying-Chan and Cynthia C. Mejia. The Filipinos in America, 1898-1974. Dobbs Ferry (N.Y.), Oceana Publications, 1976.

FINNISH (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 214,168)

Although Finnish is only regionally (rather than linguistically) allied to the other Scandinavian languages, its current status in the USA, either as an ethnic community mother tongue or as a subject of study at the higher education level, is, if anything, even weaker than that of Danish (q.v.). UOMI College (Hancock, Michigan) was originally established by Finnish immigrants and some of its faculty and students are still of Finnish heritage and are involved in Finnish studies (which, of course, are open to all students), as well as in Finnish church and community concerns. In addition, Concordia College (Moorehead, Minnesota), through its summer language-camp program, offers a two week summer camp experience in Finnish language and culture to elementary and secondary level students. (Similar programs are also available at Concordia in French, German, Italian, Spanish, Russian and Norwegian). This summer camp opportunity is a recent and innovative effort and may present the Finnish ethnic community in the USA with an effective (and perhaps last) opportunity to expose its children to a Finnish environment within the USA.

For information concerning Finnish at American universities and colleges contact the Consulate General of Finland, Finland House, 540 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022. Other information on Finns in the USA can be obtained from Tyomies Society, P.O. Box 553, Superior, Wisconsin 54880.

Resource: Resource materials for the study of Finnish Americans are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55114.

FRENCH (Total estimated number of "usual home speakers" 1975: 1,472,000. Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 2,598,408)

Because of its remaining international instrumental value as well as (and even more) because of its international reputation as a language of esthetic and cultural refinement, French, far more than any other ethnic community mother tongue in the USA, has "successfully" negotiated the difficult passage to supra-ethnic status. As a result of its very special worldwide status, its history as a colonial language in North America and its history as an immigrant language here, there are at least four different arenas in which French in the USA is educationally active:

a. The ethnic front: Gone are the days when French was used as a co-medium in scores of parochial schools of Franco-American parishes throughout the length and breadth of New England (LeMaire 1966). Although many of the schools are still there, and although many of them still teach French

(to pupils many of whom are often still of Franco-American extraction), extremely few of them still have the combination of French mother tongue students, teachers, and community context that makes French as a co-medium possible. The schools still conducted by the Sisters of Saint Anne in Webster, Ludlow, Lynn and Newton (all in Massachusetts) are examples of an approach that was once far more widespread and which may yet experience a new lease on life if the "new ethnicity" movement among Franco-Americans becomes more enterprising.

b. The private (but usually not ethnically related) front: Two types of private schools are to be found in various American cities in which French is used as a co-medium of instruction. One type, the Lycee Francais, follows the program of instruction that would be followed by a school in France proper plus a small number of courses in English and American history. Students may attend from kindergarten through to the end of high school and receive a French Baccalaureat degree (and, at times, an American high school diploma as well). The other type, variously referred to as Ecole Bilingue, Ecole International, Ecole Francaise, etc., provides a more nearly balanced bilingual program and yields an American diploma. (Some of these schools prepare for the International Baccalaureat examinations as well). Tuition rates are rather high (averaging over $2000/year), results are typically good,

and scholarships for "central city" children (a euphemism for poor Blacks and Hispanics) are sometimes available. The Washington International School is one of these (also offers a full Spanish track in addition to its French track), as is the United Nations International School (also really a Multilingual School) and the Fleming School (both of the latter being in New York City).

The de-ethnicized nature of these schools is such that some hardly mention French as a co-medium of instruction, considering it to be no more than a self-evident approach to a good education. Nevertheless, these schools do sometimes serve ethnic French mother tongue children (particularly in the Boston area), as well as French mother tongue children of Francophone diplomatic and commercial representatives in the USA (e.g. in the Washington area). Some of the large French firms operating in the USA (e.g. Michelin) operate French schools of this type attended exclusively by the children of their European French administrative and technical staffs.

c. The public front: Yet another indication of the "successful" de-ethnicization of French as a co-medium of instruction in the USA is the fact that French immersion programs (full or part) have been established by a few public school districts (Burlington, VT; Silver Spring, MD; Cincinnati, OH; Detroit, MI) and universities (SUNY, Plattsburgh, NY). These are obviously engaged in enrichment bilingual education (as

are the schools in category b, above), and one can only hope that their numbers will multiply. Although a very few such programs are available in other languages (German: Milwaukee, WI and Cincinnati, OH; Spanish: Culver City, Hayward and San Diego, CA) French still tends to be the only language that American parents, educators or legislators readily accept for bilingual education beyond the ranks of the disadvantaged and the ethnics.

d. The Cajun front: Although there has been a tangible rise in ethnolinguistic consciousness among the Acadians of Louisiana, these are currently in even worse straights than the Franco-Americans of New England insofar as ethnic community mother tongue schools (or other formal institutions) are involved. Nevertheless, this situation seems ripe for a change for the better since Cajun has recently begun to be written and more school-related claims are being mentioned in connection with it. Contacts between Cajuns and New England Franco-Americans as well as between Cajuns and Quebecois are also increasing and these too should lead to greater demands for schools in Cajun and/or standard French.

References: Re (a) above: see Lemaire, H.B. Franco-American efforts on behalf of the French language in New England in J.A. Fishman, Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague, Mouton, 1966, 253-279; Coleman, Rosalie M. An Historical Analysis of the French/English Bilingual Education Programs Conducted in Connecticut by The Daughters of the Holy

Spirit. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Connecticut, 1978. Also note Glen C. Gilbert. French and German, a comparative study, in Shirley Heath and C.A. Ferguson (eds.) Language in the USA. New York, Oxford University Press, 1979. For information concerning annual meetings of the Franco-American Conference (a joint undertaking of Franco-Americans in Louisiana and New England) contact National Bilingual Resource Center, P.O. Box 43410 USL, Lafayette, Louisiana 70501.

Re (b) above: contact Services du Conseiller Culturel, French Counselate, 972 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10021; also contact The Washington International School (2735 Olive Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20007) for a copy of its Newsletter and for a copy of the membership list of The Association of Genuinely Bilingual Schools, most of which fall into this category.

Re (c) above: Derrick, Wm. Early immersion in French, Today's Education, 1979, 68, no.1, 38-40; also see his: An early language immersion model in a demonstration school. ADFL Bulletin, 1978, 10, no.1, 34-36. For details concerning a Title VII programs in a Franco-American context contact Bilingual Education Program, Office of the Superintendent, Richford, VT 05476.

Re (d) above: Smith-Thibodeaux, J. Les Francophones de Louisiane. Paris, Entente 1977; Rushton, W.F. The Cajuns From Acadia to Louisiana. New York, Farrar Straus Giroux, 1979. Also note the many up-to-date reports of

"Project Louisiana" a joint research effort of the Geography Departments of McGill University and of Laval University as well as of the Anthropology Departments of Laval University and York University. Many of these reports focus on language use.

A visit to French co-medium school of type (b):

THE FLEMING SCHOOL (FRENCH)

New York City's Fleming School is located in a pretty, bustling neighborhood on the Upper East Side of Manhattan. Started as a pre-school instructional program in 1957, the Fleming School has since developed into a small private school offering instruction through Grade 8, with a commitment to teaching (and teaching in) French.

The school, housed in two buildings located less than two blocks from each other, carefully maintains an enrollment of very close to 600 children, that being perceived as an enrollment that the physical facilities can comfortably handle. Since instruction in French begins at the nursery school level, only children aged 3 to 6 years are admitted into the program. Fully 90% of the students are English mother-tongue, American children -- thus the program, for the most part, involves teaching French to children with no knowledge of that language.

The newer, more modern of the buildings owned by the school contains the younger children -- nursery through third

grade. The building is large, bright and airy, with children's artwork and predominantly English signs prominently displayed. Many of the "classrooms" in this building, particularly those used by the younger children, are non-traditionally laid out, with child-sized tables scattered around the rooms and lots of open space available. Children work in small groups, under the supervision of a teacher; a variety of activities and projects are underway at any one time, and members of the same "class" may be doing very different things.

The second building owned by the school houses grades 4 through 8. Each of the grades is divided into classes, students grouped according to ability, with the aim of keeping class size small (less than 20 students). Classrooms in this building are smaller and more traditional; desks are arranged in rows facing a blackboard and a teacher's desk. In addition to classrooms, this building contains a small gym, a library, reading and science laboratories and an impressive film collection.

The school's French program unfolds in carefully graduated steps, designed to facilitate the learning of French. There is more than one teacher assigned to each of the lowest grades, minimally, one native-speaker of English and one native-speaker of French, who attempt to function exclusively in their mother tongue, are active in any one classroom. Those French teachers involved with the three and four-year old groups work on developing oral/aural skills -- vocabulary building,

comprehension of simple sentences, simple French production skills, and so forth. Reading and writing are introduced at the kindergarten level in French only, the school's attitude being that French, because it is monophonic, should be and is more easily learned than (polyphonic) English. After a full year of reading and writing in French only, English reading and writing are introduced (Grade 1), with no reported difficulties, and instruction in French is continued.

From first grade on, the school day is "departmentalized", that is, divided into blocks of time, with each period assigned to a particular topic. Each class, from first through eighth grade, devotes (at least) 7 periods per week (roughly 20% of instruction time) to French. Senior grades study French Language Arts, French Literature and French History in French, using textbooks imported from France. In addition to classroom work, there is a full program of extra-curricular activities arranged for students, some of which involves French language and/or cultural events.

The Fleming School provides the following description of itself:

"THE SPIRIT OF THE FLEMING SCHOOL

Effective learning takes place when a child has confidence in his teachers, in his school, and when he has self-assurance, confidence in himself. A most important factor in his school life is a sure knowledge that he is loved and respected. Added to confidence and self-assurance must be a sense of accomplishment, of success, built on both achievement and an appreciation for temporary failure as a learning experience.

A school which creates an environment fostering growth in confidence and self-assurance and which stimulates discovery-learning is an effective school. Most schools lay claim to this distinction. However, a hallmark of such excellence is found in the way the learning experiences are organized and in the response of the children. Individualized work, projects, individual work in laboratories, in art, music and dance programs, with children producing movie films, plays and original drama productions, field trips, use of rich community resources all speak to the worth of a program which does truly bring out in each child a high degree of his potential.

Too often, the words used above suggest permissiveness. But when there are also well-understood guidelines of achievement and expectation in learning and in social behavior there is creative success. Standards and high expectations without being repressive are welcomed by children and young people. Children like to know clearly what is expected of them. They enjoy knowing where things are and having them readily available. They respond enthusiastically to words of commendation, approval and helpful suggestion. As a result, learning is enhanced and behavioral problems become rare, the true exception.

Perhaps the best indication of an effective program, in addition to the typical evidence of achievement, is the happiness and enthusiasm of pupils and teachers. There are of course, off-days for both child and teacher. There are times when even a group may not be up to its best. However, if, as a rule, youngsters look forward to a day in their school, and if teachers enjoy sharing with pupils and work well with administration in planning and developing programs, then the school is a happy school, an intelligently creative school.

This is the Fleming School. This is the spirit the School tries to cultivate. It seems to do this rather well."

Note that French is not specifically mentioned. It is presumably a natural ingredient of a "happy school, an intelligently creative school".

GERMAN (Total estimated "usual home speakers" 1975: 2,288,000; total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 6,093,054)

As in the case of French, German too is employed as a medium of education in the USA in schools of many different

kinds. As in the case of French type (a) there are also ethnic community mother tongue schools utilizing German, indeed, type (a) is much stronger today (and was once ever so much stronger) in the case of German than it is in the case of French. On the other hand, schools of type (b) and (c), private (ethnic community unrelated) and public, although they exist for German, are clearly much stronger in the French case than in the German case. Finally, when we turn to type (d), dialectally divergent schools with a weak or non-existent tradition of writing in the dialect itself, we find not only a truly huge number of day schools but, oddly enough, the largest such number for any ethnic community in the United States.

a. Ethnic community mother tongue schools. Although the number of such schools is smaller than it was some 50-75 years ago (Kloss 1966), it is still quite substantial today. Day schools in this category (under the auspices of one or another church) have well nigh disappeared (the Missouri Synod Lutheran Church having come almost to the end of the line in this connection as well as in connection with its former afternoon schools) and weekend schools (Saturday/Sunday schools) have become almost the only alternative. Nevertheless the number of the latter is growing and the sources of support for them are varied and also growing. Some schools are particularly oriented toward German-Americans of one or another regional origin (e.g.,

Donauschauben). Some are maintained by German-American fraternal associations (e.g., the German American National Congress). Others are maintained by educational organizations (e.g. the German American School Association of Southern California) and/or by the growing number of German social and cultural clubs springing up in many parts of the USA. Almost all of these schools are listed with the nearest Consulate General of the Federal Republic of German and many of them receive some support from that source. All in all, this represents a remarkable recovery from the nadir of World War II days when almost all such activity ground to a halt as a result of wartime anti-German sentiments, many of which were shared by German-Americans too. Indeed, German schooling has suffered from two such reverses (the first coming during and after World War I) and has partially recovered each time.

b. Private schools only marginally related to the German-American ethnic mother tongue community.

The German School in Washington, D.C. may well be the only one of this kind. It provides a complete (immersion) 12 year German curriculum to its roughly 650 students, 80% of which are of German mother tongue and roughly 60% of which are the children of German consular or commercial personnel in the Washington area. Graduates of the high school receive an American high school diploma and/or a German Reifezeugnis.

English is taught from grade 1, Latin from grade 7, and French from grade 9. In addition to this school there are three elementary schools for children of members of German military forces stationed in the USA for training purposes (Sheppard, Texas; Fort Bliss, Texas; Glendale, Arizona).

c. Public schools engaged in German bilingual education.

Only two such schools have come to our attention recently, namely, that in Milwaukee, Wisconsin and in Cincinnati, Ohio. The large number of such schools that functioned at the beginning of this century (Viereck 1902) and the monumental German contribution to the first era of bilingual education in the USA under public auspices (Kloss 1966) have been almost entirely forgotten. They certainly deserve to be remembered and carefully studied by all those interested in public bilingual education that is not remedial and that has not lost its link to the ethnic mother tongue community.

d. Dialectally divergent schools with little or no attention to writing in the dialect: German sects.

It is in this rather atypical area that the overwhelming bulk of German ethnic community mother tongue education is conducted today. The 575 Old Order Amish and Old Order Mennonite all day schools and 61 Hutterite weekday afternoon schools constitute one of the most stable language maintenance bilingual education efforts in USA history. Their sociolinguistic experience needs to be fully explored and the

lesson that it has for bilingual education and for ethnic mother tongue maintenance needs to be fully learned. Although all of the Old Order schools teach German it is not vernacular German that they teach or that they use for teaching (although in all of these schools such German is sometimes spoken, particularly by the youngsters) but, instead, the German of the Luther Bible, i.e., a variety which is obviously no longer used for ordinary interpersonal communication. The Hutterite pattern is somewhat different in that children attend all-English "public" schools in their respective colonies. They also attend all-German supplementary schools after public school hours. Nevertheless, the Hutterite results and the Old Order results are very much the same. The students attending these schools are trilingual, biliterate (in English and Luther Bible German) and mother tongue retentive (Pennsylvania German or Hutterite German). However, what is probably crucial here is not so much the fact that the sociolinguistic division of labor is tripartite (as it is with Hasidim; see Yiddish, below) as much as is the fact that it is compartmentalized. Everyone knows English but uses it only for school or for economic transactions with outsiders. Everyone reads Luther German but uses it only in connection with religious texts or rituals. Everyone speaks their particular vernacular for all non-sacred intra-communal interactions but typically neither writes nor reads it. A

residential separation of all three groups from the Anglo-American mainstream is present of course, but it is not nearly as important as is their philosophical separation. The Amish and Mennonites in particular have mastered the art of "interactive separation". They commonly buy and sell (and increasingly even work) in the English speaking town but they do not live there, socialize there, or bring its ways, artifacts or values back home with them in their horse-and-buggys. Given such ethnic community discipline the community school can aim at a high degree of English fluency and literacy without either of these harming ethnic mother tongue maintenance or German literacy.

A visit to an Old Order Amish School

The Fairview School, near Lancaster, Pennsylvania, is typical of the 600 or so Old Order Amish and Mennonite schools that are now functioning. It is a one room school house, purchased roughly a decade ago when the public education authorities abandoned such schools in favor of large centralized schools (to which children from various outlying areas are brought by bus). Since such centralized public schools posed a threat to the Old Order communities (their children would be clearly outnumbered in such schools) they then decided to buy up, operate and fully control the local schools that their children were attending and where they were either the only

students or clearly in the majority. The Fairview School has an enrollment of 25. One teacher teaches all eight grades, as well as the "vocational group" of 15-16 year olds who attend only one morning a week. The school is lit by oil lamps and heated by a coal stove. An older boy, or the teacher herself, minds the stove on cold or chilly days. The children are attired in traditional Amish dress and most of them arrive and depart in horse-and-buggys, living too far from school to walk there and back, particularly on cold or rainy days.

Each grade studies "Luther German" twice a week for two hours. Starting with a primer first published in 1887 the children move up through an intermediate text (Mennonite published), Old Testament stories, and finally, the New Testament in "luther German". They read German, sing German (from an 1841 Mennonite songbook) and learn to spell German ("because it improves their pronunciation"). The children do not, of course, speak "Luther German", nor do their parents. They speak Pennsylvania Dutch to each other and to other Amish, they speak English to outsiders, and encounter "Luther German" only in their hallowed texts or, in variably modernized (vernacularized) form, in sermons by their bishops. No interpretation of biblical texts is offered in school since that is the province of their church per se. First graders still commonly arrive at the Fairview school (and at many

other similar schools) knowing insufficient English for the teacher to be able to use it alone -- as is her goal -- as the medium of instruction for secular studies. As a result these children are initially helped out, now and then, by a Pennsylvania Dutch phrase. Such help is soon discontinued and children soon speak English well enough in school, and not only do so fluently, but do so without any "foreign" accent. The English social studies texts used in school are surplus copies of public school texts of some 25 years ago. They provide a general understanding of American history and geography without raising "touchy" up-to-date issues.

The Amish Pennsylvania Dutch world is not an unchanging one. Some of the young men have begun to work in local factories for a few years in order to save up sufficient money for a sizeable cohort to purchase land and begin new colonies in the west, southwest and Latin America. Some of the Amish "shops" (blacksmiths, saddle makers, plumbers, carpenters, even a health food shop) cater primarily to tourists as well as to local non-Amish families. Nevertheless the interaction with outsiders is entirely transactional rather than personal. Electricity is now employed for cooling and pasteurizing milk that is to be marketed (as required by state health and food inspection laws) but is strictly prohibited for home use since it is viewed as tieing in with the outside world and its values. All in all, the Amish seem not to have lost their

boundary maintenance and compartmentalization skills. The school and the language it requires are both viewed as conduits to an outside world that must not be admired nor indigenized but, rather, a world that must be gingerly engaged for irreducibly crucial legal, technical and financial purposes.

References: Re (a), above: The basic source for this topic is still Kloss, H. German-American language maintenance efforts in J.A. Fishman, Language Maintenance in the USA. The Hague, Mouton, 1966, 206-252. The Bulletin fur Samstagschulen of the German Language School Conference (80 Inwood Avenue, Upper Montclair, N.J. 07043) provides interesting news about various schools.

Additional material may be encountered in various issues of Deutsche Lehrer in Ausland (published by the Forschungstelle fur Auslandeschulwesen at the University of Oldenburger), and Pedagogik und Schule im Ost und West.

Re (b), above: the major source in Auslandeschulverzeichnis, a register of all government recognized (for degree/diploma purposes) German schools abroad. Published annually by Max Hueber Verlag in Munich.

Re (c), above: there are few if any extensive references after Kloss 1966. A description of the Milwaukee experience can be obtained from local school authorities. The Cincinnati program has been written up by Frederick P. Veidt, "German-English bilingual education: The Cincinnati innovation.

TABLE G

GERMAN SECTS: COMMUNITY DAY SCHOOLS

	Amish		Mennonite		Amish & Mennonite	Hutterite	
	1968	1978	1968	1978	1980	1980	1980 TOTAL
NORTHEAST (9)							
New England							
Maine							
New Hampshire							
Vermont		1			1		1
Massachusetts							
Rhode Island							
Connecticut							
Mid Atlantic							
New York	5	12		2	19		
New Jersey							
Pennsylvania	60	138	27	70	222		222
NORTH CENTRAL (12)							
East North Cen.							
Ohio	74	107		1	124		124
Indiana	48	59		1	62		62
Illinois	3	6			6		6
Michigan		10			13		13
Wisconsin	9	21			29		29
West North Cen.							
Minnesota		8			7		7
Iowa	3	20			21		21
Missouri	18	27		11	39		39
North Dakota						4	4
South Dakota						33	33
Nebraska					1		
Kansas							
SOUTH (17)							
South Atlantic							
Delaware	2	7			6		6
Maryland	3	4	1	1	5		5
Dist. Col.							
Virginia	2			3	5		5
West Virginia							
N. Carolina							
S Carolina							
Georgia							
Florida							
E South Cen.							
Kentucky		2		1	6		6
Tennessee		7			7		7
Alabama							
Mississippi							
W. South Cen.							
Arkansas		1			1		1
Louisiana							
Oklahoma							
Texas							

WEST							
Mountain							
Montana		1			1	21	22
Idaho							
Wyoming							
Colorado							
Arizona							
New Mexico							
Utah							
Nevada							
Pacific							
Washington							
Oregon							
California							
Alaska							
Hawaii							
Puerto Rico							
Guam							
Totals							
NORTHEAST	65	151	27	72	242		242
NORTH CENTRAL	142	258		13	302	37	339
SOUTH	7	21	1	5	30		30
WEST		1			1	24	25
TOTALS	214	431	28	90	575	61	636

Die Unterrichtspraxis, 1976, 9, no.2, 45-50. (This journal is published by The American Association of Teachers of German, Inc). For much earlier and more widespread efforts see Viereck, L German instruction in American schools. Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1900-1901. Washington, GPO, 1902, 531-708.

Re (d), above: No detailed research has been done in Amish Mennonite or Hutterite schools per se. However, these societies have been well studied on more encompassing grounds by J.A. Hostetler in his Hutterite Society, Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1974 (also note his briefer treatment, jointly with G.E. Huntington, The Hutterites in North America, New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980) and in his Amish Society, Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1968. For the annual directory of Older Amish and Mennonite schools see the December issue of Blackboard Bulletin.

Also note: Sawatsky, R.J. Domesticated sectarianism: Mennonites in the US and Canada in comparative perspective. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 1978, 3, 233-244; Glen C. Gilbert. French and German, a comparative study, in Shirley Heath and C.A. Ferguson (eds.) Language in the USA, New York, Oxford University Press, 1979.

GREEK (Total estimated "usual home speakers" 1975: 488,000. Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 434,571).

Thanks to endless and highly systematic work of the

Office of Education of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, Greek in the USA is not only blessed by an extensive school system but by one that annually prepares and distributes a goodly amount of statistical information as well (Greek Orthodox Archdiocese . Directory). Serving an ethnic community with a substantial mix of old timers and new comers Greek schools in the USA, almost all under Church auspices, discharge an important religious function as well in view of the fact that "no Greek priest in no Greek church has ever conducted the Liturgy wholly in English or in any other local language" (Patrinacos 1970). Thus, while the use of English is growing, especially in the sacraments and particularly outside of the larger urban centers (in which Greek has maintained itself far better than in newer, suburban or smaller urban communities), the schools are part of a conscious, concerted effort to maintain Greek and Greekness in and around the church.

In the 1977-78 school year the combined enrollment in 22 church supported day schools (one school in Canada and one in South America are included in all statistics since they too are under the Archdiocese's supervision) was 6512. Of the 22 day schools, 15 included junior high grades (7 and 8), 4 included high school grades (9 and above) and two were high schools entirely. These schools employed a total of 314 teachers of which 65 (i.e., 20%) were in the Greek program per se.

In addition to the day schools there is an extensive network of "Greek Language and Culture Schools," almost every parish affiliated with the Archdiocese supporting one such school. There were 398 such schools in the USA, Canada and South America in 1977-78 (92 five day a week schools, 71 four day a week schools, 61 three day a week schools, 86 two day a week schools and 83 one day a week schools) -- 383 in the USA alone -- the number having expanded slowly but surely during the entire decade of the 70's:

School year	No. of schools	No. of students	No. of teachers
1970-71	340	24,200	550
1971-72	350	25,100	660
1972-73	355	25,700	680
1973-74	360	26,050	702
1974-75	375	26,500	735
1975-76	382	28,036	796
1976-77	393	28,622	819
1977-78	398	28,681	831

If there is any fly in the ointment it is, perhaps, the fact that only 639 of the 28,681 students enrolled in 1977-78 were attending junior high school classes. On the other hand, there are a number of clearly unusual positive factors at work as well. The Office of Education of the Archdiocese, in cooperation with the Ministry of Education in Greece, arranges for the admission of male graduates of its local elementary schools to a high school in Greece where they can "complete their secondary education in a Greek environment, enabling them to master the Greek language and acquire a deeper appreciation of their Greek heritage while preparing for higher studies in either American or European universities (p. 82, 1979 Directory)."

GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE SCHOOLS: 1978-1980
(USA ONLY)

	All day		Weekday & Weekend		TOTAL	
	1978	1980	1978	1980	1978	1980
NORTHEAST (9)						
New England						
Maine			3	4	3	4
New Hampshire			6	12	6	12
Vermont			1	1	1	1
Massachusetts	1	1	34	39	35	40
Rhode Island				3		3
Connecticut			12	13	12	13
Mid Atlantic						
New York	12	13	51	43	63	56
New Jersey			21	23	21	23
Pennsylvania			29	33	29	33
NORTH CENTRAL (12)						
East North Cen.						
Ohio			20	22	20	22
Indiana			5	6	5	6
Illinois	3	3	32	30	35	33
Michigan			19	19	19	19
Wisconsin			5	7	5	7
West North Cen.						
Minnesota			4	4	4	4
Iowa			6	6	6	6
Missouri			3	3	3	3
North Dakota			2	2	2	2
South Dakota			1	1	1	1
Nebraska			2	4	2	4
Kansas			4	2	4	2
SOUTH (17)						
South Atlantic						
Delaware			1	1	1	1
Maryland			6	7	6	7
Dist. Col.	1		1	2	2	2
Virginia			7	9	7	9
West Virginia			5	6	5	6
N. Carolina			7	10	7	10
S. Carolina			5	5	5	5
Georgia			3	3	3	3
Florida	1	1	19	20	20	21
E. South Cen.						
Kentucky			2	2	2	2
Tennessee			3	4	3	4
Alabama			3	4	3	4
Mississippi				1		1
W. South Cen.						
Arkansas			2	3	2	3
Louisiana				2		2
Oklahoma			2	2	2	2
Texas	1	1	8	11	9	12

WEST (13)						
Mountain						
Montana			2	2	2	2
Idaho			1	2	1	2
Wyoming			3	4	3	4
Colorado			3	2	3	2
Arizona			2	2	3	2
New Mexico			1	1	1	1
Utah			4	3	4	3
Nevada			2	4	2	4
Pacific						
Washington			4	5	4	5
Oregon			1	1	1	1
California	1	1	25	29	26	30
Alaska						
Hawaii			1	1	1	1
Puerto Rico						
Guam						
Totals						
NORTHEAST	13	14	157	171	170	185
NORTH CENTRAL	3	3	103	106	106	109
SOUTH	3	2	74	92	77	94
WEST	1	1	49	56	50	57
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	20	20	383	425	403	445

Accordingly, in 1977-78, 17 students were admitted to the Anargyrios-Korgialeinos School on the island of Spetsae.

Teachers in the Greek schools of the Archdiocese are invited to annual seminars in major metropolitan areas (New York, Chicago, etc.). One such seminar takes place every year over a three week period in Athens at the expense of the Greek Ministry of Education. The Greek government also awards pensions to teachers who have served in the schools of the Archdiocese. In addition, retired teachers also receive financial assistance from the Greek Teachers Benevolent Association which the Archdiocese maintains.

The Greek schools stress "the cultural environment which underlies...the Orthodox faith...the Apostolic and Patristic tradition...consisting of the Greek language, customs, beliefs and ideologies, as well as the attitudes underlying our family...traditions (p.75, Directory 1977)."

All in all, Greek Americans have one of the most extensive and best organized community-school-systems among American ethnic groups. They have good reason to be proud because many of their schools are quite effective and because the support and guidance that they receive from the Office of Education of the Archdiocese of the Greek Orthodox Church is appreciable and helpful.

For further information see the monthly The Orthodox Observer, e.g.,

Hatziemmanuel, E. Our present and future system of education. The Orthodox Observer, 1970, 36, nos. 604-605 (July-August), 9-10 and 14.

Moskos, Charles C., Jr. Greek Americans New York, Prentice Hall, 1980.

Patrinacos, N.D. The truth about our historic 20th Congress. The Orthodox Observer, 1970, no. 606, September 4-6.

Villas, E.A. The Greek Immigrant Child. The Orthodox Observer, 1969, no. 597, December 14-15.

Finally, it should be noted that the Greek ethnic community mother tongue schools derive various direct and indirect benefits from Title VII funds in the form of materials preparation, teacher trainee and teacher trainer fellowships, and, in the case of some of the day schools, basic program funds as well.

A Visit to a Greek School

At the all day Cathedral School (grades K-8) some two thirds of the 180 children in attendance are American-born, a goodly number being children of native born parents. Nevertheless almost all pupils speak some Greek at home (if only to their grand-parents) and notices sent home by the school are in both Greek and English. There are, however, a number of children whose mastery of Greek is marginal or even non-existent and these are separately streamed for two-three years

until they catch up with their grade. Other children who speak only Greek when they arrive in school are given special help with English.

In 1976 the Greek government decided to switch from Katharevusa (a semi-classical variety) to Demotiki (modern spoken Greek) as the language of school and of government. The Greek Orthodox Church however retains Katharevusa as the language of many of its stressed and hallowed writings. Classical Greek is also highly valued (being the language of Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, etc.), particularly as the hallmark of a first rate education. As a result of this complicated language situation the Cathedral school teaches Greek subjects in Demotiki in all grades, introduces Katharevusa in the middle grades, and begins teaching classical Greek in the upper grades. In some subjects for which there will ultimately be Demotiki texts, Katharevusa texts (from Greece) are still employed. However, these are slowly being displaced by texts prepared here in the USA by the Education office of the Archdiocese. These new texts are also "more American" both in subject matter emphasis as well as in their controlled vocabulary.

Children are exposed to "Greek readiness" in Kindergarten. In the first grade they are taught to read and write both English and Greek. This seems to be accomplished without particular difficulty. Given approximately 6-6½ hours per week of coursework with Greek as the language-of-instruction,

and with Greek dancing, arts and crafts, chorus and religious studies, ceremonies and celebrations, and given the study of Greek history, geography, literature, the school's program is demanding and effective. This is a no-nonsense school. The work is hard, the teaching is good, and the results are gratifying. French is taught as a required foreign language from grade 5 and on. Formal Greek grammar is taught from the 2nd grade on.

The school believes that it has an impact on the students. Some have come back to teach at the school. Others have ultimately gone to high schools, colleges and universities in Greece. Certain traditional practices that had generally been forgotten have been revived by the school. The Greek Orthodox youth organizations (GCYA) enrolls the 7th and 8th graders and continues to bring them together (and back to the school) even after they graduate. Pupils may grumble that the school gives a lot of work but they remember it fondly and proudly. Like the other twenty-some all day schools in the USA the Cathedral school accomplishes substantially more vis-a-vis "Greekness" than is typically achieved at the 430: some afternoon schools that are associated with Greek Orthodox Churches throughout the country.

Broader American developments are felt in the school. On the one hand, some of the materials created by Title VII Greek components are finding their way into the lower grades. On the other hand the church's more liberal policy vis-a-vis use of English has caused some schools to experiment with

offering less Greek in their programs than heretofore. The Cathedral School is dubious of the value of either of these developments. It is committed to the view that Greek culture and Greek religion are completely intertwined and that both require the Greek language in order to be learned and implemented. It serves a middle class population (tuition: roughly $1100/year) and even attracts a few non-Greek pupils and is able to accomplish its dual language and dual culture goals by insisting that educational compromise are self-defecting.

Additional references: (a) Vlachos, Evangelos The Assimilation of Greeks in the United States. Athens, National Center for Sonal Research, 1968; (b) Burgess, Thomas. Greeks in America: An Account Of Their Coming, Progress, Customs, Life and Aspirations, Boston, 1970; (c) Kalaras, Stavros. The Greek language and faith. The "creed" of the Greeks. Tribune of G.A.P.A., 1970, 34, Sept.-Oct., 6 and 14; (d) Seaman, Paul David. Modern Greek and American English in Contact. The Hague, Mouton, 1972. Zotos, Stephanos. Helenic Presence in America, Pilgrimage, Wheaton (Ill.), 1976.

Resources: Resource materials on Greek-Americans are available in The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St.Paul, Minnesota, 55114.

HAITIAN CREOLE (Total estimated number of speakers 1975: 85,000)

No information has been forthcoming on ethnic community mother tongue schools.

HEBREW (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 101,686)

By far the largest ethnic-community school-network in the USA is that maintained by American Jewry. In almost all cases it involves the teaching of Hebrew (technically = Hebrew-Aramaic), either in its classical biblical/prayer book/talmudic form (= Loshn koydesh) or in its modern Israeli form (= Ivrit), or both. Of a total of 2560 schools functioning in the 1977-78 year, 425 (=17% of the total) were of the Sunday only variety. The amount of time available to them per week for language study is quite limited but, on the other hand, their curricula usually stretch over a 10-12 year period, and, as a result, appreciable facility is attained with respect to reading a limited selection of prayers and reading as well as speaking very simple modern Hebrew. In the weekday afternoon schools (n=1630 or 64% of the total) the level of Hebrew language facility is noticeably increased in both connections; nevertheless, the graduates of such schools are invariably unable to speak modern Hebrew or to read an Israeli publication, or, indeed, to read any classical texts (other than the prayer book) not specially adapted for students. Most of the latter skills <u>are</u> within the grasp of graduates of the 490 day schools, although, oddly enough, most of them are enrolled in schools that set themselves no goals at all with respect to the modern language, stressing classical hallowed texts exclusively. No schools established by Israeli parents for Israeli (Hebrew speaking) children have yet been encountered,

although the number of Israelis in the USA is now estimated at 300,000 and some (but seemingly very few) of their elementary school-aged children must be receiving Jewish educatior of some kind in the USA.

The last full scale national census of Jewish school enrollment was conducted in 1967 by the American Associatior for Jewish Education. At that time some 350,000 children were in attendance, 30% of them being in the New York Metropolitan area. In view of demographic factors (such as smaller family size and a tendency for the Jewish population to be older than the non-Jewish population) the total enrollment in Jewish schools has almost certainly decreased somewhat since 1967. At that time 36% of all students were studying under Reform auspices, 34% under Conservative auspices, 22% under Orthodox auspices, and the remainder (8%) under non-congregational auspices of various kinds. Sunday schools accounted for 42% of the total enrollment, weekday afternoon schools for 44%, the remainder (14%) being in the allday schools. Of the total school enrollment only 16% was at a post-primary level. Since accurate Jewish demographic data are non-existant in the USA, only estimates are available as to the proportion of Jewish children of school age receiving a Jewish education of any kind. In 1967 this proportion was estimated to be 34% for the 3-17 year age group but 70% for the 8-12 age group. More boys than girls were enrolled in Jewish schools (57% vs. 43%) and these boys received a more intensive education than was accorded to the girls.

The growth in day schools under Jewish auspices has been consistent and even dramatic during the past three decades. At the outset, day schools were entirely under Orthodox communal auspices. In 1952-53 there were 144 such; in 1961-60: 213; in 1971-70: 307; in 1977-78: 371. In the last mentioned year there were also 124 day schools (kindergarten, elementary and high schools) under Conservative, Reform or other nor-Orthodox auspices. (Above figures based upon Torah Umesorah and American Association for Jewish Education directories for the years cited). Although most day schools (particularly Orthodox day schools) are in the Northeast area (including New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut) every American Jewish community of at least 7500 people now has a day school. Some 120 of these 495 day schools also teach Yiddish. These schools, as well as other schools that teach or teach in Yiddish, will be discussed separately under YIDDISH.

What, if anything, can the rest of ethnic America learn from the continuous variegated Jewish educational experience vis-a-vis Hebrew? Perhaps very little since American Jewry was never Hebrew speaking. Even for the masses of Jewish immigrants, Hebrew functioned, if at all, not as a vernacular but as a scriptified language of ritual, prayer and textual study. Nevertheless, some thirty years have already transpired since the establishment of Israel. There Hebrew has become the common vernacular (and, increasingly, the mother tongue). American Jewish education

TABLE H1

JEWISH SCHOOLS IN THE USA: 1978

by Type and Language

	DAY		AFTERNOON		SUNDAY	
	Heb	Yidd	Heb	Yidd	Heb	Yidd
NORTHEAST (9)						
New England						
Maine	2		7			
New Hampshire			3		5	
Vermont			2		1	
Massachusetts	14		100		8	1
Rhode Island	2		11		2	
Connecticut	13		70	1	12	
Mid Atlantic						
New York	154	107	422	15	45	2
New Jersey	26	4	170		23	2
Pennsylvania	19	2	163	5	31	1
NORTH CENTRAL (12)						
E. North Cen.						
Ohio	14	1	30		50	2
Indiana	3		14		17	
Illinois	15		70	1	9	
Michigan	4		24		16	
Wisconsin	2		24		5	
W. North Cen.						
Minnesota	2	1	7		10	
Iowa	1		8		7	
Missouri	2		16		8	
North Dakota			1		4	
South Dakota			2		1	
Nebraska	1		5		1	
Kansas	1		5			
SOUTH (17)						
South Atlantic						
Delaware	1		6			
Maryland	10	1	44	1	7	2
Dist. Col.			5		1	
Virginia	3		25		12	
West Virginia			5		5	
N. Carolina	2		15		10	
S. Carolina	1		7		6	
Georgia	4		16		9	
Florida	20		81		12	1
E. South Cen.						
Kentucky	1		3		7	
Tennessee	5		13		5	
Alabama	2		10		6	
Mississippi			4		8	
W. South Cen.						
Arkansas			2		5	
Louisiana	1		3		11	
Oklahoma	1		4		2	
Texas	8		33		8	

WEST (13)						
Mountain						
Montana					2	
Idaho					2	
Wyoming			1		1	
Colorado	4		10		4	
Arizona	7		13		1	
New Mexico	1		2		2	
Utah			2		1	
Nevada			1		2	
Pacific						
Washington	2		7		7	
Oregon	2		3		3	
California	28	2	148	1	34	7
Alaska					1	
Hawaii					1	
Puerto Rico						
Guam						
TOTALS						
NORTHEAST	229	113	948	21	127	6
NORTH CENTRAL	45	2	206	1	128	2
SOUTH	59	1	276	1	114	3
WEST	44	2	187	1	61	7
Other						
TOTALS	378	118	1617	24	430	18

has, therefore, begun to attend increasingly to vernacular, modern Hebrew, but, by all objective estimates, has generally accomplished very little in any of the active skills. Of course, young people are increasingly visiting Israel, going there for study and vacation, and this experience does foster some active Hebrew competence and would do so even more if English were not such a widely available lingua franca there. Perhaps the Jewish experience with Hebrew should make all ethnic mother tongue groups in the USA more aware of the difficulty, nay: the improbabilty, of school-based language acquisition, maintenance and use even if the network of schools is extensive, varied and viewed as culturally indispensible. Where an active mother tongue community exists it should be maintained at all costs if acquisition, maintenance and use are to be maximized, for in its absence the school will simply not be able to fill the breach.

References: American Association for Jewish Education National Census of Jewish Schools; New York, AASE (101 Fifth Avenue), New York, NY (10003).

American Association for Jewish Education Jewish Education Directory: 1978, New York, AASE, 1978.

Torah Umesora Directory of Day Schools in the United States and Canada, 5737-5738/1977-1978. New York, Torah Umesora ("National Society for Hebrew Day Schools",229 Park Avenue South), New York, NY (10003).

Ackerman, Walter. The Jewish School System in the United States, in D. Sidorsky (ed.) The Future of the Jewish Community in America. New York, Basic Books, 1973.

Gold, David L. The speech and writing of Jews, in Shirley B Heath and C.A. Ferguson, eds., Language in the USA. New York, Oxford, 1979.

Inbar, Efraim. The Hebrew Day School: the Orthodox communal challenge. Journal of Ethnic Studies, 1979, 7, 13-29.

HINDI/Urdo (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 26,253)

Almost no information available at this time. It stands to reason that several schools exist that have not as yet been found.

HMONG

Roughly 20,000 Hmong speakers have recently been resettled in the USA and some 50,000 more are awaiting admission. The Hmong, traditionally a rural minority group in Laos where they constituted some 15% of the population, were indigenous allies with American official and unofficial efforts to stem the Pathet Lao take-over of Laos. With the collapse of the American effort there in 1975 some 3000 Hmong were airlifted to the USA. Most were resettled in the St. Paul area and most of the more recent arrivals have also continued to join them there. American social workers and educators are still generally unfamiliar with the Hmong, erroneously classifying

them as Vietnamese. There are exceedingly few Americans who have learned Hmong and equally few Hmong who have been trained to help their compatriots adjust to the problems of modern urban life including the problem of language shift. Half of the Hmong in the USA are at least nominally Christian; the others still maintain traditional Hmong beliefs and practices.

For further information concerning Hmong and all other Indonesian groups (Cambodian/Khmer, Lao and Vietnamese) contact: a) National Indochinese Clearinghouse, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3520 Prospect St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007. (Note: particularly, their 1978 General Information Series publication #16: "Glimpses of Hmong History and Culture"); and #17: "An Annotated Bibliography of Materials on the Hmong of Laos"; b) Hmong Association, c/o Leng Vang, 415 Marshall Ave., #L, St. Paul, Minn. 55102.

HUNGARIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 447,497)

The rather complete list that we have of Hungarian schools in the United States was compiled by the Hungarian Research Center, American Hungarian Foundation, New Brunswick, New Jersey. This organization also publishes the Hungarian Studies Newsletter (a very informative and sophisticated review of all aspects of Hungarian American cultural activity), as well as Karikazo, Hungarian Folklore Newsletter, and seeks not only to encourage Hungarian studies among Hungarian Americans but among as wide a circle of others as well.

It is now almost 25 years since the last major influx

of Hungarian immigrants (originally called "freedom fighters" because they left Hungary as a result of the failure of the 1957 uprising against Soviet control) reached the USA. Prior to that time Hungarian immigration had practically ceased in the early 20's. Since then almost all Hungarian American efforts are conducted by these "old-timers" and a few of their children and grandchildren. Whatever impetus the newcomers initially gave to Hungarian language maintenance in the USA -- never very much to begin with due to the major gulf separating "old timers" and"newcomers" with respect to education, religion and general culture (Fishman 1966) -- has now subsided. Of the Hungarian schools that remain in the USA only two meet on a daily basis. Most of the others are Saturday schools whose contribution to language maintenance is necessarily a modest one indeed.

For further information (and for a copy of the Hungarian Studies Newsletter) contact: a) the American Hungarian Foundation, 177 Sumerset Street, PO Box 1084, New Brunswick, NJ 08903. Among the Foundation's own publications Master's Thesis Related to Hungary and Hungarians Accepted in the United States and Canada, 1977, by Joseph Szeplaki, and Bibliography of Hungarian Linguistic Research in the United States and Canada, 1979, by Andrew Kerek, would be of most interest to students of Hungarian language maintenance in the USA. The major study of this topic is still Fishman, J.A., Hungarian Language Maintenance in the United States, Bloomington, Indiana University Publications (=v. 62 of the Uralic and Altaic Series), 1966,

b) American Hungarian Educators' Association (Note its Newsletter), P.C. Box 4103, Silver Spring, Md. 20904.

References: Kerek, Andrew. Hungarian language research in North America: Themes and directions. Canadian -American Review of Hungarian Studies, 1978, 5 (no.2), 63-72; Szeplaki, Joseph. The Hungarians in America, 1583-1974: A Chronology and Fact Book. Dobbs Ferry, Oceanea, 1975.

Resources: Resource materials on Hungarian-Americans are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn. 55114.

ICELANDIC (Immigrants from Iceland and their children numbered just under 10,000 in 1970).

There seem to be no community ethnic mother tongue schools in the USA that teach or teach in Icelandic. Some courses are available at the college and university levels. For further information consult the Gage and Rovinsky volume listed under Danish, above.

INDIAN LANGUAGES, see Native American languages

IRANIAN, see Persian

IRISH

In several cities Irish-American organizations offer evening classes -- generally for adults -- once a week in this slowly weakening tongue. These efforts at language revival

(more than maintenance) are currently also weakening in Ireland proper. Nevertheless, they may yet grow stronger in the USA -- where they are already noticeable at the terciary education level -- if the ethnic revival here and unification efforts in The Emerald Isle -- intensify. For further information contact: Irish Arts Center, 553 W. 51st Street, New York, N.Y. 10019.

ITALIAN (Total estimated "usual home speakers" 1975: 2,853,000; Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 4,144,315).

Although Italian is the third most frequently claimed ethnic mother tongue in the USA (coming after Spanish and German) its school-relatedness is exceptionally slight, perhaps even slighter than that pertaining to Spanish. Language maintenance in most Italian communities in American urban areas (and in a number of suburban ones as well) is a result of population concentration and the informal processes and established traditions of the family, neighborhood, church and social club.

In marked contrast to the above "folksy" approach to language teaching and language use is that of the Sciola d'Italia (50 East 69th Street, New York, NY 10021), a school sponsored by the Italian Government and chartered by the Regents of the University of the State of New York. At this school -- which covers all grades through to the completion of high school -- only English and American history are

taught in Italian. As in many other such schools, students who do not know Italian may be accepted into a special program in which they receive intensive instruction in Italian while they pursue other subjects in English until they can comprehend Italian sufficiently well to enter the regular classes. The Italian teachers at the school have all been certified in Italy and have taught in Italian schools. The English and American history teachers are also fluent in Italian. Students who complete the high school (Liceo) program are granted a New York State diploma and the diploma di Maturita Scientifica. The latter entitles recipients to immediate and direct entry into any Italian university at the graduate school level (e.g., architecture, law, medicine, etc.).

The Italian American Committee on Education conducts a network of Saturday schools for children (as well as evening courses for adults). Somewhat similar efforts are sponsored on a smaller scale by a few other organizations. In some cases, some Italian government support is provided to these schools. On the other hand, the former Catholic school involvement (e.g. on the part of the Filippini order) in Italian instruction (Fucilla 1967) has now largely been discontinued. What little remains is generally related to Title VII and is oriented toward recent immigrant children and at no more than transitional bilingualism. Although this situation

is not appreciably different from that which has long obtained in Catholic educational circles for most other ethnic mother tongue groups (e.g., French too is practically unutilized in Franco-American Catholic schools this Catholic disengagement from ethnic mother tongue schooling -- now beginning to be modified in more ethnoculturally appreciative directions -- probably made less difference for speakers of Italian than for many others. Italian was never as substantially school - or literacy-related as was French (or even Polish). If something has changed at all, relative to a decade or two ago, it is the clash between conscious Italian pride, on the one hand, and Italian social (and, most recently, geographic) mobility on the other. These two forces often lead in opposite directions, insofar as language maintenance is concerned, and the resolution of forces between them is far from clear. It could just be that the close-knit Italian family and neighborhood will still triumph in the end, ever over social mobility, but the odds are against it.

For further information contact: (a) Dr. Angelo Gimondo, Program Director, Italian American Committee on Education, 66 Court Street, 15th Floor, Brooklyn, NY 11201, (b) Dr. Yole Correa-Zoli, Department of Foreign Languages, California State University at Hayward, Hayward, California 94542.

References: (a) Barton, J.J. Peasants and Strangers: Italians, Rumanians and Slovaks in an American City, 1890-1950.

Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1975; (b) Bondi, Lawrence. The Italo-American Child: His Sociolinguistic Acculturation, Washington, D.C. Georgetown University Press, 1975; (c) Cordasco, Francesco. The Italian Community and its Language in the United States. Totowa (N.J.), Rowman and Littlefield, 1975; (d) Correa-Zol, Yole, The language of Italian Americans, in Shirley B. Heath and C.A. Ferguson, eds., Language in the USA. New York, Oxford, 1980; (e) Di Pietro, Robert. The verbal magic of Italian in the New World. Proceedings of the Third Annual L.A.C.U.S. Forum, 1976, 000-000; (f) Fucilla, J.C. The Teaching of Italian in the United States: A Documentary History. New Brunswick, New Jersey, American Association of Teachers of Italian, 1967.

Resources: Resource materials on Italian-Americans are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn. 55114.

JAPANESE (Total estimated "usual home speakers" 1975: 527,000
Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 408,504)

Given their indecent treatment by the American government during World War II, Japanese-Americans have almost miraculously snapped back since then. They have been active on the ethnic community mother tongue school front as well, establishing a large number of language schools both on the mainland and in Hawaii. These schools are generally oper

only on Saturdays and provide instruction in Japanese language and culture. One of the most noteworthy networks of these schools on the mainland is the Japanese Language School Unified System in the Los Angeles area. Classes from the elementary to the high school level meet for three to four hours on Saturdays and study conversational Japanese, Japanese grammar, composition, literature, history, geography, Kanji, composition, flower arrangement, calligraphy, tea ceremony, etc. They "not only strive to teach the Japanese language ... but also help ... students to appreciate and acquire Japanese cultural traits and personal manners. Furthermore, (they) train the students to develop a cooperative nature at home and in society." Students in the 9th grade or higher in public school may be granted foreign language credit by examination.

Another type of Japanese school in the USA is the all day school. Most of the students in these schools (there are three at present) are the children of Japanese consular or commercial personnel stationed in the USA for periods up to five years. The day school receives budgetary support from the Japanese government but also depends substantially upon the tuition fees paid by the parents. In the future such schools may attract more American born students as well. (An annotated **three** volume report lists all such schools the world over)

Finally, there are also Buddhist schools, particularly in Hawaii, which teach and/or teach in Japanese. Those in Hawaii have probably never returned to their pre-World War II strength. Those on the mainland may be growing beyond their former numbers but are, on the whole, less intensive and less integrated into an intact ethnic community context.

For further information concerning Japanese language schools contact Mr. Hiroshi Okano, Chicago, Illinois 60076 (concerning day schools) and/or the Japanese Language School Unified System, 1218 Menlo Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90006, (concerning Saturday schools). For information pertaining to Japanese schools in Hawaii contact Dr. Zino Song, Department of East Asian Languages, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822.

References: Kitano, Harry. Japanese-Americans. The Evolution of a Subculture. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1969; Connor, John W. Tradition and Change in Three Generations of Japanese-Americans. Chicago, Nelson-Hall, 1977; Lebra, Takie S. Japanese Patterns of Behavior. Honolulu, University Press of Hawaii, 1976; Japanese Educational Institutions Overseas (3 vols.) Tokyo, Japanese Overseas Educational Services, 1979. (In Japanese).

A Visit to a Japanese School

The Japanese School of New York is one of the allday schools maintained by the Japanese Government for the children

of its citizens temporarily residing outside of Japan. Located in Jamaica (Queens), New York, it draws children from all over the Metropolitan New York area, approximately 70% of the student body being bussed in from locations in Westchester County, Riverdale (the Bronx), Great Neck in Nassau County, Queens, and Fort Lee, New Jersey.

As might be expected, almost all of the students at the school are Japanese-born, native speakers of Japanese. They and their parents generally remain in the United States for a period of five to eight years, depending on contractual agreements between a parent and his/her employer. A large majority of the school's students return to Japan for high school education, even if their parent's contract keeps the rest of the family in the United States. In such cases, the child lives with relatives or is sent to boarding school until his/her family returns to Japan. Approximately 70% of students are male.

Housed in a modern two-floor building in Jamaica, the school is a bright, cheerful, bustling place. Bilingual signs adorn the walls, and a showcase near the main entrance contains displays of Japanese ceramics, woodwork and dolls in traditional dress. With approximately 230 students, the physical facilities are being used to capacity; a long waiting list of students (some entered on the list before they have left Japan) attests to the fact that the school's services are

much in demand. Classrooms are small, but adequate for the (approximately) 23 students who occupy each. The atmosphere in classes is businesslike, but informal; students are attentive and industrious. Clothing is casual; all studnets are dressed in American-style clothing, many of the boys in jeans, T-shirts and sneakers. Casual conversation, both in the classroom and in the hallways, is almost exclusively in Japanese, the one exception being when students address a non Japanese-speaking teacher or visitor.

When it was established in 1975, the school was authorized by the State of New York to offer elementary instruction, and admitted children into grades three through 6. Since that time, the State of New York has authorized an extension of the range of instruction: the school now operates through grade nine. This extension has allowed the school to fulfil its goal of preparing students to take high school entrace examinations in Japan.

The typical school day is broekn down into seven 40-minute instructional periods, or 280 minutes of classroom time. Between 75% and 80% of the school day involves instruction through Japanese: Japanese, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Music, Physcial Education (and Industrial Arts and Homemaking, in the upper grades) are taught in Japanese by native speakers of the language. Of 19 Japanese teachers in the school, 14 are sent by the Japanese

Government, on three year contracts, after which time they return to Japan. The reamining Japanese teachers are Japanese nationals residing in the United States. The bulk of textbooks and curricula used in the school are sent by the Government of Japan (a shipment arrives at the beginning of each year) and correspond to the ones being used in school in Japan.

The English-language component of the program comprises 20% to 25% of the available instructional time. English is taught five times per week, in classes that have been subdivided according to student ability. Those students with least proficiency in English are taught using traditional ESL methods. Middle-ability level groups contain students with varying levels of English proficiency, each of whom is functioning below grade level but above the level of the least proficient group. Where there are sufficient students functioning at or near grade level in English, a third ability group is formed. Both American and British texts are used for English language instruction; curricula are relatively flexible, taking into account the needs and abilities of students.

In addition to English, American Social Studies and Arts are taught using English as the medium of instruction, American Social Studies for one period per week and Art, twice per week. The five teachers teaching or teaching in

English are American, native speakers of English, two of whom are fluent in Japanese. American Studies and Art are taught without textbooks, using materials prepared by the teachers involved.

Both teachers and administrators view the school and its program as an important compromise between the American and the Japanese educational systems. On the one hand, they say, relatively strict adherence to the Japanese curriculum is both desirable and necessary, in order that students be well-prepared to (re-) enter the fiercely competitive school system in Japan. On the other hand, the English component of the program attempts to equip their students to cope with life in the United States, and perhaps to enter American high schools, should they remain in the United States.

JEWISH languages, see Yiddish and/or Hebrew and/or Judezmo

JUDEZMO

The prospects of Judesmo/Judezmo/Dzhudezmo (also referred to as Ladino, Spanyolit, Judeo-Espanol) in the USA have improved slightly in the past few years but the future of the language -- particularly in literacy-related functions -- is shakey at best. There does not seem to be a Sephardic community mother tongue school anywhere in the USA today, although the language still has several thousand speakers

and many more "understanders." The improvement referred to above refers to the formation of the Judezmo Society by a group of University students and the intermitant appearance of its newsletter Adelantre! as well as other publications. In recent years Judesmo has also been taught at Yeshiva University, New York University and Columbia University. The past glories of the language have received regular attention in the American Sephardi. The future of the language is still of very little general concern among those in whose patrimony it figures.

For further information contact The Judezmo Society, 4594 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, New York, 11235. Information re Judezmo related research, meetings, publications, programs, etc. is often found in the Jewish Folklore and Ethnology Newsletter issued by the American Folklore Society and the Yivo.

References: Bunis, David M. A Guide to Reading and Writing Judezmo. New York, Adelantre! The Judezmo Society, 1965.

Gold, D. The speech and writing of Jews, in Shirley B. Heath and C.A. Ferguson Language in the USA. New York, Oxford, 1979.

Note also the papers and discussion on Ladino/Judezmo in H.H. Paper (ed.). Jewish Languages: Theme and Variation. Cambridge, (Mass.), Association for Jewish Studies, 1978. Also note IJSL, 1982, 33 devoted entirely to Sociolinguistic research on Judezmo.

KHMER No information is currently available concerning community maintained schools in Khmer. (Also see Hmong Lao, Vietnamese).

KOREAN (Total estimated "usual home speakers" 1975: 249,000. Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 53,528.

This relatively small community has managed to establish a relatively large number of ethnic mother-tongue schools. By and large these are church-affiliated Saturday schools, most Korean churches being either Korean Church, Methodist or Presbyterian. In addition there are unaffiliated, communal language-and-culture schools which constitute about a third of the total. The students at either type of school are largely immigrants themselves or the children of immigrants.

As is the case in Korea itself, Korean ethnic community schools in the USA at the elementary school level use materials that are written entirely in Hangul, an almost totally phoenic writing system dating back to the 15th century. Koreans are extremely proud of this writing system (prohibited by the Japanese during the period of their occupation of Korea 1936-45) and one of their most popular holidays (Hangul Day) is devoted to honoring it. Nevertheless, most Korean newspapers and advanced texts are written in a combination of Korean and Chinese characters. The latter begin to be studied in the middle school in Korea and are becoming increasingly problematic for

Korean-American children attending ethnic community schools in the USA. The community's educational leaders still insist on teaching the required Chinese characters but some parents are beginning to object that the motivational toll among their children is too great.

Many ethnic communities in the USA are more linguistically (and graphically) conservative than are those in the motherland from which they hail. In some instances this is due to foreign occupants or foreign influences to which their ethnic motherlands are exposed, the expatriate communities in the USA serving as staunch defenders of the undefiled and authentic ethnolinguistic traditions. In other cases this is due to the conservative response of threatened and alarmed minorities while their kinsmen in the "old country" can afford to experiment with "new fangled" spellings and writing systems the minority communities outside of the ethnic motherland cannot afford such a luxury. Deviations from "the original pattern" are viewed (and perhaps rightly so) as tending to weaken the entire language-and-culture maintenance enterprise. Ethnic culture in the USA does change, of course, but its rationale is normally that of continuity, defense, preservation, guardianship and caution. In a few instances, viz the Old Order Amish, the Old Order Mennonites, the Hutterites and Hasidim, this stance is formally ideological and implemented. In most other cases it is a posture that co-exists together with appreciable overt behavioral

and philosophical interaction with and acceptance of the Anglo-American economic, political, and cultural mainstream. The resulting tensions between these two discrepant orientations, one for ethnically encumbered viewpoints, are often beyond the compartmentalization capacity of minority ethnolinguistic systems, particularly when the bulk of reward and recognition derives from the realm of ethnically unencumbered pursuites. The Korean ethnic mother tongue community's resolution of the contradictory forces to which it is exposed remains to be studied.

For further information contact Dr. Byounghye Chang, Asian Bilingual Curriculum Development Center, Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey 07079.

References: Cheong-Soo Suh and Pak Chun-Kun, eds. Aspects of Korean Culture. Seoul, Soodo Women's Teachers College Press, 1974; Choy, Bongyoin. Koreans in America. Chicago, Nelson Hall, 1979; Kim, Byongwon. Reading and reading instruction in Korea: past and present in Feitelson, Dina, et al. Mother Tongue or Second Language On the Teaching of Reading in Multilingual Societies. Newark (Del.), International Reading Association, 1979, 82-11.

LAO

Little information is currently available concerning ethnic-community maintained schools in Lao. (Also see Cambodian/Khmer, Hmong, Vietnamese).

LATIN

No schools teaching Latin for specifically ethnic community purposes have been located. Some 30,000 students are currently studying Latin in public high schools in the USA. (See Christian Science Monitor, 1980, April 21, p. 25).

LATVIAN/Lettish (First and second generation Latvian Americans numbered 86,413 in 1970)

The Latvian ethnic mother tongue community is perhaps the most active among the post World War II immigrants whose home countries fell under the Soviet heel. This plethora of activity-- which includes churches, cultural societies, sports groups and welfare organizations -- is also fully recognizable in the educational realm. A network of schools is affiliated with the American Latvian Association in the United States. The ALA prepares and publishes school texts and teaching materials, organizes regional teachers conferences, plans school curricula, gathers statistical data, engages in teacher preparation, operates a home-study division for children who do not live near any Latvian mother tongue school, and provides awards to superior students -- all on a volunteer basis (Sanders 1979).

In addition to the ALA-affiliated schools -- most of which are one day a week schools -- a number of congregations (primarily of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran

Church) support schools of their own unaffiliated with ALA. A majority of the ALA affiliated schools are also congregationally affiliated. The peak year of Latvian community mother tongue schools in the USA was 1960-61, when the ALA listed 58 schools with an enrollment of 2000 pupils. Today there are 46 schools at all levels and of all types with a proportionately smaller enrollment. Classes meet for approximately three hours per week and are devoted to religion, language, literature, geography and history of Latvia, folk singing, folk dancing and other Latvian arts. There are three summer high schools held in summer camps in three different regions of the USA. For the past ten years there has also been an ALA sponsored 7 week summer program at Western Michigan University during which time a Latvian Teacher's Seminar is also held there to provide young (American born) school teachers with the knowledge needed to teach in Latvian schools in their localities. Nevertheless, notwithstanding all of the following, language maintenance among the young is lessening as integration with general Anglo-American life proceeds.

For further information concerning Latvian ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA contact Bureau of Education, American Latvian Association in the United States, Inc., 400 Hurley Avenue, P.O. Box 432, Rockville, Maryland 20850. Note the various departments and sections of the Bureau in the table of organization presented in

Zinta (1979, see below); Also: Committee for a Free Latvia, 12 Ainsworth Ave., East Brunswick, N.J. 08816.

Reference: Sanders, Zinta. Latvian Education in the United States: antecedents and development of supplementary schools. Journal of Ethnic Studies, 1979, 7, 31-42.

Resources: Resource materials on Latvian-Americans are also available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55114.

LEMKO, see Carpatho-Rusyn

LITHUANIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 292,820)

Although nearly four times as numerous the Latvian-Americans Lithuanian American ethnic community schooling in the USA functions both on a somewhat smaller scale and at a lesser level of organization. Most of the Lithuanian schools are Saturday schools and although some of them are church (usually Roman Catholic) related, most of them are not.

The major qualitative difference between Latvians and Lithuanians in the USA is that an appreciable number of the latter arrived in the USA before 1920 and, as a result, there are proportionately more 3rd generation Lithuanian-Americans than Latvian Americans. Since the major modernization of Lithuanian occurered subsequent to 1920 there are noticeable differences in the grammars as well as in the lexicons of

Lithuanian as spoken by "old timers" and their children, on the one hand, and by "newcomers" and their children, on the other hand. Since the mass is now also performed in Lithuanian and since modern standard Lithuanian is used in the mass, the mass functions as another avenue for learning this variety of the language for "old timers" and their children/grandchildren. This "dialect" difference (indicative as it is of intra-communal differences), plus the general lack of assistance from church authorities (with a few noteworthy exceptions), may be co-responsible for the generally lower state of Lithuanian language maintenance in the USA relative to that of the Latvians.

For further information contact Mr.B.F. Juodelis, chairman, Lithuanian Educational Council of USA, Inc., 912 Plainfield Rd., Downers Grove, Illinois 60515. English language publications on Lithuanian topics are available from Darbininkas, 341 Highland, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11207.

References: Alilunas, L.J. Lithuanians in the United States. San Francisco R and E Research Association, (n.d.)

Greene, V. For God and Country: The Rise of Polish and Lithuanian Consciousness in America, 1860-1910. Madison, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1975.

Resources: Resource material on Lithuanians in the USA is available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn. 55114.

MACEDONIAN, see Bulgarian

NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 268,205)

Because of the large number of small languages involved, all Native American controlled mother tongue schools will be treated here collectively. Of all of the languages involved only a very few have been related to literacy even to a moderate degree and in a stable, continuous fashion and, therefore, to literacy-based education as well. Somewhat more have (or have had) a more minor or recent relationship of this kind and, in some cases at least, literacy related (rather then merely oral) schooling in their ethnic mother tongues may have been (re) established. Beyond these, there are yet others, particularly among the Alaskan Eskimos, among whom interest in school use of (or in school instruction via) their language is growing, even though implementation of this interest generally is very recent and, at times, eratic.

The major recent factor facilitating Native American ethnic mother tongue schooling has been the willingness of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to contract with various (not by any means all) Indian nations whereby the latter will operate schools for their own children using BIA funds rather than have the BIA continue to operate such schools for them as was the rule in the past. As a result some 50 "Indian

Controlled School Boards" have come into being which operate schools in which children spend 2-4 hours a day learning and/or learning in their ethnic mother tongue. The result is an often unprecedented level of literacy among the younger generation which is in marked contrast with that of their parents and grandparents. Indeed youngsters often speak the language better as well, and often are taught long neglected songs, dances, arts and crafts, clothing and grooming styles, etc. Obviously, such results reflect community support (indeed, community pressure) in this direction rather than school curricular innovation alone. Interestingly enough, the above sults have been obtained not only without a drop in English attainments but, indeed, with a rise in such attainments (Rosier and Holm 1979). Significantly such schools not only can boast of ethnic mother tongue attainments but of English achievement that surpasses that of the English monolingual or Title VII dominated schools.

Nevertheless, after all is said and done, the majority of Native American children still receive no exposure to their mother tongue in their literacy related education, whether they attend public schools or schools directly conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indeed, many of these languages are at the verge of extinction and others have been temporarily "recalled from the grave", so to speak, by belated efforts to revive them or to teach children to at least sing or chant

them, or to recognize certain phrases in them. The cruel extinction of Native American cultures continues apace, perhaps without bloodshed as in years gone by, but not without alienation, disorientation, mental and physical illness, and irreparable loss of cultural values, practices and sensitivities as well as of the languages in which these are authentically expressed. The only ray of light in this dismal picture is the growing activity of Native Americans themselves in their own education, government, economic development, legal protection, territorial recovery and cultural direction. In each of these respects some improved future for their mother tongues becomes possible.

For further information write to: Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards, 511 16th Street, Denver, Colorado. 80202; Indian Education Department, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 N. Kent Street, Arlington, VA 22209; National Tribal Chairman's Fund, Inc., 2760 29th Street, Suite 204, Boulder, Colorado 80302; Association of American Indian Affairs, 432 Park Avenue S., New York, N.Y. 10016.

References: a) John-Stiner, Vera and Helgi Osterreich. Learning Styles among Pueblo Children. Albuquerque, College of Education, University of New Mexico, 1975 (mimeo).

b) Kari, James and B. Spolsky. Trends in the study of Athapaskan language maintenance and bilingualism, in J.A. Fishman (ed.) Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism. The Hague, Mouton, 1978, 635, 664.

c) Krauss, Michael E. Alaska Native Languages: Past, Present and Future. Fairbanks, Alaska, Native Language Center, 1980.

Note: The Native American Information Center at Bacone College, Muskogee, Oklahoma, is likely to become a valiable data bank and referral center to educators who seek information dealing with any one or another Indian community. With respect to Navajo educational experience in particular, The Dine Biolta Association (c/o Prof. Anita Pfeifer, Education Department, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N.M.) resource.

d) Leap, William. American Indian languages; Walker W. Native American Writing Systems; Taylor, R. Allan. Indian lingua francas, all three in Shirley B Heath and C.A. Ferguson (eds.) Language in the USA. New York, Oxford University Pres , 1979.

e) Rebert, R (ed.) Bilingual Education for American Indians. Washington, D.C., U.S.B.I.A., 1971.

f) Rosier, P. and W Holm. Saad naaki beel na'nitin: Teaching by means of two languages (Navajo and English at Rock Point Community School). Arlington, VA, CAL, 1979.

A Visit to a Native American Community School

The Rock Point School is one of five on the Navajo reservation that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has "contracted out" to a school board of elected local representatives. It

is now ten years that the Rock Point School Board has managed that the Rock Point School ... has managed the community's school (Kindergarten throug.. ade 10), disposing of BIA funds as well as more modest funds from Title I, VII, etc. The schoo the "major industry" at Rock Point. Except for a few fam es still engaged in agriculture or in sheep raising, most adults work for this School Board: as teachers, extra curricular instructors, bus drivers, custodians, cooks, repairmen, "school visitors" (=school observers) or school board members. As a result the boundaries between the school and the community (culturally, economically, politically, etc.) are difficult to maintain. The school and the community are literally, rather than just figuratively, one

Three hundred fifty students attend the school, 100 of whom board in the dormitory because their families live too far away or in areas not reachable by roads during long periods of the year. Rock Point is roughly 100 miles from the nearest large Anglo-American town (Farmington, NM). As a result most children are Navajo dominant when they arrive in school, some are monolingual Navajo and only a very few (children of "returnees" or of Anglo teachers) are in need of Navajo-as-a-Second-Language instruction. Reading/writing begins first in Navajo and starts in English in the second grade. It takes a few years before the children read as well in English as in Navajo since English is not greatly needed (neither oral English, nor written

English nor read English) outside of the school walls. Nevertheless, by the eighth grade students read English at the national norm (although they are still slightly behind that norm in mathematics). The school has been ingenious in setting up situations that require active English use outside of formal classroom activity. Similar ingenuity re mathematics is harder to come by.

An extensive program of extra-curricular offerings is very popular. It includes typing, home economics and sewing, in the "modern" sector, and Navajo dancing, singing, basket weaving, netting and leather woodwork, in the "traditional" sector. Several traditional dances and songs (as well as the traditional Navajo hairdress) have been revived by the school as a result of school board and parental interest. Parental, school board recommendations have also led to a stress on Navajo kinship patterns (e.g., "non-incestial dancing", i.e. dancing in which kinship rules define admissable partners) in the social studies curriculum. Social studies is taught in Navajo throughout the school program as is science. Mathematics, on the other hand, is consistently studied in English. The school has helped innovate many of the Navajo terms in the social studies area.

Two thirds of the teaching personnel is now Navajo, the proportion rising slowly year after year as more and more Rock Pointers qualify for such work. Teachers do not need

State Education Department certification -- nor does the school as a whole -- since the school does not operate under State Education jurisdiction, but rather, under that of the BIA. Nevertheless, most teachers, whether Anglo or Navajo, are certified, as are the administrators, and the contract schools in general are functioning far more effectively than are the ESL only BIA schools (non-contract) public schools (under State Education Department control) on the reservation. Indeed, in many respects the school is very similar to its monolingual counterparts throughout the country. St. Patrick's Day decorations predominate in March, as do St. Valentine's in February. Children are called by their English names (traditional Navajo names are now reserved in ritual contexts). Children's compositions and drawings are displayed in profusion throughout the school. The school library consists entirely of English holdings. Nevertheless, the school is clearly a Navajo school, not only because Navajo art and Navajo language reports are also displayed in every room, but because Navajos themselves run the school, Navajo speech is heard on all sides, community observers visit all classes one week out of every month, and the school board meets frequently and in a modernized hogan erected on school grounds. If BIA and other federal support were to stop tomorrow the school board is dedicated to somehow continuing to operate the school as a bilingual community school. Even if the community cannot

continually employ all of its graduates at its school it intends to maintain its school and to maintain it as a bilingual school so that its children will know that "there is nothing wrong with the Navajo nation or its language."

NORWEGIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 612,861)

As with the other Scandinavian languages already reviewed (see Danish, Finnish, Icelandic above) there are now hardly any Norwegian ethnic community schools teaching or teaching in Norwegian. (For the picture in the early decades of this century, see Haguen 1956) There are, of course, college/university courses that teach Norwegian (see the Askey, Gage and Rovinsky reference listed under Danish above). In addition there are one or two summer language camps conducted by mid-western colleges -- e.g. Concordia College, Moorehead, Minnesota -- not necessarily for Norwegian derived children. Finally, there are a few classes in Norwegian under the aegis of the Sons of Norway (offered at its headquarters in Minneapolis as well as at a number of its branches) and of the American-Scandinavian Foundation (offered in New York). In the distant past there were a number of mid-Western colleges that were conducted in Norwegian and that stressed Norwegian studies. The last of these to do so, Luther College (Decorah, Iowa), converted to English entirely at the beginning of this century. Nevertheless, the flicker of affection

is still there and in addition to the few ethnic community mother tongue schools that still exist some churches offer a Norwegian service once a year in recognition of their origins and of their link to their tradition.

Reference: Haugen, Einar. The Norwegian Language in America. Bloomington (Indiana), Indiana University Press, 1969. (Second printing, combining the two volumes of the original 1953 edition into one volume).

PENNSYLVANISH, see German: Pennsylvania German

PERSIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 20,553)

Prior to the expulsion of the Shah (1979) there were a number of informal Persian classes for Iranian youngsters throughout the USA. Their exact number today is unknown and it would serve little purpose to seek to reconstruct the number of locations, students and teachers involved in such courses prior to 1979 in view of the drastic changes that have occured in these connections since the coming to power of the Khomeini government. There were also two part-time programs for children of consular and other government related personnel, that had the sanction of the Ministry of Education in Iran. The teachers in these programs were subsidized by the Ministry and were formerly employed in the

education system in Iran. The texts and examinations used in these programs were prescribed by Ministry authorities and the credentials issued to students completing the program were accepted by the Ministry. It is too early to tell whether the new government will encourage either type of program, informal or formal, to continue. This will depend on future Iran-USA relations. These relations will doubtlessly also determine whether the smaller remaining number of Iranian-Americans will re-establish ethnic community mother tongue schools/classes for their children similar to those that they had in the past.

PILIPINO, see Filipino/Pilipino

POLISH (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 2,437,938)

Undoubtedly the major Slavic language spoken in the USA, far too little systematic information is currently available as to the number and location of the Polish ethnic community mother tongue schools currently functioning in the USA. It does seem that at least a few day schools are still functioning under Roman Catholic auspices (and, perhaps also under Polish National Catholic auspices) in which Polish classes are part of the daily curriculum. However the full story of the roughly 500 Polish parochial schools,

past and present, that have functioned in the USA, particularly under the auspices of the Felician Sisters, certainly remains substantially untold and unappreciated (Kuznicki 1978a, 1978b; Miaso 1977).

Still flourishing and numerous are the Saturday (or other one day) schools, courses and classes conducted either under local parental, parish or benevolent society auspices. Thus, the Polish American Congress has branches throughout the northeast and northcentral states, many of which sponsor or support a Saturday school. Although no full list of these schools is currently available, a partial list reveals 36 such schools in New York and 22 such schools in Michigan alone. Similar (if fewer) schools are supported by the Polish Boy and Girl Scouts Association, The Polish American Folk Theatre, etc. Saturday schools in the Middle Atlantic and Mid Western states are regularly listed in the Polish American Journal (Scranton, PA). Two colleges that have contributed significantly to Polish American life are St. Mary's College (Orchard Lake, MI 48033) and Alliance College (Cambridge Springs, PA 16403). At the latter college a team of researchers (Professors Krusz, Dolzenko and Smetana) has developed a battery of Polish Language and Culture Proficiency Tests at the high school and college levels for use as exit examinations for Polish language teachers seeking certification

or placement and by graduates of the Saturday schools seeking college credit for their studies.

The fact that the current Pope is Polish (and that he visited the USA in 1979) and the strong national spirit shown by Polish workers in 1980 may both provide short-term incentives to increase Polish language maintenance in the USA. Whether these can also lead to long-term maintenance processes remains to be seen. A large scale project on the Polish language in the USA, is currently being conducted by specialists at Polish and American universities, may be of some help in this connection.

For further information contact: Polish American Congress, Inc., Michigan Division, 11333 Joseph Campau, Detroit, MI 48212; Polish National Alliance, 6100 N. Cicero Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60646; The Pilsudski Institute of America, 381 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016; The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences, 57 E. 66th St., New York, NY 10021.

References: Kuznicki, Sr. Ellen Marrie. The Polish American Parochial Schools, in F. Mocha (ed.) Poles in America-Bicentennial Essays. Illinois, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, (1978a); also, by the same author: A historical perspective of the Polish American Parochial School. Polish American Studies, 1978, no. 1-2, 5-12.

Napierkowski, Thomas. Stepchild in America: Growing up Polish; also Pawlowska, Harriet. The education of Harriet Pawlowska, both in Novak, M. (ed.) Growing Up Slavic in America. Bayville, EMPAC, 1976, 9-20 and 21-27.

Greene, V. For God and Country, The Rise of Polish and Lithuanian Consciousness in America, 1860-1910. Madison, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1975.

Zaniecki-Lopata, Helena. Polish Americans: Status Competition in an Ethnic Community. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, 1976.

Miasi, Josef. The History of the Education of Polish Immigrants in the United States. New York, Kosciuszko Foundation, 1977 (translation of the Polish original published in 1970).

Resources: Resource materials on Polish-Americans are available at the Pilsudski Institute (address above) and at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn. 55114.

PORTUGESE (Total estimated "usual home speakers" 1975: 349,000. Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 365,300)

A surprisingly large number of Portugese schools, almost all being Saturday schools affiliated with local benevolent, recreational or social clubs, is currently fuctioning

in the USA. The students are generally either immigrants themselves or the children of immigrants. In most cases these schools are registered with regional Portugese consulates (from which they also derive some support) so that newcomers can more easily be directed to them. The recent democratization of Portugese governmental operations has, if anything, contributed to the popularity of the Portugese ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA and, possibly, also to the support that these receive. Brazil too is a source of some Portugese speakers and of a modium of support for Portugese language use and language teaching in the USA.

For further information contact the Portugese Embassy in Washington (for a list of Portugese Career Consulates in the United States from which, in turn, lists of local schools, classes courses can be obtained). The Brazilian Embassy in Washington distributes a regularly updated Survey of Courses in the Portugese Language, Luso Brazilian, and Latin American Area Studies Offered in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States. The annual "National Portugese Educators Conference" can be contacted via the Multilingual-Multicultural Resource Center, Rhode Island College, Providence, RI 02908.

References: Cardozo, Manoel daSilviera. The Portugese in America: 590BC - 1974; A Chronology and Fact Book. Dobbs Ferry, Oceana Publications, Inc. 1976; Lap, Leo. They Came from Portugal. Boston, Twayne, 1981.

ROMANI (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 1588, is ridiculously underestimated. Informed members of the community estimate roughly 500,000 speakers of the Vlakh dialect and 250,000 speakers of the Anglo-romani dialect)

Of the various Romani speaking groups the Vlakhs are best organized. More generally, knowledge of Romani is an essential factor in Gypsy identity and, notwithstanding widespread functional illiteracy (schools being rare and sporadic, due, in part, to the tradition of migration). The language is very much alive in all vernacular functions. For further information contact: International Gypsy Publications, 18306 47th Place N.E., Seattle, Washington 98155; Prof. Ian Hancock, Department of English, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

References: Romania Newsletter, Romano Instituto, 61 Blenheim Crescent, London, England W112EG; Hancock, Ian (Issue Editor), International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 1979, no. 19. Issue devoted entirely to Romani sociolinguistics.

ROMANIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 56,590)

At the present time there is no reasonably complete list of Romanian ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA. Fortunately, research on this matter (and on other aspects of Romanian language maintenance in the USA) is currently under way by Roceric-Cernea and,(in association with

The Center for Applied Linguistics) as a result, detailed information should be forthcoming in the not too distant future.

For further information contact Union and League of Romanian Societies in the USA, 1106 Williamson Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio 44114, and Dr. Alexandra Roceric, 4527 Warren Street, Washington, D.C. 20016. The Romanian Embassy maintains an informal and incomplete list of American colleges and universities in which Romanian is taught.

Andronesco, Serban C. Who's Who in Romanian America. New York, Andronesco-Wyndhill, 1976.

References: Barton J.J. Peasants and Strangers: Italians, Rumanians and Slovaks in the American City, 1890-1950. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1975.

Wertsman, V The Romanians in America, 1748-1974 New York, Dobbs Ferry, Oceana Publications, 1975.

Roceric, Alexandra. Awareness of national identity among Romanian-Americans. Mierita (A Journal of Romanian Studies), 1979, 6, no.1, 62-73.

Resources: Resource materials on Romanian-Americans are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55114.

RUSNIAK, see Carpatho-Rusyn

RUSSIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 334, 615)

It is quite likely that many Russian Orthodox churches in the USA maintain affiliated schools that both teach as well as teach in Russian. In addition, Old Church Slavonic must be taught for ritual/worship functions. Unfortunately no reasonably complete list of these schools is available, possibly due to lingering suspicions (carried over from the "old country" and the "old days") harbored by community leaders that any such list might lead to "problems" with "the authorities." The list of local churches itself is easily available and the fact that this list is primarily in Russian reinforces the impression that Russian is both used and taught in the enumerated churches, seminaries, administrative offices and other institutions.

In the period 1910-1940 many of those claiming Russian mother tongue in the USA were, in fact, Jews rather than ethnic Russians. Most of these individuals have since been (re-) claiming Yiddish as their mother tongue. Lately, a new immigration of Russian speaking Jews has begun to appear on our shores, some 100,000 such individuals having arrived (either directly from the USSR, or (indirectly from Israel) since 1970. These newcomers have not yet begun to sponsor either Russian or Jewish (Hebrew or Yiddish) ethnic community mother tongue schools of their own. Their Jewish identities

seem to have been essentially damaged by the communist regime's general de-ethnization and specific antisemitic policies, while their eagerness to de-identify from all things Russian may well lead them to deracination in this respect as well. This double alienation (triple, indeed, if American economic rewards are slow in coming due to general problems of inflation and unemployment) may result in serious problems for these newcomers (and particularly for their youngsters) in the coming decade. Finally, mention should be made of the Russian speaking Old Believers who maintain churches and schools of their own in Oregon and Washington, in accord with a life-style very much like that of the Amish.

For further information with respect to mother tongue schools either for ethnic Russians or Russian speaking Jews, contact Mrs. Anna Ellman, Board of Education, 110 Livingston Street, Room 651, Brooklyn, N.Y. For information concerning schools for ethnic Russians specifically, contact Department of Public Relations, Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, 75 E. 93rd St., New York, NY 10028. Additional information may also be available from the Tolstoy Foundation, 250 W 57th St., New York, N.Y. 10019.

Reference: Henzl, Vera M. Slavic languages in the New Environment, in Shirley B Heath and C.A. Ferguson (eds.) Language in the USA, New York, Oxford University Press, 1980.

Wertsman, Vladimir. The Russians in America:

A Chronology and Fact Book. Dobbs Ferry, Oceana Publications, 1977.

Resources: Resource materials concerning Russian-Americans are available in The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55114.

RUSYN, see Carpatho-Rusyn

RUTHENIANS, see Carpatho-Rusyn

SERBIAN (No estimates since 1959 (=50,000). Serbocroatian 1970: 239,455)

Very little information is available at this time on Serbian ethnic-community mother tongue schools in the USA. Thus far only a very few such schools have been identified, although it is very likely that there are several more under Orthodox church auspices.

Resources: Resource materials concerning Serbian-Americans are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55114.

SLOVAK (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 510,366)

Exaustive information is currently lacking concerning the number and location of Slovak community ethnic mother tongue schools. The Slovak Catholic Cultural Center, established in order to assist communities throughout the

country in their efforts to maintain and strengthen Slovak language and culture in the USA, is itself seeking to locate the schools and other cultural institutions of Slovak Americans

For further information contact Slovak Catholic Cultural Center, Benedictine Priory, 5900 W. 147th St., Oak Forest, IL 60452; The First Catholic Slovak Union/Jednota, 3289 E. 55th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44127.

Reference: Henzl, Vera L. Slavic languages in the new environment, in Shirley B. Heath and C.A. Ferguson (eds.) Language in the USA, New York, Oxford University Press, 1979.

Novak, M. How American are you if your grandparents came from Slovakia in 1888?, in his Further Reflections on Ethnicity, Middletown (PA), Jednota, 1977, 20-37.

Matus, Margaret. Slovakia on my map, in Novak M. (ed.) Growing Up Slavic in America. Bayville, EMPAC, 1976, 28-32.

Barton, J.J. Peasants and Strangers: Italians, Rumanians and Slovaks in an American City, 1890-1950. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1975.

Resources: Resource materials concerning Slovak-Americans are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn. 55114.

SLOVENIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 82,321)

A small network of Slovenian community mother tongue

schools currently functions in the USA. Most of the schools meet on Saturdays and are locally sponsored by a parent-teacher group. A few schools are (Catholic) church-related and church supported. Most of these schools, as well as a goodly additional number of students who study Slovenian privately or on their own, utilize the Slovenian Language Manuals (vols I and II) prepared and published by the Slovenian Research Center of America, Inc. The weekly newpaper Prosveta (Chicago) has also reprinted lessons from these manuals for several years and has reached thousands of additional students in this fashion. In addition, the Center has prepared a Slovenian Proficiency Test for the Chicago Public Schools which will have both teacher credertialing and student accrediting functions. All of the foregoing activities and accomplishments are thanks to a small number of tireless teachers and researchers headed by Dr. E. Gobetz. Several of these same individuals are also involved in and responsible for the Slovenian language and literature courses at a handful of colleges, universities and adult education centers. Nevertheless the 1970 Census revealed a marked drop (in excess of 50%) in Slovenian mother tongue claiming in the USA relative to the 1940's and 1950's as well as a marked increase in the age (from mid-twenties to mid-seventies) of the claimant. Obviously, vigorous maintenance steps -- or increased immigration from Slovenia (in Yogoslavia) -- are urgently needed if the Slovenian language is not to disappear from

the American scene (Hocevar 1978).

For further information contact Dr. Edward Gobetz, Director, Slovenian Research Center of America, Inc., 29227 Eddy Rd., Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44092; also: Slovene National Benefit Society, 166 Shore Drive, Burr Ridge, Illinois 60521.

References: Paternost, J. Slovenian language on Minnesota's Iron Range: Some sociolinguistic aspects of language maintenance and language shift, in Lenek, R.L. and T.F. Magner (eds.) The Dilemma of the Melting Pot: The Case of the South Slavic Languages. University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976 (=1976, vol. 16, nos. 2-3 of General Linguistics).

Hocevar, Toussant. Slovenski Druzbeni Razvoj. New Orleans, Zalozba Prometej, 1978. (P.O. Box 8391, New Orleans, La. 70182) A new scholarly journal, Slovene Studies, was begun in 1979 by The Society for Slovene Studies, Institute on East Central Europe, Columbia University. Items of sociolinguistic interest have also been published in the Studia Slovenica series (P.O. Box 4531, Washington, D.C. 20017).

Resources: Resource materials concerning Slovenian-Americans are available at The Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota 55114.

SPANISH (Total estimate of "usual home speakers", 1975: 10,011,000
Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 7,823,583)

Spanish community ethnic mother tongue schools are basically of three types:

(a) Roman Catholic (and, in a few cases, other religious-order-sponsored) day schools engaged in transitional Title VII bilingual education. There are dozens of programs of this kind, examples being encountered in all larger American cities in which Hispanics have settled during the past two decades and into which they continue to stream, as legal and as illegal residents, from Puerto Rico, Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. On occasion some of these programs are unofficially maintenance oriented but, far more frequently, they consciously or unconsciously pursue the avowed Title VII goals of anglification via coopting the linguistic minority's leadership for this very purpose. The bulk of children attending Spanish community ethnic mother tongue schools are enrolled in programs of this type.

(b) Roman Catholic (and, in an extremely few cases, other-religious-order sponsored) day schools that are primarily language maintenance oriented and that are not dependent on Title VII for their Spanish programs of instruction. The lion's share of these programs are in Puerto Rico, although, here and there, such schools are also appearing elsewhere and not necessarily under church auspices (e.g. the Escuela Espana de Washington).

(c) Spanish language Alternative Schools, maintained with the help of foundations, parental groups and public funds, are springing up throughout the Chicano southwest,

particularly in California and in Colorado. These schools frequently stress the economic and social problems of Hispanics, Chicanos (and, often the Indian too) as well as the Hispanic roots of the Chicano people. More or less Spanish may actually be used as a medium of instruction, depending on the degree of anglification of the student population. At any rate, these schools seek to instill pride in the Spanish language and to foster facility in it.

Obviously the largest non-English language group in the USA, Spanish is seriously under-served insofar as community mother tongue schools of its own are concerned (all the more so if non-public schools in Puerto Rico are set aside). To some extent this is due to the depressed economic status of most speakers of Spanish on the mainland. To some extent it is due to the minor literacy association that most of them currently have with their language. To some extent it is due to the overdependencies that Hispanics have developed on public funds, on public affirmative action and on public legal guarantees on the one hand, and (until recently) on Roman Catholic sponsored schooling, on the other hand. Additionally, the special status of Spanish in Puerto Rico and in New Mexico may also explain some of the hesitation and reluctance of Hispanics to establish community-based language schools and other language related institutions in the USA. Language consciousness, not to mention language loyalty and Spanish literacy,

are also generally low among Hispanics in the USA (although at least the former is somewhat higher among the young). This represents a serious danger for the maintenance of the language, even though the ranks of its newcomers are destined to be replenished almost indefinitely. However, there is no room for a blase attitude in this connection, for as the current drift establishes and becomes ever stronger, those Hispanics who are already anglified will become the major force in the anglification of their late-coming cousins. Even now the children of third generation bilingual parents are overwhelmingly monolingual English speakers.

For further information contact Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenos, 445 W. 59th St., Room 1206, New York, NY 10019; Institute for Urban Studies, Mid-West Council of La Raza, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556; Dr. Francisco Hernandez, Bilingual Education Program, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California 94928.

References: Cafferty, Pastora Sandia. Puerto Rican return migration: its implications for bilingual education. Ethnicity, 1975, 2, 52-65.

Chavez, Reginio. La Academia Emiliano Zapata: A Case Study, in Oakland Street Academy School Project, Washington, D.C. National Urban League, Experimental School Projects and National Institute of Education, 1976.

Elias-Olivares, Lucia and David Kasjleti (eds.) Spannish in the U.S. Setting: Beyond the Southwest. In press.

Keller, Gary and J.A. Fishman (eds.) Bilingual Education for American Hispanics. New York, Teachers College Press, 1981.

Macias, Reynaldo et.al. Educación Alternativa: On the Development of Chicano Bilingual Schools. Hayward (CA), The Southwest Network, 1975.

Craddock, Jerry R. Colonial Spanish; Zentella, Ana Celia. Language Variety among Puerto Ricans, both in Shirley B. Heath and C.A. Ferguson (eds.) Language in the US. New York, Oxford University Press, 1980.

SUB-CARPATHIAN RUS, see Carpatho-Rusyn

SWEDISH (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 626,102)

As with the other Scandinavian languages, (see Danish, Finnish, Icelandic, Norwegian, above) Swedish too experienced a virtual end to immigration several generations ago. Since the end of World War II the few school-age immigrant children still arriving from Sweden tend to understand (if not to speak) English quite well because English is a required subject in all Swedish schools. On the whole, therefore, Swedish, like all other Scandinaivan or Norse Studies has pretty well "graduated" from the ethnic community per se to the commercial

language school and/or to the general college and university. Among the latter are several colleges initially established by Swedish churches (e.g., Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill., Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.,etc.) Finally, note that a handful (half a handful) of Swedish community ethnic mother tongue schools do exist today notwithstanding all of the above. Perhaps the recent "rebirth of ethnicity" will lead to the establishment of a few more.

For further information consult Swedish Information Service, 825 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022; American Swedish Cultural Foundation, 4505 Abbott Ave., North, Minneapolis, Minn. 55422; American Swedish Institute, 200 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn. 55407.

References: D.E. Ashley, G.G. Gage, R.T. Rovinsky, Nordic Area Studies in North America. Lawrence (Kansas), Society for the Advancement of Scandiravian Study and Allen Press, 1976.

Hasselmo, N. Swedish America: An Introduction, Minneapolis, Brings Press, 1976.

Lindbark, S. Swedish America 1914-1932. Studies in Ethnicity with Emphasis on Illinois and Minnesota. Uppsala, Studia Historica Upsaliensia, 1971.

Kastrup, Allan. The Swedish Heritage in America. St.Paul, Swedish Council of America, 1975.

TAGALOG, see Filipino/Pilipino

THAI (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 14,416)

Various Buddhist Temples utilize Thai and teach it to the children of affiliated families. A full list of these Temples is available from the Office of the Public Relations Attache, Royal Thai Embassy, 2300 Kolarama Rd., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

TIBETAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 352)

As in the case of Chinese, Japanese, Khmer, Sinhalese, Thai (see above) and Vietnamese, so also in the case of Tibetan there are Buddhist Temples that use and teach Tibetan in connection with teaching (Vajrayana) Buddhism and Tibetan culture (including Tibetan herbal medicine, philosophy and religion, cooking, etc.). In addition to conversational Tibetan (at various levels) some Temples also offer instruction in classical Tibetan. Since most Temples are independent and unrelated to each other a central address for further information might be The Tibet Society, Inc., Indiana University, Goodboy Hall 101, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

TURKISH (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 24, 123)

Although no schools have been located there are obviously some Turkish mosques that may employ (and teach) Turkish as well as Arabic. Additional information on Turkish-American ethnic community schools is sorely lacking.

UKRAINIAN (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 24, 123)

The world of Ukrainian ethnic community mother tongue schooling is still an active and sizable one, although it too may well be at least somewhat past its prime. There are three types of sponsorship for Ukrainian schools:

(a) Consistory of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church sponsored schools. No name and address list of these schools is currently available but they are some ten in number and enroll approximately 1000 pupils. Not all of these schools are necessarily currently teaching Ukrainian.

(b) Roman Catholic sponsored schools. Many Ukrainians are affiliated with the Ukrainian Catholic (= Uniate) branch of the Roman, i.e. Western) Catholic Church (in its Philadelphia, Stamford and Chicago eparchies) and this branch sponsors 31 day schools for some 7000 students. All of these schools teach Ukrainian as well as conduct some of their classes in Ukrainian. One college is also conducted under this sponsorship, namely, St. Basil's College, Stamford, Connecticut 06902.

(c) Saturday schools. Over three dozen Saturday (or other one-day-a-week) schools are functioning and are attended by some 3000 students. Most of these schools are affiliated with the Educational Council (Skilna Rada) U.C.C.A. These schools commonly meet for four-hour sessions and are still usually geared to pupils with native or near native proficiency in Ukrainian. Most students are the children

of immigrants although even third generation students are also not uncommon.

As the numbers of students in the above schools diminishes, slowly to be sure but yet surely, the number of college and university courses in Ukrainian rises. This latter phenomenon, although gratifying to Ukrainian language-and-culture leaders, is nevertheless worrysome because of its seeming reciprocal relationship to the former. The professional routinization and de-ethnization of higher Ukrainian studies is not a development that the community or its leadership welcomes but it has not been able to reverse the trend. Hopes for increased future immigration from the Ukraine (paralleling the current Soviet Jewish immigration) are often mentioned but the realization of these hopes is probably also not within the community's political power.

For additional information contact Consistory of Ukrainian Orthodox Church, P.O. Box 495, South Bond Brook, N.J. 08880 (att: Prof. G.Bobrowsky); Ukrainian Catholic Diocese of Stamford, Bishop's Chancery, 161 Glenbrook Road, Stamford, CT, 06902; Educational Council - UCCA, P.O. Box 391, Cooper Station, New York, N.Y. 10003 (att: Dr. I. Huryn); Selfreliance Association of American Ukrainians, 98 Second Avenue, New York, NY 10003.

References: A 50 page article by Vasyl Markus, "Ukrainians in the United States," which appears in a two-volume work

covering Ukrainians in the homeland and in the immigration, Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia 2 (Toronto, 1971) is the best general introduction. See also Wasyl Halich, Ukrainians in the United States (Chicago, 1937; repr. New York, 1970); Yaroslav Chyz, The Ukrainian Immigrants in the United States (Scranton, Pa., 1959); and Myron B. Kuropas' more popular Ukrainians in America (Minneapolis, 1972). The Ukrainians in America, 1608-1975: A Chronology and Fact Book (Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., 1976), compiled by Vladimir Wertsman; and The Ukrainian Immigrant Experience in the United States: A Symposium (Cambridge, Mass., 1977) edited by Paul R. Magocsi and Richard Renoff, are also useful.

Iuliian Bachyns'kyi, Ukrains'ka immigratsiia v Z'iedynenykh Derzhavakh Ameryky (Lvov, 1914) is a classic. Current sociological analyses can be found in the collection edited by Wsevolod W. Isajiw, Ukrainians in American and Canadian Society (Jersey City, N.J., 1976) and in a sociolinguistic study by Vladimir C. Nahirny and Joshua A. Fishman, "Ukrainian Language Maintenance Efforts in the United States," in J.A. Fishman et al. Language Loyalty in the United States, (The Hague, Mouton, 1966, 378-357). Two reference works are also valuable: D.M. Shtohryn, ed., Ukrainians in America: A Biographical Directory (Chicago, 1975) and Wasyl Weresh, Guide to Ukrainian-American Institutions, Professionals, and Business (New York, 1955).

The largest collection of materials, serials, books,

pamphlets and primary sources on the Ukrainian immigration is maintained by the Immigration History Research Center at the University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn. 55114. Other centers with significant holdings, (in some cases: the archives and libraries of leading figures in the immigration) are the Ukrainian Museum-Archive (Ukra'ins'kyi Muzei Arkhiv) in Cleveland, Ohio, the Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences (Ukrains'ka Vilna Academiia Nauk) in New York City; The Ukrainian Research Institute at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., and The Ukrainian-American Archives Museum and Library, Detroit, Michigan.

A Visit to a Ukrainian community ethnic mother tongue school

Ukrainian community schools in the USA reveal the substantial diversity that characterizes the community itself. There are all day schools and Saturday schools; there are schools under Roman Catholic (Byzantine Rite) auspices, others under Ukrainian Orthodox Church auspices, and still others under secular ("cultural") organizational auspices. Many of the schools in smaller mining towns in Pennsylvania are now attended overwhelmingly by American-born 3rd generation students. Others, in urban centers that have benefitted most from post World War II immigration, are attended by children whose parents were immigrants and even by children who were themselves born abroad. More of the latter are now expected, both from the Ukraine itself

and from Ukrainian immigrant communities originally established in Latin America and now resettling in the USA. Finally, Ukrainian community schools reveal the substantial and recent impact of social mobility and neighborhood change experienced by the populations whom they have served.

At the Holy Ghost School in Brooklyn only some 5 out of 150 students are now of Ukrainian parentage. Some 18 years ago, when the school and the church with which it is affiliated were erected, the neighborhood surrounding them both was still appreciably Ukrainian. Today this is no longer the case and the school serves an ethnically mixed Catholic population eager to take advantage of the school's low tuition ($350 per year) and its "no nonsense" educational program. Ukrainian language and culture are offered to any students who might be interested and some 13 students of non-Ukrainian parentage currently join the 5 that are of Ukrainian heritage for two half hour lessons a week devoted to these subjects. Ukrainian is offered only in grades 3 to 6. Grades 1-2 are considered too young for the additional burden; grades 7-8 are considered "too hard to control" in connection with this subject area.

The demographic and curricular circumstances at St. George's School in Manhattan are currently far better than at the Holy Ghost school but might be viewed as slowly moving in the same direction. Boasting an enrollment of some 1000 pupils in the early post-World War II years (even before a

high school was added to the original elementary school), the school now has less than a total of 300 students (combining both levels) due to the continuing exodus of Ukrainian-Americans to the suburbs from the "old neighborhood" (one which has seen a succession of immigrant groups for the past two centuries) during the past few decades. Nevertheless, some 80% of the students now in attendance still walk to school, the neighborhood boasts several Ukrainian shops (foodstuffs, books, religious articles, travel agencies, restaurants), churches and organization headquarters. Many of those who moved away still frequent the "old neighborhood" for shopping, entertainment and religious services and a Saturday school (with as many children as the all day school) provides their children with a full 12 year curriculum. Thus, although the number of students is diminishing, it is still substantial and there is a definite sense of an intact "Ukrainian community" associated with it.

Ukrainian language, literature, history and geography are taught in all grades for 40 minutes per day five times a week. In addition, Ukrainian is used in religious instruction (masses are now given in Ukrainian as well as in Old Church Slavonic) twice a week, and in crafts instruction once a week. Almost all students (half of whom are foreign born) speak Ukrainian at home (and to their teachers, all of whom know Ukrainian, even if they teach general subjects), and several speak Ukrainian to each other. The school's ethno-religious efforts are buttressed by a scout organization, an annual

street carnival, and by Ukrainian courses at a nearby University (with which the school co-sponsors an annual Ukrainian Day). The State Regents examination in Ukrainian (newly instituted in 1976) and a school requirement that a 12th year of Ukrainian must be passed for graduation all help raise student achievement in this area. Ukrainian is not a frill, even though it takes up only 15% of the school day.

The school's texts are from various diaspora sources (Philadelphia, New York, Canada, Australia). Its teachers of Ukrainian are currently still foreign born in the all day school but, increasingly, American born in the Saturday school. English reading and printing begin in the first grade, as do Ukrainian reading and writing/printing. No particular difficulties are encountered in this approach, even though some letters have different phonetic values (e.g. Ukrainian g is pronounced as the English d) in the two languages. In the upper grades students are studying and discussing advanced literary and historical selections with apparent ease and with equally apparent interest. The Czarist and Soviet suppression of Ukrainian is much stressed and this develops and maintains a sense of responsibility among the students for safeguarding their heritage.

Nevertheless, there is a certain poignancy in the fact that their former friends and neighbors who have resettled in the suburbs have established no all day schools of their own. Whether their churches and Saturday schools will be sufficient

to the task of maintaining their children within the ethnolinguistic fold is still far from clear and a source of constant concern. (See Zaleska-Onyshkevych, Larissa. Aspects of the preservation of Ukrainianness: language and schools. Plastovy Shliakh, 1979, 58, July-September, 33-50. (In Ukrainian).

WELSH

Evening courses and university courses for adults exist, although few in number, but schools/classes for children have thus far not been located.

WHITE RUSSIAN, see Byelorussian

WHITE RUTHENIAN, see Byelorussian

VIETNAMESE (persons of Vietnamese "background" 1976: 150,000 (Waggoner 1978))

Only a very few ethnic community mother tongue schools have been established thus far for these relatively recent arrivals.

For further information (also re Hmong, Khmer, Lao) contact the National Indochinese Clearinghouse/Technical Assistance Center, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3520 Prospect St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

References: Montero, Darrel. Vietnamese Americans: Patterns of Resettlement and Socioeconomic Adaptation in the United States. Westview Press, 1979; also A Guide to Two Cultures. Washington, D.C. Emergency Taskforce for Indochinese Refugees, 1975.

YIDDISH (Total mother tongue claimants CUS 1970: 1,593,993)

There are two major and importantly different community mother tongue school systems teaching and teaching in Yiddish in the USA today; one is secular, relatively small today and shrinking, the other is ultra-orthodox in religion, larger and may very well still be growing or at least holding its own. In addition to these two disparate worlds of Yiddish community ethnic mother tongue schooling, there are a few additional language related activities that may be small in size but significant in impact.

Secular Yiddish schooling reached its zenith in the 30's with hundreds of schools and tens of thousands of students. At that time it was ideologically differentiated into Labor Zionist, Socialist, Communist and neutralist camps. The camps remain to this very day but only the erstwhile socialists still maintain a network of roughly a dozen weekday afternoon/weekend schools known as the I.L. Peretz Workmen Circle schools. These schools now follow a moderately "liberal" (rather than a strictly socialist) line and a curriculum which is also pro-Israel, sympathetic to various relgious traditions and includes some attention to Hebrew as well as paying primary attentior to Yiddish

,language, literature, Jewish history and holidays. The communist schools never regrouped after the McCarthyite period and, to the extent that they still exist, are rarely visible to and make minimal use of Yiddish. Obviously, the graduates of today's W.C. schools can attain only positive attitudes and very modest language skills as a result of their Yiddish schooling, given the restricted number of hours available for it.

Ultra-orthodox Yiddish schooling is the only Yiddish schooling in the USA today that involves any appreciable number of students of Yiddish mother tongue. Nevertheless, even these schools (all of them day schools and several of them day high schools) also deal with a sizeable number of students (approaching half of their total enrollment of circa 30,000) for whom Yiddish is not their mother tongue but a language learned and used in school and in a limited number of school sponsored activities. Generally speaking the graduates of these schools can speak at least semi-fluently, read quite freely (although rarely) and understand well nigh completely. Whereas the overall increase in orthodox day schools has jumped 21% (from 307 to 371) from 1970-71 to 1977-78, the number of such schools teaching in Yiddish has increased from 79 to 117, i.e., by 48%. These 117 schools now constitute 32% of the total of 371 orthodox day schools. On the other hand, among 107 non-orthodox day schools there

is only 1 that teaches or teaches in Yiddish. Thus, it is quite evident that the appreciable association between Yiddish and day schools is specifically an association within the orthodox fold. The details of this latter association are revealed in Table Y1, below, which covers the 25 year period 1953-1978.

TABLE Y1

ORTHODOX DAY SCHOOLS TEACHING IN YIDDISH

Year	1 Total # of ODS	2 # teaching Yiddish	2/1
1952-53	144	25	17%
1960-61	213	67	32%
1970-71	307	79	26%
1977-78	371	117	32%
Increase from 1962-53 to 1960-61:	48%	168%	
1960-61 to 1970-71:	44%	18%	
1970-71 to 1977-78:	21%	48%	

Why it is that this new spurt has occurred in the number of Yiddish teaching Orthodox day schools is not clear at this time. Birth rate factors may well be involved, the ultra-orthodox birth rate being larger not only than the general Jewish rate but than the general orthodox rate as well. There may be a concentration or New York City factor as well since the Yiddish teaching day schools are almost all in the Northeast (113 out of 118), whereas this is less so for day schools that do not teach in Yiddish (229 out of 378).

Concentration may foster the opening of new schools even when they are initially low in enrollment, because of the awareness of the ultra-Orthodox birth rate upon which they can draw in the future (while the Jewish child population in general is shrinking).

Beyond the above two major worlds of Yiddish schooling (the secular and the orthodox) there is also the often incohate world of adult courses in Yiddish at community centers and synagogues as well as the growing but still tiny world of Yiddish at the college and university level. The first of these two has yet to be reviewed in detail, whether as to number or content. The second is an undoubted source of prestige for Yiddish but also presents the very evident danger of routinization and de-ethnization from within, i.e., from students and professors who identify with academia and its problems and rewards, rather than with those of the ethnic mother tongue community. (See comments under Czech, above).

Finally, a few words are in order about the huge universe of Orthodox conservative and Reform weekday afternoon and Sunday schools. Very few of these teach Yiddish today but a recent (1980) survey by The American Association for Jewish Education has revealed that nearly half of them would like to do so at least to some minimal extent. This may be no more than "nostalgia" for the vanished past, but, on the other hand, it might lead to more Yiddish study in the future than has

long obtained in American Jewish education.

For further information contact: Workmen's Circle Education Department, 45 East 33rd Street, New York, NY 10016; Torah Umesorah, 229 Park Avenue South, New York, NY 10003; Yugntruf: Youth for Yiddish, 3328 Bainbridge Avenue, Bronx, NY 10467.

References: Fishman, J.A. Yiddish in America: Sociolinguistic Description and Analysis. Bloomington, Indiana University, 1965.

Parker, Sandra. An educational assessment of the Yiddish secular school movements in the United States, in J.A. Fishman (ed.) Never Say Die! The Hague, Mouton, 1981.

Prager, Leonard. Yiddish in the university. The (London) Jewish Quarterly, 1974, 22, no. 1-2 (79-80), 31-40; also in J.A. Fishman (ed.) Never Say Die! The Hague, Mouton, 1981.

Weinreich, Max. History of the Yiddish Language. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1980 (= English translation of vols. 1 and 2 of the 1973/4 vol. Yiddish original).

Generally useful English sources: Yiddish (Queens College, CUNY), News of the Yivo, News about Yiddish (American Association of University Professors of Yiddish) Jewish Folklore and Ethnology, Working Papers on Yiddish and Eastern European Jewish Studies, The Jewish Catalog III, etc.

MULTILINGUAL

A few multilingual schools (schools in which two or more languages other than English are used as media of instruction) do have genuinely multiethnic community roots. Thus there is a school utilizing both Spanish and German in Texas, another utilizing both Spanish and Ute (a Native American

language) in Colorado, yet another utilizing French and Italian in Rhode Island, etc. Similarly, there are several day schools utilizing Title VII funds for transitional bilingual education with several different immigrant student populations simultaneously (e.g., Spanish and Italian). All of these schools are few in number, relatively recent in origin, and in many cases, of unpredictable longevity because of population mobility, on the one hand, and the unreliability of outside funding, on the other.

Another category of multilingual schools are those that are unrelated to ethnic communities from the outset. These schools are very similar to private, non-ethnic French schools mentioned above, and, indeed, they all do teach partially through French. The United Nations International School is of this latter type and so is the Washington International School. These schools are of importance for any student of ethnic mother tongue schooling in the USA because they provide a basis of comparison insofar as language learning and use is concerned. How much can be accomplished by good teachers, texts, curricula and students, without any ethnic community outside of the school to provide useful opportunities, membership identity and social purpose to language learning? The answer would seem to be "quite a bit" if we are dealing with carefully selected, able, self-motivated students drawn largely from homes where this type of education is highly valued. However, it should be admitted that if the graduates

of these schools do not travel or settle abroad after graduation, or do not find employment in occupations that require and reward their special linguistic skills, that these quickly become passive and, ultimately, hard to reactivate. Thus, these schools are a mirror (inverse) image of ethnic community mother tongue schools. The latter often have natural, ongoing reward systems requiring language-use but lack the funds for optimal teachers, materials, programs, etc. Conversely, the non-ethnic bi- and multilingual schools possess funds, optimal materials, optimal teachers, optimal pupils, optimal programs, etc., but lack natural links to a natural community of speakers, members, worshippers, i.e. they lack the bonds of kinship and authenticity. Finally there are, unfortunately, a growing number of ethnic community mother tongue schools that have serious lacks on both fronts. As ethnic groups in the USA disperse, di-ethnicize, re-linguify and re-ethnicize, many of their schools, linger on for years, even for decades, without any real community links insofar as pupil language use and related behaviors are concerned. The schools "hang in the air", so to speak, often being neither here nor there, neither schools nor contributors to ethnic community processes. This danger, above all, must be faced by ethnic America today if its community mother tongue schools are to be more effective and are to be worthy of their name.

A visit to a multilingual school

Multilingual Enrichment at the Washington International School

The elitist concept of bilingual education (as something broadening, humanizing, sensitizing and facilitating) is alive and well in the USA but it has been upstaged by WIS, a school also attended by a goodly number of non-white or non-Anglo center-city children on scholarships. All students receive roughly half of their education (from nursery through grade 12) in either French or Spanish. Some 20% of the pupils are either of Francophone or Hispanoparlante parentage; for them then, WIS is also a language maintenance opportunity.

The school (actually two schools: an elementary school and a secondary school many miles apart) is a busy, happy, maze of rooms, decorated alcoves and corridors. The teachers must all be mother-tongue speakers of the languages they employ as media of instruction (although they may come from any country of the world) and obviously enjoy working at a school where parents and children alike are dedicated to bilingual education as an enriching experience. With this elan the lack of space, the thin partitions separating Spanish and French subsections of the same grade and the obvious financial needs that peak through here and there seem to add to the charm of the school rather than detract from its effectiveness.

The staff is constantly on the lookout for new materials, better methods or innovative curricula. Children are grouped within grades not only by differences in language mastery (since new children are annually admitted into all grades in view of Washington's constantly changing consular community), but also by "maturity" and a variety of individual considerations. The school also has a rich extra-curricular program (dramatics, sports, and additional languages such as Dutch and Farsi) and a constant flow of admiring visitors. It has been in existence since 1966 and its graduates are now entering colleges and universities in various countries. Those interested in studying abroad can do so easily via qualifying for the Internation Baccalaureate Diploma for which the WIS prepares them. A few other schools in the Washington area also offer enrichment bilingual education (e.g. the private Four Corners School and The Gorman School as well as the public Oyster Bilingual Elementary School) but WIS remains a beacon in its own home-town. Given its prominence it is understandable why it is also the operational headquarters of "The Association Of Genuinely Bilingual Schools" which has an annual meeting every spring. This association is, of course, open to ethnic community mother tongue schools, and, indeed, to all bilingual schools that reject the transitional philosophy of Title VII vis-a-vis the need for languages other than English in the USA.

Conclusions

1. The world of ethnic community mother tongue schooling in the USA is large (some 5500 units having been located and many more doubtlessly remaining as yet unfound) and variegated over four dozen different language-groups, or many more than that if the various native American nations are to be counted separately rather than lumped under one catchall designation).

2. The largest groups, in terms of the numbers of schools and pupils, pertain to Hebrew, German, Greek, and Spanish, these four languages-contexts alone accounting for roughly two thirds of the total community ethnic mother tongue schooling universe. Their schools are overwhelmingly under religious auspices and an appreciable number of them are day schools. These languages all have strong traditional functions and their family-and-neighborhood systems are often relatively intact.

3. Some of the oldest non-English mother tongue communities in the USA have almost entirely lost their ethnic mother tongue schools. The Scandinavian languages and French are most clearly in this category. However, these languages are still frequently taught in the USA, but usually not under ethnic community auspices nor as much at the elementary as at higher levels of education.

4. Many newer (recent immigration derived) ethnic communities have vibrant and still effective ethnic mother

tongue schools, e.g., Armenians, Chinese, Croatians, Estonians, Koreans, Japanese, Latvians, Poles, Ukrainians, etc. However many of these groups are currently past their peaks in terms of community based schools, although the number of colleges and universities offering instruction in their languages continues to rise.

5. Largely unknown and uncounted at this time are ethnic community mother tongue schools that teach and teach in Arabic, Russian, Serbian, in the various languages related to Buddhist worship and traditional life and in various other European, Asian and African languages, e.g., Albanian, Basque, Irish, Bulgarian, Dutch, Frisian, Hawaiian, Haitian Creole, Rumanian, Turkish, languages of India, Indo-chinese languages, etc.

6. European immigrant children recently arriving in the USA are often less likely to be attracted to or to be long enrolled in ethnic community mother tongue schools because of their substantial modernization and mastery of English prior to arrival in the USA.

7. The number of high schools (not to mention tertiary schools) involved in ethnic community mother tongue schooling is extremely limited. On the other hand, with the exception of the groups mentioned in 2, above, most other groups are engaged primarily in no more than one-day-a-week ethnic mother tongue schooling (usually on Sundays). The combination of

low intensity in terms of number of hours per week, plus brief exposure, in terms of number of years, does not bode well for school contribution to the language maintenance efforts of the communities involved.

8. An unmixed blessing, from the point of view of the future of ethnic community mother tongue education is the constant "promotion" of these languages to the college/university level where ethnic community control usually no longer obtains. This promotion often draws off funds and intellectual leadership from the community and exacts the price of de-ethnization and professionalization for the "prestige" that it provides.

9. With the exception of the schools listed under 2, above, all of which are oriented primarily toward American born children, and, more broadly, with the exception of day schools under direct community control (i.e., not under the control of an extra-communal non-ethnic or other-ethnic hierarchy), there is only modest evidence that ethnic community mother tongue schools generally make much of a contribution to mother tongue acquisition, development, use or retention in and of themselves. Even in the case of the day school the contributions that <u>are</u> often claimed and documented in these connections are hardly independent contributions in the sense that they depend crucially on <u>school-and-community interaction</u> rather than being attributable to the school per se. For a

description of school-and-community characteristics that result in optimal ethnic mother tongue achievement. See Markman and Fishman 1980.

10. Nevertheless, ethnic community mother tongue schools play a role in ethnic community life far above and beyond whatever contributions they may make on the language front. They are institutions that help define identity, philosophy, ideals, ideology, goals and purpose. They help foster and mobilize affect and activity. They imply and express the ethnomoral dimension of community life. They represent integrative aspirations without which alienation and dislocation would be greater. More and more they define intimately legitimate ways of being particular kinds of Americans. Other chapters in this report expound on these latter goals at great length.

11. On the other hand, as far as language mastery is concerned, these schools can lay a foundation that a few children subsequently build upon for their own benefit as well as for the benefit of their communities and the country as a whole. Indeed, the active, natural and meaningful language use experience that these schools still provide for particularly fortunate and capable students probably results in the highest level of language mastery attained by any language programs in the USA.

12. These schools are a national resource. If they continue to be ignored and undercut we will all be the poorer.

Their future, therefore, should be a priority national concern.

Reference: Markman, Barbara and Joshua A. Fishman. Why do some ethnic-community-schools in the USA accomplish more than others with respect to ethnic mother tongue instruction. Non-English Language Resources of the United States: A Preliminary Update Focused on Ethnic Mother Tongue Instruction. New York, Yeshiva University (Final Report on Grant No. G00-79-01816).

CHAPTER 5

WHY DO SOME ETHNIC COMMUNITY SCHOOLS IN THE USA ACCOMPLISH MORE THAN OTHERS WITH RESPECT TO ETHNIC MOTHER TONGUE INSTRUCTION*

by

Barbara Markman
and
Joshua A. Fishman

In a previous study (Markman and Fishman 1979) a tentative answer was given to the question posed in the title of this paper. The purpose of the present paper is to return to that same question but with sharper and more powerful analytic tools. Before proceeding to address this purpose we will first briefly summarize several of the major descriptive parameters pertaining to the schools we have studied (124 out of a total enumerated universe of roughly ten times that many)[1] so that our current findings with respects to ethnic mother tongue achievement can be better understood in light of other characteristics of the schools, their students, parent bodies, staffs and programs.

School Characteristics

Ethnic community language-related all day(AD) schools are primarily under religious sponsorship whereas weekday afternoon (WDA)

TABLE I: SUMMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF ETHNIC COMMUNITY SCHOOLS STUDIED

(n=124)

School Characteristics	School Type AD	WDA	WE
1. Proportion: each school type/entire sample	33%	23%	44%
2. Religious affiliation	66%	34%	31%
3. Affiliation with cultural/fraternal organiz.	27%	52%	61%
4. Established since 1964	37%	52%	41%
5. Average number of hrs./wk.of instruction	30	5	5
6. Tuition: $250 or more	71%	0%	6%
7. Tuition: None	20	28%	17%
8. Enrollment above 200	56%	14%	7%
9. Over 50% Native Born Students of Native Born Parents	50%	38%	15%
10. Over 50% Native Born Students of Foreign Born Parents	15%	48%	54%
11. Over 10% of Studentsnot of ethnic background implied by CMI	41%	21%	6%
12. Over 80% of parents fluent CMI speakers	44	41	52%
13. Over 90% of parents fluent English speakers	37	31	69
14. Families live in neighborhoods with majority of CMI speakers	27%	3%	0%
15. All CMI teachers with specific CMI training	46%	55%	31%
16. Over 50% of CMI staff is Native Born/Native Born	56%	10%	0%
17. All teachers literate in English	59%	45%	63%

School Characteristics	School Type AD	WDA	WE
18. All teachers literate in CMI	17%	66%	83%
19. All students receiving CMI instruction	46%	59%	85%
20. 50% or more of student time devoted to CMI	33%	95%	96%
21. CMI taught for transitional purposes	20%	7%	0%
22. CMI taught for language maintenance	73%	52%	83%
23. CMI used for teaching ethnocultural subjects	39%	48%	69%
24. School plans to increase time for CMI instruction	24%	41%	19%

and Weekend (WE) schools are primarily under cultural/fraternal organizational sponsorship (Table I). Although most AD schools predate the "ethnic boom" that began in the mid-sixties most of the WDA schools have been established since that time. AD schools tend to be obviously larger, charge far more tuition and (of course) meet for many more hours/week. However, since few of them spend even half of their time on or in CMI (ethnic "co-medium of instruction") (see item 20) it may be that the total number of hours devoted to such instruction is either not very different from one school type to the other or is even greater in the non-AD than in the AD schools.

AD schools have proportionately more students who are American born of American born parents. They also have much larger proportions of children not derived from the ethnic background implied by their Co-Medium of Instruction (CMI). Finally, they also more commonly serve children who reside in neighborhoods in which the CMI is spoken by a

majority of the inhabitants. Thus, AD schools seem to be oriented toward a very heterogeneous student body in which ethnic, linguistic and nativity characteristics are present in quite unusual combinations.

WE schools, on the other hand, reveal a number of unusual characteristics of their own. They are most commonly oriented to native born students of foreign parentage, to students who <u>are</u> of the ethnicity implied by the CMI, and whose parents <u>are</u> most fluent in the CMI. On the other hand, WE school parents are also most fluent in English and least likely to live in neighborhoods in which the CMI is commonly spoken. Obviously, this is the school type for children of secular and socially/economically mobile, post-World War II arrivals. Its teachers are most likely to be highly literate in both languages but to be untrained for their CMI roles.

AD schools least commonly claim that all students are receiving CMI instruction. This may be due to the fact that not all AD school pupils are of the ethnicity implied by the CMI, but it is also clearly due to the fact that such schools more commonly teach the CMI only for transitional purposes to begin with. It is the <u>WE</u> school that most commonly stresses the CMI for language maintenance purposes and that employs it most frequently for ethnocultural subjects (history, literature) other than language per se.

Relatively few schools plan to increase their number of hours devoted to CMI instruction. The WDA schools most frequently claim such plans and these are also the schools that most commonly have professionally trained CMI teachers. Nevertheless, in most other respects these tend to occupy an intermediate position between the AD and the

WE schools. The latter two seem to be the polar types in ethnic community language-related schooling, each with certain characteristic internal contradictions. It now remains to be seen whether (and, if so, how) any of these characteristics -- of schools, pupils, parents, staffs, programs or sponsorships -- are significantly related to school achievement.

To What Extent Can CMI Achievement Criteria Be Predicted?

As Table II reveals both English and CMI criteria our current approach to studying ethnic community language related schools is that of analyzing questionnaire data via cumulative multiple correlation and factor analytic methods.

TABLE II A: CUMULATIVE PREDICTION OF CMI AND ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT CRITERIA*

a) In all 124 schools

Criterion	Steps	CR	CR^2
1. Graduating students speak CMI fluently:	9	.78	.61
4. (Graduating students speak English fluently:	17	.88	.78)
7. Graduating students read/write CMI with ease:	10	.75	.57
8. (Graduating students read/write English with ease:	15	.85	.72)
2. Increase in proportion speaking CMI fluently (entrance to graduation):	10	.82	.68
5. (Increase in proportion speaking English fluently (entrance to graduation):	9	.78	.61)

b) In Weekday Afternoon and Weekend Schools only (n=83)

7. Graduating students read/write CMI with ease:	5	.71	.50
8. (Graduating students read/write English with ease:	16	.91	.83)

c) In Allday schools only (n:41)

7. Graduating students read/write CMI with ease:	4	.81	.65
8. Graduating students read/write English with ease:	7	.84	.70

Brackets indicate that the information is included in this table for comparative purposes only and does not pertain to main purpose of this paper.

can be predicted rather well via these methods on the basis of the self-report (questionnaire) data which we collected. Whether these are criteria of oralcy or of literacy, whether they are final level criteria or amount of gain criteria from school entry to school graduation, whether they pertain to English or to CMI achievement and whether they are examined separately in Allday schools attended in lieu of public education or in Weekday Afternoon/Weekend Schools attended in addition to public education, the level of prediction attained is 50% of the variance at worst, 83% of the variance at best, with the median prediction being in the mid 60's. On the whole, the English criteria are somewhat better predicted than the CMI-related ones

(even though WDA and WE schools have little or no responsibility for teaching English per se) and the reading/writing criteria are somewhat better predicted than the speaking criteria. All in all, the results obtained are very encouraging insofar as their implications for the tractability of this research area via the rather parsimorious data collection and data analysis approaches that have been attempted thus far. More refined observational and measurement approaches should obtain even better results (Fishman 1980).

Intercorrelations Among Criteria

As Table II B reveals the four criteria that we will seek to account for in this paper show low to moderate correlations with each other. The negative correlations between improvement in CMI

TABLE II B

INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN CRITERIA*

	CMI Oral Fluency (C1)	Improv. in CMI Oral fl. (C2)	CMI Literacy (C7)	English Literacy (C8)
C1	-	-.45	.66	.17
C2		-	-.46	.10
C7			-	.18
C8				-

*All correlations are significant at the .05 level except for that between C2 and C8.

oral fluency(between school entrance and school graduation) and either the final level of CMI oralcy or the final level of CMI literacy is a reflection of the fact that such improvement is greatest for those who are initially least advarced with respect to CMI oralcy. More noteworthy is the fact that all three measures of CMI fluency -- oral or written -- correlate positively with English literacy. More about both of these tendencies later.

Predicting CMI Speaking Fluency

Two criteria of CMI oralcy among the pupils were queried: #1) fluercy of speech at the time of school graduation and #2) amount of improvement ir such fluency from the first to the last year of school attendarce. Tables III and IV indicate which predictiors were of independent incremental sigrificarce ir predicting these criteria ir all 124 schools studied.

TABLE III: SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS OF CMI FLUENCY AT TIME OF GRADUATION IN COMPLETE SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS (n=124)

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
1	V63	Common for students to converse in CMI	.49	.24
2	V92	Teachers read/write CMI well	.61	.37
3	-V67	Graduating students read well, write with some difficulty	.68	.46
4	V132	Parental improvement in CMI due to children's attendance	.71	.50

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
5	V110	Proportion of parents that converse daily in CMI	.72	.52
6	-V108	Proportion of parents not fluent in English	.73	.54
7	-V98	Proportion of teachers: native of native born parents	.75	.56
8	V99	Proportion of teachers native of mixed parentage	.76	.58
9*	-V42	Proportion of budget from public funds	.78	.61

*: No other variables met the .05 significance level for entry into the model.

-: A mirus sign indicates that this variable per se correlates negatively with the criterion.

The most predictive variables for the criterion of CMI oral fluency among graduates (Table III) are an interesting set, both in terms of what they do include and in terms of what they do not include. Other than for V67 they do not include direct references to program or school characteristics per se (although V132 and V42 may be considered indirect indicators of these two areas). Most noticeable of all are teacher and parental predictors. CMI oral fluency upon graduation seems to be facilitated by teachers whose CMI literacy is advanced and, on the other hand, it seems to be counteracted by teachers who are third generation (or beyond). Since first generation teacher status is not a predictor it would seem that second generation status

(as reflected by V99) may actually be optimal in terms of influencing student CMI fluency. As far as parental characteristics are concerned, non-fluency in English (V108) is actually contra-indicated whereas parental daily use of CMI (V110) or parental interest in improving their own CMI-use in conjunction with their children's school attendance (V132) are clearly crucial. Most telling of all --insofar as this criterion is concerned -- is a student variable, namely the extent to which students themselves customarily converse in CMI (V63). Although this may, to some extent, be a school-promoted variable, it is even more probably related to parent/home/community characteristics such as V110 (parental daily conversational use of CMI). As far as school factors are concerned, inability on the part of graduates to write CMI freely (V67) seems to be related to inability to speak freely; in other words, schools that stress passive textual skills may very well be ineffective in both active areas: speaking and writing. Finally (and ominously), schools who are recipients of public funds (e.g. Title VII) -- and these are well nigh exclusively AD schools serving non-English language background students -- may well have a negative impact on the CMI fluency of their students by the time the latter graduate (V42). All in all, the picture we get from the entire sample of schools is that CMI fluency among their graduates is only minimally a cause of school factors per se.

This issue can be more directly examined via the analysis reported in Table IV. This analysis deals with increases in the proportions of students fluent in CMI from the time they enter to the time they leave the school. This proportion cannot increase greatly

TABLE IV: SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS OF THE INCREASE IN PROPORTION OF STUDENTS SPEAKING CMI FLUENTLY (BETWEEN ENTRANCE AND GRADUATION) IN COMPLETE SCHOOL SAMPLE (n=124)

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
1	-V110	Proportion of parents that converse in CMI daily	.62	.39
2	V38	CMI used in language classes only	.71	.50
3	F2	"Exposure to participate in CMI conversation in and out of school"	.74	.55
4	V43	More time for CMI instruction expected in 1980	.76	.58
5	F4	"Teacher facility in Eng.:speak,read, write"	.77	.60
6	-V63	Common for students to converse in CMI	.79	.62
7	V40	Proportion of budget from parents community	.80	.64
8	-V33	CMI instruction for students who already know it	.81	.65
9	V18	Organizational sponsorship	.81	.66
10*	-V107	Proportion of parents that cannot speak English at all	.82	.68

*: No other variables met the .05 significance level for entry into the model

-: Indicates that the variable involved correlates negatively with the criterion

in schools that deal primarily with students who are already fluent (V63), coming from homes and neighborhoods in which adults are actively using the schools CMI (V110). However, school-stress on CMI use, particularly in language classes for that purpose (V38) and particularly for students that do not already know the CMI (V33), as well as via focus on school and out of school use of the language (F2) (and with a high level of motivation implied in planning to devote ever more time to CMI instruction in the near future (V43)), when undertaken by teachers who are themselves fully fluent in English (F4), and when implemented in schools that have tangible community support (V18,V40), does seem to produce results insofar as CMI fluency is concerned. Ethnic community language related schools are most obviously successful in increasing the CMI fluency of those who know least CMI from their homes (implied by V107) -- particularly where they are community/organizationally (rather than church or publicly) supported. The moot point in this connection is whether the community can also organize to maintain the school-acquired CMI facility of graduates once they leave the school behind and interact both with general American and in ethnic speech network. If schools themselves cannot be expected to impart CMI fluency/fluency increase then they certainly cannot be expected to be major forces in maintaining such fluency as has been acquired once the period of schooling has ended.

Predicting CMI Literacy (Reading/Writing)

Modern life requires literacy as well as oralcy. Thus it is highly appropriate to inquire as to what circumstances contribute to

the effectiveness of ethnic community language-related schools in this latter respect. As Table V reveals, our predictive capacity in this connection, although still adequate in the sense of accounting for more than half of the variance, is more modest than it was for oralcy This is a reflection of a lesser range of talent in this connection (that is there is less inter-student variation with respect to CMI literacy than with respect to CMI oralcy), perhaps because students do not arrive already literate in the CMI and the school itself cannot take them as far in literacy as it takes those who cannot speak the CMI vis-a-vis oralcy. If this is indeed the case it also implies that CMI literacy has less of a parent community/neighborhood functional base than does CMI oralcy.

TABLE V: SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS OF CMI READING WRITING AT TIME OF GRADUATION IN COMPLETE SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS (n=124)

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
1	V110	Proportion of parents that converse in CMI daily	.46	.21
2	-V98	Proportion of teachers: native of native born parents	.56	.31
3	V63	Common for students to converse in CMI	.62	.38
4	V80	Number of teachers of/in CMI	.65	.42
5	-V32	CMI taught only until English is sufficiently good	.68	.46
6	-V11	Religious sponsorship: Protestant	.70	.49
7	V18	Proportion of students: native of foreign parentage	.72	.52

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
8	V141	School sponsors classes to teach parents to speak CMI	.73	.54
9	V84	Proportion of teachers that speak CMI fluently	.75	.56
10*	V94	Proportion of teachers that read English poorly and cannot speak it	.75	.57

*: No other variables met the .05 significance level for entry into the model.

-: Indicates that the variable involved correlates negatively with the criterion.

The analysis reported in Table V conforms and refines several of the above assumptions. Schools under religious sponsorship (often only stressing "ritual literacy" vis-a-vis a restricted set of texts, many of these not even being in the CMI per se, but in an older ecclesiastic variety thereof) are negatively related to CMI literacy (V11). Where the CMI is taught only until English is sufficiently mastered (Title VII again!) CMI literacy is indifferently acquired, if at all (V32). All day schools with a high proportion of 3rd generation teachers are probably particularly implicated in this very respect (V98).

Nevertheless, there are a few positive factors even in connection with CMI literacy in ethnic community language related schools.

The variables of active student and parental CMI use (V63 and V110) come through again, as they did for oralcy. Once again, complete immigrant status or non-English speech at home seems to be contra-indicated, although some direct home link with the tradition does seem to be desirable (V48) Beyond the above, several teacher factors seem to be instrumental. Teachers also seem to require a personal link with the pre-immigrant past if they are to be able to cultivate CMI literacy (V98, V94). In addition, there is a need for a school environment in which several CMI teachers are present (V80) who speak CMI fluently (V84) and who sponsor classes for parents to acquire the CMI (V141).

Apparently, the acquisition of CMI literacy is a more difficult process than the acquisition or oralcy, particularly if literacy is defined as including both writing and non-ritualized reading. The begrudging involvement of Title VII in CMI oralcy is even less noticeable (or entirely absent) in connection with CMI literacy Many ethnic traditions themselves do not really stress (and some do not even value) CMI literacy. To the extent that CMI's are still active ingredients of ethnic community life it is the oral language in particular that most adults are familiar with, utilize and experience. Yet CMI literacy is almost necessarily an important school goal -- because of the unique nature of modern schooling per se and because, ultimately, lack of CMI literacy becomes a severe penalty insofar as language attitudes and language maintenance (in the context of the overpowering English environment) are concerned (Kloss 1966). For these reasons

we will examine CMI literacy in greater detail, first in non-AD schools and then in AD schools.

TABLE VI: SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS OF CMI READING/WRITING AT TIME OF GRADUATION IN WEEKDAY AFTERNOON/WEEKEND SCHOOLS (n=83)

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
1	V110	Proportion of parents that converse daily in CMI	.52	.27
2	-V112	Proportion of parents that converse daily in English	.61	.37
3	V33	CMI instruction for students who already know it	.66	.43
4	V26	Size of grad. class is within 10% of $\frac{1}{n}$ enrollment	.69	.47
5*	V134	Proportion of total hours devoted to CMI instruction	.71	.50

*: No other variables met the .05 significance level for entry into the model.

-: Indicates that the variable involved correlates negatively with the criterion.

CMI Literacy in the Non-Allday School

When we examine CMI literacy in the non-AD schools a small subset of predictors is involved. Together they account for exactly

half of the variance on this criterion. In this small subset of predictors we find again the parental variable V110 that has appeared in all analyses thus far (proportion of parents that converse daily in CMI). Apparently, without this foundation of parental CMI fluency as the basis of pupil CMI oralcy (V33) the acquisition of CMI literacy in the non-AD schools would be seriously handicapped Conversely, if the parents of the pupils are entirely anglified in speech (V112) the above foundation for CMI literacy is lacking. Programmatically, CMI literacy in non-AD schools is dependent on having available a goodly number of hours of instruction (V134) and an ability to keep students from dropping out of the program prematurely (V26).

CMI literacy in the Allday School

As Table VII reveals a very different set of predictors is involved with respect to CMI literacy in the AD schools. Receipt of public funds whether Title VII or not, requires or fosters emphases that are counter to those of CMI literacy. On the other hand, parental dedication and insistance insofar as the schools CMI program (V126) and an esprit de corps reflective of the "new ethnicity" (V74: renewed ethnic pride, sense of roots, unembarrassed interest in cultural pluralism) are necessary ideological/contextual features if AD schools are to overcome their internal complexes and ambivalences insofar as CMI literacy is concerned.

TABLE VII: SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS OF CMI READING/WRITING AT TIME OF GRADUATION IN ALLDAY SCHOOLS (n=41)

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
1	V126	If CMI instruction discontinued parents would send students elsewhere	.57	.32
2	-V38	CMI used in language classes only	.71	.51
3	-V30	School receives public funds	.77	.59
4*	V74	"Rebirth of ethnicity" has facilitated CMI mastery	.81	.65

*: No other variable met the .05 significance level for entry into the model.

-: Indicates that the variable involved correlates negatively with the criterion.

TABLE VIII: SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS OF ENGLISH READING/WRITING AT TIME OF GRADUATION IN ALLDAY SCHOOLS (n=41)

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
1	-V82	Proportion of teachers that cannot speak CMI	.42	.18
2	V109	Proportion of parents that speak English well	.57	.33
3	-V88	Proportion of teachers that cannot read write CMI	.63	.40

Order of Entry	Item or Factor #	Item or Factor	CR	CR^2
4	-V65	Proportion of students that read CMI haltingly and cannot write it	.73	.53
5	-V41	Proportion of budget from sponsoring organization	.76	.58
6	-V104	Proportion of parents who cannot speak CMI	.81	.65
7*	-V46	Proportion of parents that are native of native born	.84	.70

*: No other variable met the .05 significance level for entry into the model.

-: Indicates that the variable involved correlates negatively with the criterion.

A Brief Look at English Literacy in AD Schools

Although our concern in this paper is with CMI criteria, both with respect to oralcy and literacy, it is instructive in connection with that concern: to close on a note of the symbiosis that obtains between CMI literacy and English literacy. The only ethnic community language-related school in which both types of literacy might be pursued with genuine and substantial concern is the AD school. Thus it is in this type of school that the problem can be posed as to whether the pursuite of maximal literacy in two languages may be a contradictory, self-defeating goal. Table VIII strongly implies that such

is not the case. English literacy does not benefit from lower accomplishments insofar as CMI literacy is concerned (V65), it does not benefit from teacher deficiencies insofar as CMI literacy (V88) or CMI oralcy (V82) are concerned. On the other hand, it does benefit from outside (government,Church) funding from sources beyond those of the immediate constituency (V41) and it does benefit from greater parental English proficiency. All in all, therefore, the research implications vis-a-vis successful bilingual education outside of ethnic auspices are confirmed Biliteracy requires sustained attention to both languages in their literary guise (Cummins 1980) Any compromise with this position -- including any tendency to minimize CMI literacy -- inevitably backfires. English literacy itself is one of the major victims of lack of success relative to CMI literacy in an AD bilingual-bicultural setting insofar as non-English language background pupils are involved.

Some recurringly important variables and patterns

One of the surprising findings flowing from the above analyses is that a relatively few variables (or patterns of variables) keep recurring from one CMI criterion prediction effort to the next. Indeed, notwithstanding for our varied structural concerns (students, parents, teachers, programs,sponsorhip/funding) studied via the use of 143 predictor variables (subsequently, also composited into 10 factors), only a handful turn out to be predictively useful in conjunction with our criteria of CMI oralcy, increase in oralcy and

literacy. Furthermore, those few variables that turn up in this handful are themselves largely conceptually interrelated.

In the student area V63 (how commonly students converse with each other in CMI) reoccurs both for oracly and literacy with the implication that prior (pre-school) student facility is a factor in both and that oralcy is important not only in its own regret but as a necessary precursor of literacy as well. Factor 2 ("exposure to and participation in CMI conversation in and out of school") is also closely related to this area but touches upon both students and parents.

With respect to parent characteristics two related clusters of predictors appear. The first is the parental counterpart of what we have just commented upon among students (V110 and V104 proportion of parents who can and do converse daily in CMI). The second is its English parallel (V108, V109, V112) or the nativity counterpart thereof (V46, V48). Thus, once again, the characteristics that constituencies possess either limit or facilitate school goals in important (and frequently, in surprising -- ways)

In the teacher area there are again a few basic patterns. One such pertains to teacher facility in English or its counterpart: native of or mixed native parentage (V94, V98, V99 and F4). Another network of predictors pertains to teacher CMI oralcy and literacy (V82, V84, V88, V92). Here, too, as with the parental predictors of these two types, the relationships between these two networks of predictors is not always obvious on intuitive grounds.

Program characteristics that are frequently reoccuring as good predictors of CMI oralcy and literacy appear in one of three linkages.

The most common linkage is that which pertains to whether CMI is used transitionally only or in a maintenance manner (V32, V33) and, in either case, whether it is restricted to language classes alone or is used in teaching other subjects as well (V38). Another linkage patterr involves school achievement beyond the ordinary: devoting more time to CMI in the future (V43), improving parental CMI fluency via improving that of the pupils (V132), currently devoting many hours to CMI instruction (V134), and being part of a CMI-fostering communication network (F2).

Finally, when we examine the structural characteristics of CMI schools we note the recurring predictive role (vis-a-vis CMI oralcy and literacy) of church community or public sources of support and funding (V11, V18, V30, V40, V41, V42). Another network deals with moral issues such as felt (or claimed) impact of the rebirth of ethnicity (V74) The number of CMI teachers employed (V80) parental readiness to withdraw students if CMI instruction is not continued (V126), proferred permission for "outsiders" to visit the school (V141), and ability to hold on to students until they graduate (V26). Perhaps, all in all, this could be considered a "consciousness" or "alertness" re CMI factor.

SUMMARY

The differential ability of ethnic community language related schools to attain criteria of oral and literate fluency is substantially predictable from self-report data obtained from these schools. Initial

(pre-schooling) student, parental and teacher oralcy/literacy levels both with respect to the schools' CMI and with respect to English, whether or not CMI is merely transitionally taught and whether the schools are under local cultural-organizational sponsorship and funding are recurringly the most important predictors of school success, although esprit de corps variables are also of substantial importance. All in all, CMI literacy or oralcy and English literacy are not negative related to each other and, indeed, when both are carefully pursued and earnestly supported both seem to prosper accordingly.

REFERENCES

Cummins, Jim. The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. TESOL Quarterly, 1980, 14, 175-188.

Fishman, Joshua A. Ethnocultural dimensions in the acquisition and retention of biliteracy. (In press: 1980)

Kloss, Heinz. German-American language maintenance efforts in J.A. Fishman et al. Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague, Mouton, 1966.

Markman, Barbara and Joshua A. Fishman. Why do some ethnic mother-tongue-schools accomplish more than others? in Joshua A. Fishman and Barbara Markman. The Ethnic Mother-Tongue-School in America: Assumptions, Findings and a Directory. New York, Yeshiva University (Final Report under NIE Grant G-78-0133 (Project No. 8-0860), 1979.

FOOTNOTES

* The analyses reported in this paper were conducted and the paper itself written thanks to a grant from the Office of Education's International Studies Branch entitled "Language Resources of the United States Revisited". (Grant No. 300-79-01816).

[1] The total universe of ethnic community non-English language related schools includes some 6,000 to 7,000 schools. However, not only was the entire universe still unknown to us when our sample was selected and our data obtained, but "centrally scheduled" schools (i.e. schools listed in national directories of major religious bodies such as Greek Orthodox, Jewish, Old Order Amish and Mennonite, etc.) were purposely undersampled so as not to skew our results unduly in their direction. As a result, we operated upon a universe of 1140 schools and obtained our data from roughly 10% of them. In subsequent research on ethnic community non-English language related schools our sample of "centrally scheduled" schools has regularly been increased to correspond to increases in the number of the "unscheduled" schools we have succeeded in locating for additional characteristics of this sample of schools (regional, ethnic, etc.) see Markman and Fishman 1979.