

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 929

FL 018 902

AUTHOR Cazden, Courtney B.; And Others
 TITLE Language Planning in Preschool Education with "Annotated Bibliography."
 SPONS AGENCY International Development Research Centre, Ottawa (Ontario).
 PUB DATE Apr 90
 NOTE 94p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of Applied Linguistics sponsored by the International Association of Applied Linguistics (9th, Thessaloniki, Greece, April 15-21, 1990).
 PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; Bilingual Education Programs; Caregivers; Case Studies; Child Language; *Educational Environment; Foreign Countries; Indigenous Populations; Irish; *Language Acquisition; Language Maintenance; *Language Planning; Language Proficiency; *Language Role; Literacy Education; *Multilingualism; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Program Descriptions; Quechua; Sociolinguistics; Spanish; Transitional Programs; Uncommonly Taught Languages

IDENTIFIERS Maori (Language); New Zealand; Peru; Scotland

ABSTRACT

A discussion of language in preschool education reviews research findings on children's language acquisition and its relationship to their general development and examines issues to be considered in making decisions for each community and program. The first section summarizes basic knowledge about preschool language development, facilitating language development at this stage, and the specific language problems faced by multilingual preschool children at home and in group care. The second section looks more closely at the sociolinguistic dimensions affecting language choice and proficiency. In the next section, three preschool program descriptions are given, each involving a situation in which a higher-status national language coexists with an indigenous language. They include a Spanish-Quechua/Aymara transitional bilingual program (Peru), a Gaelic maintenance program in Scotland's Western Isles, and a Maori revitalization program (New Zealand). The fourth section discusses practical aspects of planning for language learning and emergent literacy in preschool environments, including group size and organization, adult-child relationships, choice of language, instructional materials, staffing and staff training, adult and community participation, and administration. A brief "conclusion" and a list of almost 100 references conclude this part of the document. A special feature of the "annotated bibliography" which follows is that the annotations are written around themes (countries/communities and language use at the preschool level) and are similar in nature to essay reviews. Entries are listed alphabetically by country and information is provided under the following headings: document source; community (including language situation); educational system specifics; program (including characteristics/components); and comments. (MSE)

LANGUAGE PLANNING IN PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

with

"ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Cazden

**COURTNEY B. CAZDEN
CATHERINE E. SNOW
CORNELIA HEISE-BAIGORRIA**

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

**HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS (USA)**

**This document was prepared with support from the International Development Research Centre, Ottawa,
Canada for the Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, UNICEF (New York).
July, 1990.**

LANGUAGE PLANNING IN PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

with

'ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY'

**COURTNEY B. CAZDEN
CATHERINE E. SNOW
CORNELIA HEISE-BAIGORRIA**

**HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS (USA)**

**This document was prepared with support from the International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada for the Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, UNICEF (New York).
July, 1990.**

LANGUAGE PLANNING IN PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	Pg. 1
Language Development in the Preschool Years	Pg. 3
Language Development of Preschool Children	
Facilitating Preschool Children's Language Development	
Multilingual Preschool Children at Home and in Group Care	
Sociolinguistic Dimensions Affecting Language Choice and Proficiency	Pg. 12
Three Case Studies	Pg. 19
Peru: A Spanish-Quechua/Aymara Transitional Bilingual Program	
Western Isles, Scotland: A Gaelic Maintenance Program	
New Zealand: A Maori Revitalization Program	
Planning Preschool Environments	Pg. 34
Planning for Language Learning	
Planning for Emergent Literacy	
The Preschool Staff	
The Administrative Context	
Conclusion	Pg. 48
References	
Annotated Bibliography (By Country)	

INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights includes no mention of language rights. One attempt to formulate such a statement is UNESCO's report on the use of vernacular languages in education (1953). That report asserted the right of all children to be educated in their native tongue. Now, nearly 40 years later, controversy continues over the practical difficulties of implementing that right, and even over whether there can be a single "language right" for all situations. (See Ch. 11 on "Vernacular language education" in Fasold, 1984, for review of discussions of these issues since 1953.)

The practical difficulties of vernacular education are obvious. To name just three: inadequate materials in many language communities whose financial resources are stretched too thin as it is; the social need for a lingua franca shared among speakers of different vernaculars in a multilingual country; and the need for students to switch at some point in their educational career to a language of wider communication in order not to be cut off from the world-wide heritage of knowledge.

Questions about the wisdom of the UNESCO policy, even where it can be implemented, arise from conditions of current and past oppression. Among minority communities of guestworkers in Europe, schooling in the vernacular reinforces their segregation and "prepare[s] the migrant pupils for forced repatriation when their parents' labour is no longer needed" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988, pp. 23,26). In South Africa, the Bantu Education Act of the 1950's is the linguistic expression of apartheid, placing barriers between majority Black students and the English-speaking world and also barriers among Black speakers of different Bantu languages.

Moreover, in communities where indigenous languages are dying because of past oppressive policies, the UNESCO policy ignores attempts--as by the Maori in New Zealand, and Native American and Canadian communities--to create immersion education in the group's heritage language for the purpose of revitalizing it.

Taking such linguistic, cultural and political complexities into account, Spolsky (1986) has reformulated "a responsible and feasible language education policy." He asserts two principles: the first concerning the rights of individuals to equality of educational opportunity; the second concerning the rights of groups to maintain their own linguistic heritage. Spolsky discusses each of these principles in turn:

Equality of educational opportunity has two complementary parts to it. The first is the right, whenever feasible, to be educated in the variety of language one learned at home, or at a basic minimum when this is not feasible, to be educated in a school that shows full respect for that variety and its strengths and potentials....The second is the right to learn in the best way feasible the standard or official language or languages of wider communication selected for the society as a whole....

The second major principle recognizes the right of the individual or the group to do whatever is possible to preserve or strengthen varieties of language that have important ethnic, traditional, cultural, or religious values for them (p. 189).

As Spolsky says in conclusion, "These two straightforward principles, because of the complexity of situations in which they apply and because of the complexity of factors that come to affect them, can lead in actual fact to a large number of actual policies." (p. 190)

This paper focuses on language in preschool education, and Spolsky's principles seem a wise guide there as in educational policy for the primary and secondary schools. In considering the issues which these principles raise for young children, we do not attempt any specific recommendations about which language should be used in any specific situation. We offer instead a discussion of research findings on young children's language acquisition and its relationship to their general development, and a discussion of issues to be considered in making the necessary decisions in each community and program.

We use the term 'language planning' to refer to all these decisions: not only those at the national level (where the term is more conventionally used) but at the community and program level too; and not only decisions about which language but also decisions to be made in planning the preschool environment to give maximum support to children's learning and development in whatever language is in use.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN THE PRESCHOOL YEARS

The preschool years see rapid and dramatic developments in many aspects of children's abilities, none perhaps more striking than in the areas of language and cognition. Children of 18 months express their thoughts in gestures or single-word utterances, but by 6 years they can express themselves in long and complex sentences; 18 month olds rely on an expressive vocabulary of only a few dozen words, but 6 year olds control several thousand; 18 month olds use language primarily to request things of adults and to discuss the here-and-now, whereas 6 year olds use it for a wide variety of purposes and topics, including humor, deception, fantasy, explaining, hypothesizing, and narrating. These developments in control of the language system parallel and rely upon equally astounding developments in the domain of cognition--the abilities to plan, to remember, to categorize taxonomically, to learn intentionally, to take a variety of perspectives, to understand complex and abstract phenomena, to analyze problems and to solve them, all develop rapidly during the preschool period.

Increasingly throughout the world the social contexts for the cognitive and language developments of the preschool years include group-care settings. In some settings preschool group care is conceived of primarily as an alternative to home care, and as directed primarily to concerns about protecting health, promoting nutrition, and providing enjoyable experiences to the children served. In others preschool group care is designed to serve primarily social needs--providing opportunities for children to develop interpersonal skills and to become members of a peer group. In still others, group care is seen literally as 'pre-school', i.e., as a setting in which the activities can be conceived of as a 'curriculum' and designed to promote cognitive development, language, and early literacy skills.

A world-wide perspective on language planning for preschool education must also reflect the fact that a majority of those children are living in multilingual societies, and the children themselves either are or are expected to become bi- or multi-lingual. Some children are first confronted with the need to learn a new language during their initial exposure to formal education--but in many cases this happens even earlier, during preschool in group care settings. Central questions for educators about language development include: a) what does normal language development look like? b) how do we know which children are showing slow or deviant development and may need special help? c) does bilingualism slow down language development? d) how do we design environments to ensure optimal language development? e) how does language development relate to literacy?

One goal of this paper is to illuminate the nature of practices designed to provide language experience and teaching to preschool aged children. Our focus will be especially on preschool aged children in non-mother tongue care settings. In the first section of the paper, as a background, we will briefly review what is known about language development and factors influencing it in preschool children. The second section will review the sociolinguistic dimensions of relevance to understanding the role of language in preschool education programs, and will present three case studies that illustrate quite different situations in which choices about language for preschool care have been made. The third section of the paper will consist of discussion of issues that arise when considering language-oriented preschool education. The final section presents an annotated bibliography of materials related to other-language preschool programs.

Language Development of Preschool Children

We are using the term 'preschool children' in this document to include children older than two (i.e., those for whom group care settings are common). The upper end of the 'preschool' age range is difficult to establish, since formal schooling starts in some countries as early as 4 years and in others as late as 7, 8, or even 9. However, we will focus in this discussion on the years 2 through 5. In considering issues and programs, in later sections of this paper, we include programs designed for older children if they are not part of the local formal 'public' educational system.

What can children reasonably be expected to learn about language during the years 2 to 5? Our descriptions of language acquisition are based primarily on work done with English-speaking middle class children, though descriptions of children learning other languages in diverse cultural settings are becoming increasingly available. First and most obviously, children learn words--estimates for the size of a 6 year old's vocabulary range from 8000 to 12000 words. The lower figure works out to 3.6 words a day or over 25 a week! Of course, many of these words are acquired along with new concepts as well. In these cases, it probably takes several exposures to the word in information-rich contexts (e.g., a word like 'harvest' might be learned from repeated discussions of 'the grain harvest,' 'harvesting the crops,' 'after the harvest,' etc.). However, if children already know something about a particular semantic domain (e.g., already know several color terms, or several different animal names), they can learn the meaning of a new word in that domain from hearing it used (in a way that is understandable) only once or twice.

In addition to words, of course, children by the age of five learn an enormous amount of detail about the language in their environment. Much of this detail has to do with form--which prefixes or suffixes or little function words express particular meanings (see the papers in Slobin, 1985, for more information about cross-language differences). But an enormous amount of it has to do with meaning itself. Each language selects, from the large set of possibilities available, a subset of semantic dimensions as linguistically important. In English, for example, the dimension singular vs. plural has been selected as one that needs to be marked linguistically in every single reference to physical objects. One can say *I saw a house* or *I saw (some) houses*; but English speakers do not have the option (as do speakers of Chinese, for example) to say simply 'I saw house' and leave unspecified the question of how many. Speakers of Marshallese (the language of the Marshall Islands in Micronesia) must attend to number considerably more carefully than English speakers; they mark the distinctions among a single, two, three, or more than three objects. English speakers are also obliged to place events in the present, past, or future linguistically, and to mark whether the event referred to is finished or ongoing; thus, for example, *I ate dinner* is marked for both past tense and completion, whereas *I was eating dinner* is marked for past tense and incomplete, ongoing action. These distinctions of tense and of aspect are by no means universal in the world's languages. Hebrew, for example, has tense but no aspect; Tok Pisin, spoken in Papua New Guinea, has aspect but no tense; and Chinese has neither. Some languages select quite different aspects of meaning to mark linguistically: in Turkish, for example, a verb must be marked to indicate whether the event was actually witnessed by the speaker or is reported based on indirect knowledge; in Navajo verb markings reflect the relative degree of activity and intelligence of their subjects and objects (whether human, animate non-human, mobile non-animate, etc.); in Hebrew, verbs must be marked for the

gender of their subjects; in Japanese, verbs are marked for degree of respect the speaker owes the listener. Learning any language involves becoming sensitized to the aspects of the world that language has identified as important to the linguistic system, and then learning how the linguistic system works to mark those dimensions.

Thus, during their preschool years children learn how to use at least some parts of the morphological systems of their language to express semantic distinctions (e.g., the difference between **magnet** and **magnets**; the difference between **jump**, **jumping**, and **jumped**). They also can learn to control morphological distinctions that are not semantically motivated, such as gender in German, French or Hebrew, or noun class in Russian. Especially in languages more morphologically rich than English, such learning requires hearing and analyzing many individual instances to see the underlying patterns. English-speaking children display their discovery of those underlying patterns when they make errors with irregular forms, e.g., **foots** for **feet**, or **bringed** for **brought**. Such errors are common in any language that shows exceptions to its morphological rules or more frequent and less frequent morphological patterns--as every language except Esperanto does. Thus, Spanish speaking children early learn that feminine words typically end in **-a** and masculine words in **-o**, so they regularize exceptions (producing **la flora** for **la flor**, and **el mano** for **la mano**), and Hebrew-speaking children note very early that many present tense verbs start with **m-** prefixes (**mi**, **me**, or **ma**), and incorrectly use this prefix as a present tense marker with groups of verbs where present and past tense are actually the same form (e.g., **mesim** instead of **sam**, or **mirademet** instead of **nirdemet**). The crucial thing to note about these errors is that they are, in fact, indicators of progress in language acquisition; thus, while it is considered nonstandard if an adult English speaker says **brang** for **bring**, such a form would be an indicator of linguistic sophistication and thoughtful analysis in a five year old.

Whether or not five year olds have fully mastered the morphological system of their language has to do in part with the internal complexity of that system. Plural is relatively easy in English, and few mistakes are made after about three. In Arabic, the formal marking of plural is much more complex (though the idea is, of course, perfectly simple), and children still make mistakes until 10 or 12. There are five classes of nouns and seven cases in Russian, with a complex system of noun endings many of which are ambiguous. Russian children still make errors with this complex noun morphology through the early school years; the same basic system of case and noun classes is much more regular in Polish, and children learn it much earlier. German, French, Hebrew and Spanish speaking children typically are not making mistakes with gender any more by about age five, but Polish children still have problems with the virile/nonvirile distinction, which is marked only on plural nouns.

Children also learn about word order by age five. English speaking children are producing utterances like **Can I take it off and put it on?**, in which the subject and verb have switched places, and like **I don't want any cheese** in which the negative is correctly marked. They are typically able to understand passive sentences like **The boy was kissed by the girl**, which confuse younger children. And they are generally able to produce sentences that have adult-like word order. Turkish children typically put objects first and verbs last, like Turkish adults, whereas French children put subjects first and objects last, like French adults. Some sentence constructions may still offer trouble, e.g., embedded questions (**I wonder why did the teacher stay home today** instead of **I wonder why the teacher stayed home today**) for

English speakers. Embedded relatives (sentences like **The girl who the boy kissed kicked me**) are not typically produced, and are often still misunderstood by English speaking children, and most relative clauses still cause problems for Turkish children under five. Thus, most languages have a few areas of difficulty that are not fully controlled by the school-aged children, but the basic syntactic system is typically largely acquired by about age five.

An obvious difference between the speech of a two year old and that of a five year old is in pronunciation. Two year olds often make phonological simplifications (**goggie** for **doggie**, **ehpane** for **airplane**) and often find substitutes for difficult sounds or sound combinations (**waywo** for **yellow**, **peam** for **cream**). Most five year olds have achieved generally adult-like pronunciation. In addition, five year olds have often started to think about words as sounds, no longer totally focused on their role as referential and communicative symbols. Thus, five year olds typically can engage in word play or games that reveal their understanding of rhyme, of concepts like 'the first sound' in a word, and even of ambiguity (one word with two meanings). Five year olds who know the names or the sound values of the letters in their alphabet will often produce spontaneous spellings that reveal their analysis of the sound structure of words.

There are many additional areas in which five year olds are not finished with language learning. First, of course, they must triple their word-learning rate if they are to achieve adult-like vocabularies of 70,000+ words by the age of 20. Second, their control over the means for talking about complex topics (politics, agriculture, literature) will develop along with the cognitive capacity to consider such complexities. Third, their control over the means for expressing relations across utterances will grow, so that they will be able to make explicit the logical relations between propositions (using words like **however**, **nonetheless**, **although**, etc.), the temporal relations between events in narratives (five year olds typically use only **and then**), the causal relations between events in the physical and the psychological world (**because**, **as a result**, **in spite of**, **consequently**, etc.), and so on. Fourth, their control over nonliteral uses of language (irony, metaphor, sarcasm), over sociolinguistically complex uses of language (condolence-talk, ritualized speech-making, jokes, issuing and declining invitations, arguing a legal case, praying, etc.), over the nuances of register variation (how to talk to a social superior, a social inferior, a priest, a teacher, etc.), over politeness dimensions, and many other matters has only begun to develop at age five. Finally, of course, the analysis of oral language forms necessary to understand how they are mapped in the local orthography, and how they are changed in the special registers most frequently encountered in literacy, is typically just beginning for the five year old.

Facilitating preschool children's language development

Most of the research that has been done on how the environment facilitates language development relates to the early period (1 to 3 year olds), and to children's interactions with their mothers at home, not to group care settings. For young children, one facilitative style of interaction is highly responsive, a style in which the adult lets the child decide what to talk about, expands on that topic, works hard to figure out what the child means, suggests new activities only when the child is not actively engaged in other activities, and worries more about what the child wants to say than about whether it is being said correctly. This picture shows an optimal language teacher who assumes the role of cooperative

conversational partner, rather than an explicitly didactic or directive role. The studies on which this picture is based have mostly been carried out in middle class, English speaking families, a cultural group within which responsive, nondirective, child-centered parenting is considered desirable, children and adults have relatively equal social status, and children are expected from a very early age to function as conversational partners (Cazden, 1988; Snow, 1989).

In other cultures, the rules governing parent-child interaction and parental roles are quite different. In Samoa, for example, social status is closely connected to age, and the idea of engaging a child in a conversation as a social equal would seem unnatural. Among the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea, it is considered better to induce children to talk like adults about adult matters than to 'descend to their level' in talking to them. In these cultures, we would not expect the responsive style of talk that facilitates language acquisition for American children to work well; even if parents were willing to engage in it, they would produce children who were poorly adapted to the larger society in which they are growing up. In these cultures, though, future research will no doubt confirm that there are better and worse language environments for young children; the better ones just have different interactive features from those in England or North America.

Furthermore, even for middle class English-speaking families, it is not clear that the strategy of always responding to the child's conversational topic remains optimal for language development throughout the later preschool years. In their first few years, children's mastery of the core of the language system depends on their finding connections between newly developing semantic notions and linguistic procedures for expressing those notions. Thus, language is most useful to them if it is presented embedded in and related to their own activities and attempts at expression. As they get older, though, children can use language to learn language--they no longer need to encounter every new language form embedded in a meaningful context that is provided nonlinguistically. Furthermore, they become increasingly capable of learning intentionally, of attending to and benefitting from explicit instruction, and of using models as a source of learning. At this stage, simply responding to the child's interests might not optimally stimulate language development any more: talking about a wide variety of complex topics, modelling an enriched vocabulary, engaging in talk about talk itself, discussing word meanings, challenging children to explain themselves and to justify their own thinking, setting higher standards for comprehensibility, and explicitly correcting errors may come to function as facilitative factors in language development as children turn 4 or 5 or 6. Children in this age range are also expected to control certain language-related literacy skills that probably emerge from being read to, from experience in looking at books with adults, and from experience with letters, with pencils and paper, and with observation of adult literacy activities; such skills are fostered when parents manage the environment so as to provide and encourage the use of literacy artifacts.

In group care settings, one study has shown that the quality of the language environment of the day care center has a large impact on the language development of the children enrolled (McCartney, 1984). The study was carried out in Bermuda, where over 80% of children of all social classes are in day care by age two. Quality in this study was defined in different ways: a) as ratings on the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, which reflects quality of personal care, furnishings, language/reasoning activities, fine/gross motor activities, creative activities, social development, and adult facilities; and b) as amount of talk from

caregivers to children, and the proportion of that talk that was controlling or directive vs. expressive and representational. While overall quality as reflected in the rating scale was related to measures of the children's language and cognitive development, the amount of expressive verbal interaction with caregivers had a specific effect on the children's language development. Particularly interesting was the finding that children's language level was related to their opportunities to initiate conversations with caregivers, and negatively related to number of conversations initiated with peers. These findings suggest, not surprisingly, that many of the characteristics of the stimulating, enriching group care center are very like those of the optimal home environment--opportunities to talk one-on-one with an interested and responsive adult. In addition, though, children with experience in group care settings have been shown to be better at certain uses of language than children who spend most of their time with adults: learning the rules for playing, conversing, negotiating, and arguing with peers is easier in preschool than at home.

Another important point to derive from this study of day care quality was the effect of quality on cognitive as well as linguistic development. During the preschool years, language and cognition are very closely related. Stimulating children's language involves enriching their vocabulary, their understanding of how things work, their knowledge about numbers, about weather, about how things grow, about how people live in other parts of the world, and dozens more such topics. Furthermore, preschool programs that wish to prepare children for schools in which reading and writing are central activities need to plan ways to stimulate the development of preliteracy skills. Though three year olds don't need to start learning how to read formally, they can learn a great deal about letters and the sounds they stand for, about how to write important words like their own names, about the many purposes writing is used for, about books and the stories in them from the activities planned in their preschools. Children who start formal reading instruction with this kind of background have a head start over children with little exposure to either the forms or the uses of literacy.

Multilingual preschool children at home and in group care

Native bilinguals. There are many reasons why a preschooler might already be or need to become bilingual. Some children grow up in homes where two or more languages are used; they might be called 'native bilinguals'. Studies of the language development of such children (e.g., Fantini, 1985; Saunders, 1988; Taeschner, 1983) suggest that they look much like monolingual children. They manage to learn two language systems in about the same time and to about the same degree of skill as monolingual children take to learn one. Of course, if such children stop hearing or using one of their languages, they typically also lose it quite quickly.

Submersion settings. Very often children have to become bilingual at the time when they enter group care settings. For example, immigrant families' children may be almost entirely monolingual until they enter a day care or nursery school, where they have to learn the societal language. Group care is, in fact, utilized as a procedure for speeding assimilation of nonnative children in Sweden, where children of immigrant families have priority for places in government subsidized day care centers (Test, 1988). Such settings are called 'submersion' settings for second language learning, since the learners are submerged in a situation where their first language is not used at all--often there is no one in that situation

who can even understand it.

Studies of such children have been carried out in American preschools serving university communities with many foreign graduate students. Tabors (1987), for example, studied a preschool where half the children spoke no English on entry. Since all the foreign children had different language backgrounds, they all had to learn English in order to forge any social relationships at all, and of course to be able to talk to the teachers and understand the activities going on in the classroom. Meyer (1989) studied a similar preschool, but a classroom in which four Korean children arrived at the same time and thus could band together for social activity, and help each other negotiate the complexities of communication with the English speaking teachers and children. The children in this second setting probably learned English somewhat slower--but perhaps also with less trauma, since they did not experience an initial period of total isolation and communicative ineffectiveness, as Tabors' subjects did.

It is a common belief that children like those studied by Tabors and by Meyer will learn their new language quickly and easily, benefitting from the child's ability to 'just pick languages up'. Some have argued that this ability relates to a critical period for language acquisition, in which the brain is still more flexible and capable of new learning than is the older child's or adult's. In fact, a normally developing preschool child can take quite a long time to learn a second language. It is not uncommon for such children to start out refusing to speak at all, for a period of weeks or even months. They are, of course, learning a great deal during this silent period, starting to pick up words, phrases, sounds, and meanings; but they are also failing to understand a good deal of what is being said around them. It is hard to assess exactly how much preschoolers understand of the language they hear, since they can look like they understand just by attending to other children's activities and joining in. Do they respond to the teacher saying 'Time to go outside to play now' or to the other children putting on their coats? Do they understand the teacher saying 'Choose between the water table, the sticker table, and the easels', or do they simply assess the options visually and go to the preferred activity? Evidence that the children didn't understand very much English during their first year or more in an American preschool classroom abounds in Tabors' and in Meyer's reports, though the children were very clever in coming to understand the structure of the classroom, the daily schedule, and what was expected of them. No doubt these nonverbal understandings helped them ultimately learn the language that went with these activities.

Children's emergence in Tabors' study as more competent English speakers was marked by their increasing ability to enter into more language-mediated activities. Thus, even the four year old foreign children were pretty much limited to the sand box, the water table, and solitary art or manipulative play activities, until they could talk at least a little English. They couldn't insert themselves into the most desired activities--fantasy play in the house corner, dress-up, and so on--until they could speak quite a lot of English, since those activities were highly dependent on language and were controlled by the English-competent children.

The teachers in the preschool classroom studied by Tabors offered some insights into the difficulties the non-English speaking children faced in their second language environment. They reported organizing their classroom in some ways more like a toddler classroom--one for children a year to two younger than those actually involved. These adaptations included

planning activities and selecting books that were relatively simple, less dependent on language, more predictable, and thus a better environment for beginning to learn English.

Sometimes children living in largely monolingual societies like the U.S. come to reject the use of a different familial language, refusing to speak it in public, or at all. Parents who continue to use the family language at home but without forcing their children to speak it can maintain the children's comprehension ability at least. Moving back home, or even visiting for just a month or two in an environment where the other language is used widely, typically enables the child to catch up quickly in production. But the issue of maintaining two languages is not a negligible one for young children, for whom loss can occur much more quickly than acquisition.

Immersion settings. Second languages can also be acquired by preschool aged children in immersion settings. The term 'immersion' derives from an innovative way of teaching second languages first used in Quebec to teach French to English speakers. In immersion programs for school-aged children, a class of same-language children receive their teaching from a native speaker of the target language, entirely in the target language. Thus, the curricular language is one the children do not know at all (to begin with), but an entire group of children who can talk to one another face this experience together, their teacher can understand and respond to the children's language (though teacher talk is all in the second language), and the nature of the teacher's talk is designed to be adapted to the needs and capacities of the children.

Immersion programs are sometimes used with preschool aged children in precisely this way in order to start the children out early in the second language. For example, the Ecole Bilingue, a French-English bilingual school in Arlington, Massachusetts, has a full day program for 3 and 4 year old English speakers to introduce them to French so that they can enter the bilingual kindergarten with some oral/aural facility in their second language. As an independent school with a largely middle class group of students, the Ecole Bilingue constitutes a classic example of 'elite bilingualism'--elective bilingualism achieved by relatively privileged groups through education. While the success of the second language learning in these cases can be somewhat variable, the high status of the children's first language ensures that it will not be lost as the second language is acquired. Another example of the use of immersion with preschool aged children, one which is not an elite program, is presented in our case study of the Maori in New Zealand, below.

Programs which may seem very like those designed for the Maori or the children at the Ecole Bilingue, except that they serve a less privileged segment of society, include preschool programs in neighborhoods full of language minorities. Spanish-speaking parents in New Haven, Connecticut and Turkish speakers in West Germany send their children to preschool programs conducted in English or German, languages the children first acquire in those group settings. Such groups are actually experiencing something closer to submersion than immersion, though, for a number of reasons. First, their second language environment has not been planned as a pedagogical environment to be responsive to their communicative and language-learning needs in the same way that immersion environments are planned. Secondly, acquiring the second language for these children is not a privilege, as for the Ecole Bilingue children, but a necessity if they are to function in their new surroundings. The low status of Spanish speakers in the U.S. and of Turkish speakers in Germany means,

furthermore, that the children are very likely to stop learning their native languages as they acquire the societal language in these group care settings.

Bilingual preschools. Bilingual programs are those in which two languages are used by the teaching staff. Although children may enter speaking only one language, they in principle emerge competent in both. Bilingual programs have been used in a wide variety of settings with different purposes: to ease the children's transition into the school language (transitional programs), to maintain development of the home language while fostering acquisition of the school language (maintenance programs), and to enable two groups of children to both become bilingual (two-way programs). Preschool programs that are explicitly bilingual are not common. The University of Lowell, Massachusetts is initiating a program in 1990 which will provide transitional bilingual classrooms for Cambodian and Hispanic 3-5 year olds; an innovative aspect of this program is that these children will be in classrooms with each other and with English speakers. The non-English speaking children will spend part of each day receiving instruction in their native language and help with English, while the English speakers receive a culture-language enrichment program. All three groups of children will spend increasing amounts of time together as the Cambodian and Spanish speakers learn more English; thus the native English speakers can help the other children learn English while being exposed themselves to a rich multicultural educational environment.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC DIMENSIONS AFFECTING LANGUAGE CHOICE AND PROFICIENCY

Language acquisition always occurs within a sociolinguistic context--a context of language history, language use, and language planning. In stable, developed, largely monolingual societies, these sociolinguistic forces may be relatively transparent, but in multilingual societies and in societies where language change is occurring they become quite salient. Decisions about language in educational settings cannot ignore the broader social context in which the educational program, the family, and the child learner operate. In this section, we outline a number of sociolinguistic dimensions which may be relevant to the success or failure of specific educational policies with regard to language. The ways in which these sociolinguistic factors operate will be different in every specific situation--we discuss them here simply to bring them to the attention of those making decisions about language policy in preschool, since they are almost sure to be relevant. These dimensions can be divided into those relevant to a) the language itself, b) the group that speaks it, or c) the language education program. In the next section, we present three case studies that represent quite distinct and contrasting situations in terms of these sociolinguistic dimensions.

Language status: official or unofficial. More of the countries of the world are multilingual than are monolingual. Multilingual societies typically make decisions about which of the languages spoken by their citizens are 'official'--i.e., which language or languages will be used for governmental functions, on radio and television, and in the schools. Sometimes, the selection of a language or languages as official reflects an attempt to downgrade other indigenous languages; in other cases this selection is a matter of convenience, designed to facilitate nation-wide functioning, and under the assumption that everyone will continue to use indigenous languages in addition to the official language.

The impact of the status of a language as official or not on its role in preschool education can be enormous. First, official languages are likely to be used in later, formal schooling, and good control over them can provide access to better jobs and higher education. Thus, they have higher status, and seem worthy of more investment. Educational programs in unofficial languages may suffer from the absence of an agreed upon writing system, the absence of a variety of books or educational materials, and the absence of support from the educational establishment. On the other hand, educational programs in the official language may suffer from the unavailability of fluent native speakers, from a history of reliance on rote-learning methods, and from a paucity of interesting materials that are relevant to the local life.

Robust vs. dying language. A number of the interesting cases in which specific preschool language programs have been developed include cases where a traditional language is dying. Languages die when their speakers grow old without having passed the language on to their children. Language revitalization (see the Maori case discussed below) involves an effort to maintain a language by passing it on, not from parents to children, but from elders (the only large remaining group of native speakers) to young children. Language revitalization becomes necessary in a society where one of the languages in use has come to dominate the other(s). English in New Zealand shares the advantages of English in North America, in

Scotland and Ireland, and elsewhere in the world; it is an international language, it gives access to participation in the international economy, it is crucial in New Zealand for participation in government and higher education, it has been the language of schooling there, and it has a long history of literate use. Situations of bilingualism in which one of the languages has a wider array of uses, a perceived higher status, a closer connection to the institutions of government and of education, and a larger number of monolingual speakers may well lead to death for the other language. Educational programs designed to counteract language disappearance are revitalization programs if a generation of learners has already been skipped, as in New Zealand, or maintenance programs if introduced earlier in the cycle (see case study of the Western Isles presented below).

Written language or not. Written languages are more likely to 'win out' over traditionally nonliterate languages, both for general use in modern societies and in particular for use in schooling. Much of schooling is about literacy, and it has often been seen as impossible to conduct lessons in languages which did not have an official script. For example, the introduction of Papiamentu as a curricular language in Curaçao and Aruba was postponed for years while the issue of how to spell it was thrashed out--though newspapers, novels, and poetry had been written in Papiamentu and read widely since the 1800's, the unavailability of an agreed upon spelling system blocked the production of schoolbooks in the language. An advantage colonial languages have over vernaculars for use in school is their long history of being written, and of being used to convey scholarly material.

Although it might seem that the absence of a writing system should not be a serious issue in selecting a language for preschool, it can have important implications. One of the activities in preschools that prepare children for success in formal schooling is exposure to books and practice in using the local writing system (see above); the absence or paucity of materials available in a traditionally unwritten language may cause problems. Adults may not find an unwritten language appropriate for use in a setting that has any connection to school. Adults who speak the local language well may still not be used to reading or writing in it, and be unable to introduce these activities easily to preschoolers.

Degree of separateness from/mutual intelligibility with other languages. An issue affecting the viability of a local language is its relation to other languages spoken in the same area. The question of what constitutes a separate language and what constitutes a dialect is a very difficult one, with more political than linguistic determinants. Some language varieties referred to as dialects are not, in fact, mutually intelligible--e.g., the various, extremely divergent Chinese dialects, which become mutually intelligible only in their shared written form. Other varieties which for political or social reasons are defended as quite separate languages are, in fact, fairly similar and generally mutually intelligible, such as Norwegian and Swedish. The Chinese dialects remain separate and viable precisely because the lack of mutual intelligibility prevents the merging of populations at the dialect boundaries; Norwegian and Swedish, on the other hand, remain separate primarily because of the political and educational boundaries between them. The degree of similarity of the local language to the national, official, or written language must be considered in deciding on materials, on teachers, and on the variety to be used in the classroom.

Another issue related to the degree of variability within a minority language is whether the speakers of that language can effectively work together for political, social, educational, or

economic ends. In Peru, for example, the major differences among the varieties of Quechua spoken have been one factor in hindering the ability of the Quechua to work together.

An interesting case in which the issue of related but quite different language varieties has been faced and resolved in planning preschool education was the production of an Arabic-language version of Sesame Street. Although Arabic is widely spoken in the Middle East and Northern Africa, the varieties of vernacular Arabic used in the different countries vary considerably from one another. Written Arabic is a representation of a formal, standard version of the language that is not actually used for oral communication anywhere, certainly not with preschool aged children, though classroom language throughout the Arab world approximates the standard variety. It was decided to use a simplified version of Modern Standard Arabic for Sesame Street, though its use by characters like the Muppets in songs, verses, chants, and jokes constituted a major cultural innovation. Nonetheless, the Arabic language Sesame Street has been a great success, and parents have been pleased that their children could be exposed at such a young age to the variety of Arabic they would need in school and for reading.

Importance of language in the social/cultural identity of its speakers. Traditionally, a language was associated with a cultural/ethnic group. In the modern world, a product of colonization, imperialism, multiple redrawing of national boundaries, mergers of small separate groups into nations, and massive migrations, such is no longer universally the case. A language that is intrinsically tied to the social/cultural identity of its speakers cannot be lost without some loss of identity. Some groups lose their traditional language but maintain traditional values, ways of thinking, and a sense of themselves as a separate group, e.g., many North American Indian groups who now speak English without assimilating to the dominant culture. In other settings, e.g., Catalonia, maintenance and use of the traditional language is seen as central to cultural identity, to the extent that immigrants to Catalonia who become fluent in the language thereby achieve group membership.

Number of speakers. Languages spoken by a small percentage of the people in any society are, other things being equal, likely to disappear. Members of these smaller groups must typically learn the majority language, simply in order to survive in the larger society. These bilingual minority group members then very often slip into mostly using the majority language with their children, or their children refuse to use the traditional language with them. Smaller groups retain their languages in situations where the speakers are isolated from the majority community (e.g., Welsh Gaelic was retained in towns with poor roads linking them to the cities), where they have exceptionally high status and power (e.g., Afrikaans in South Africa), where the language is needed for special purposes (e.g., German immigrants in the U.S. retained German for use in church for several generations), where that language is a language of wider communication outside the society in question (e.g., English in Quebec), or where its association with the group's social/cultural identity is so strong that consistent efforts are made to maintain it across generations (e.g., Frisian in The Netherlands).

The fact that a language is used by a majority of the speakers in a community does not assure its retention, of course. If those speakers constitute a low status group, if the range of situations in which they can use their language is small, and if they must all become bilingual in any case in order to function in the larger society, then even a majority language

can disappear. Very often schooling in an official, though minority, language has speeded the disappearance of the majority language. For example, like many upper and middle class Indians, Rajiv Gandhi, the former Prime Minister, knew no indigenous Indian language, having spoken English (clearly a minority language in India) all his life.

Political/economic power of speakers. A language associated with a group in power is likely to attract speakers, whereas a language associated even with a large group that has little power is likely to lose speakers. In Quebec, for example, a province where 85% of the population is French-speaking, immigrants who spoke neither English nor French almost universally chose English schooling for their children until the laws were changed to exclude this possibility. English was a minority language, but the language of economic and political power in Quebec; only radical legislation could reduce its power to attract new speakers there.

Institutionalized or grassroots language programs. When considering the choice of language for preschool classes, and the likely success or failure of programs to teach, revitalize, or maintain languages, a major factor to consider is the nature of the program. Grassroots language programs have the support of the community, and are likely to generate enthusiasm and interest. They may not have adequate financial support, nor access to materials, training programs, and other sources of improvement. Institutionalized programs may be more remote, less tuned in to the needs and desires of parents and of local staff; they may, however, be able to provide more secure funding, an assurance of continuation, and some links to the formal educational system preschool graduates will eventually enter.

THREE CASE STUDIES

In order to make the operation of these sociolinguistic dimensions of language history and language use more concrete, we present here three fairly extensive case studies of preschool language programs. All three deal with situations in which a higher status national language has coexisted with an indigenous language. In Peru, Spanish is the national language; though Quechua/Aymara (the two most widely used indigenous languages) are also official, they clearly have less status, their speakers have less power, and both have several varieties which are not mutually intelligible. Success in Peru requires functioning in schools where Spanish is used; thus, all Quechua or Aymara speakers must become bilingual to pursue their education or to function in urban areas. The educational programs we discuss generally acknowledge these sociolinguistic facts; they are designed as transitional programs, in which Quechua or Aymara and Spanish are both used with the goal of aiding the children to learn Spanish and to achieve better in the mainstream educational system. However, the Puno program we present fairly extensively is a maintenance bilingual program. All these programs are elementary programs; bilingual preschool education is virtually nonexistent in Peru.

In the Western Isles, the traditional Gaelic has coexisted with English for several generations. Most of the population is bilingual to at least some degree. As discussed above, this is a situation in which the local language is very likely to disappear. However, Gaelic-language preschools have been set up as part of an attempt to use educational settings (elementary as well as preschool programs) to strengthen Gaelic and to ensure the maintenance of bilingualism against the inroads of English monolingualism.

The Maori case, in New Zealand, is one in which Maori language preschool programs have been designed to reintroduce and revitalize a language on the verge of disappearance. The Maori are a minority group with relatively low status, little economic or political power, and high risk for educational failure. Knowledge of the Maori language is widespread only in the older generation. The language is, however, closely tied to Maori culture and traditional ways of thinking; thus, the community is heavily invested in its preservation.

We have selected these three cases because they are among the few which are sufficiently richly documented, and they represent to some extent the different sorts of situations which can be addressed by 'preschool language planning'--the need for mother tongue education to promote academic success in a second language, a program to protect a local, traditional language so as to ensure maintenance of bilingualism, and a language revitalization program. None of these cases deals with a situation where the preschool includes children of heterogeneous language backgrounds (such as the Lowell program mentioned above). Nor does any deal with a situation in which the community members prefer their children to receive early and exclusive exposure at school to the majority language, as is the case among Bantu speakers in South Africa. Other such situations are described more briefly in the annotated bibliography appended to this report.

PERU:

History

Preschool education in Peru began in the 1930s in Lima as private facilities for privileged children and was closely associated with "middle class values" and the church. After the state assumed responsibility for preschool education in 1941, the number of centers, teachers, and enrolled children increased rapidly, but remained "irrelevant and unavailable" for "the vast majority of children, namely those from rural Peru and the new migrants to Lima (Bernard van Leer Foundation, 1986, p. 60). Up to 1969, there were only two higher training centers for preschool teaching instructors (Ibañez Salazar, 1977).

Preschool education since 1972

With the 1972 Educational Reform introduced by the Revolutionary Government, preschool education (by now institutionalized as *educación inicial*) was not only given unprecedented weight, but more importantly, a new objective: to attend to the needs of children from underprivileged populations: the rural poor and the ever growing number of migrants to Lima. Renamed "initial education" it has since been provided in two forms: a) the formal mode of schooling in government run centers called *centros de enseñanza inicial* (CEI) (initial teaching centers) where "crèches" are for children up to age 3 and "kindergartens" for children from age 3 - 5; and b) the non-formal initial education programs called *programas no escolares: aulas de educación inicial* (PRONOEI) for 3 - 5 year olds (Ministerio de Educación, 1977). These are administered by a "special system which is highly flexible as regards the aims, content, duration, timetables, staff, premises, etc., thus affording immense scope for creativity, initiative and a sense of responsibility on the part of those involved in them (Ibañez Salazar, 1977, p. 551)." PRONOEI are meant to serve particularly those communities for whom the normal (formal) teaching services are nonexistent or inadequate. These include communities in remote rural areas as well as the ever growing marginal urban settlements which in Peru are euphemistically called "pueblos jóvenes" (young towns). PRONOEI are officially under the supervision of the Ministry of Education, and their general objectives and content are the same as those of the formal programs (CEI). However, their organization is sufficiently flexible to allow for the enormous differences in the various areas of Peru. Indeed, it is one of their goals to provide an education that is based on the diverse socioeconomic and cultural conditions of the specific area or community. These programs are characterized by their emphasis on parental and community involvement from building the center to running it. The latter is largely done by women from the community who have been trained as so-called "animadoras" (promoters) and who receive continuous training and support from so-called "coordinadoras," themselves professional preschool teachers.

Experimental Pilot Project in Informal Initial Education

(Description of this project is largely based on an article by López, 1988. Quotes not otherwise identified refer to this article).

The "Experimental Pilot Project in Informal Initial Education (PROPEDEINE)" in the Department of Puno has been running for almost 20 years. It marked the beginning of

systematic initial education for 3-6 year olds in Peru. By 1981 about 30% of rural children from the Department of Puno were enrolled. This ongoing project has been supported by various development agencies, such as CARITAS, AID and UNICEF. According to Hornberger (in press), however, support has consisted mainly of the donation of building materials for the so-called Wawa Wasi or Wawa Uta (meaning the "children's house" in Quechua and Aymara respectively, Ibañez Salazar, 1977) and the training of promoters of community origin to run the program in the community.

One of its principal characteristics is parent and community involvement. The "promotores" (teacher/caregivers) come from the communities and are native speakers of Quechua or Aymara. But, although they as well as the children speak an indigenous first language, "neither its maintenance nor cultivation nor that of the expressions of rural culture are stimulated ... (p. 34)." On the contrary, the program's objective is to prepare the children for entrance into the Spanish-language school. As López points out, "the PROPEDEINE is based on an ideological concept of cultural and linguistic homogenization and supports rapid assimilation of the Aymara [and Quechua] individual into the mainstream society" (p. 39). Not only does this approach mean a tremendous neglect of these children's rich linguistic and cognitive potential and creativity, but it moreover constitutes difficulties for those (many) indigenous "promotores" whose Spanish is not adequate and who are not given any training in teaching Spanish as a second language. Notwithstanding the importance of this project must not be underestimated. It is the only of its kind in this large and poor rural area that provides education for 3 to 6 year olds. Moreover, it provides them daily with food.

Van Leer Foundation Projects

A special report (Bernard van Leer Foundation, 1986) gives an overview of the Foundation's involvement in non-formal early education in Peru, in particular its project in Ate-Vitarte, an area of poor neighborhoods on the outskirts of Lima: it helped establish 31 PRONOEI and train more than a hundred mothers as "animadoras" between 1979 and 1984. Upon request of the Ministry of Education, a dissemination phase followed in which the project's center was taken as the basis for a National Center for the training of non-formal preschool educators. This has become the National Training Center under the Ministry of Education.

Articles in the van Leer Foundation July 1989 and October 1989 Newsletters report on two projects supported by van Leer and in cooperation with the Ministry of Education. Both are operated by the **Centro Nacional de Capacitación Docente en Educación No Escolarizada** (National Preschool Education Training Center, the above mentioned National Training Center). One is concerned with "Transfer of Preschool Training Methods," the other one with developing "Strategy for the transition between preschool and the early years of primary school." Both projects involve training people who then train preschool staff and primary school teachers. The training methods used are characterized as "action-reflection-action" and "investigation-action" and the PRONOEI of Ate-Vitarte help as field sites.

Within the larger activities of these projects, the latest has been a small action/research program specifically concerned with language. It was carried out in four communities in the Ate-Vitarte area. In three sites, both children and parents participated in the programs; in

the fourth there was no parent component. We summarize the program's main observations and recommendations in the following:

1) **Children's and Parents' language:** Language of the children (both in Spanish and in Quechua) was "very limited" (p.7). One cause was that parents' language skills were "not so good."

2) **Improving parent-child communication:** One of the project's priorities is to encourage parents to talk to the children, tell them stories, stimulate the children's language. The hope is that this will develop a bond between parent and child and that the child will communicate more. The aim is to "create the conditions where parents could help their children to enrich their language." [The report does not specify whether parents are encouraged to speak in Quechua or Spanish].

3) **Spanish as L2:** The project would like to "give a form of gradual learning of Spanish, not forced (p.8)."

4) **Reading and Writing:** The team is planning a teaching method for reading and writing "based on oral Spanish where first the child has a period in which he or she listens to Spanish words and speaks them and afterwards the ability [?] to read and write is brought in (p.8)." [This is unclear: the phrasing seems to indicate that there is an ability to read and write...presumably in Quechua, but from the context of the article the reading/writing teaching is in Spanish]. The main point seems to be a change in methods: from mechanical/repetitive to comprehension-based and situational. "The method" has been prepared for first grade and the team is working on adapting it for use in second grade.

5) **Trainers' language:** The person who is developing the methods for teaching reading and writing speaks Quechua, but "most of the team don't [which makes it] very difficult to set up this approach."

6) **Preliminary results of actively promoted parent involvement in child-parent communication:**

- the language of all children improved in some way;
- five year olds' language improved more than younger ones';
- children's language improved more in the three groups where parents were involved;
- fathers' attitudes towards their children changed (more involvement and awareness of being role models).

Except for the fact that this was an action/research approach, details on the methods of data collection and analysis are not given.

Perhaps more important than the results themselves is the fact that here for the first time in the Foundation's involvement in preschool education in Peru, "language" is addressed as

a major issue, and specific reference is made to the bilinguality of the children involved.

The relative "lateness" of addressing this issue is astounding in view of the fact that Peru has already had a comparatively long history of bilingual education programs (i.e. since the early 1970s), some of which have been described and analyzed in great detail (e.g. the "Proyecto Experimental de Educación Bilingüe"-Puno, henceforth PEEB). However, this "lateness" or neglect is by no means limited to the van Leer Foundation:

Referring to the work in education in the Department of Puno, Hornberger comments on the "distressing paradox that there has been a major pre-primary education program with support from UNICEF, and US AID that is not bilingual, often in the same community with the Bilingual Education Project (PEEB), beginning in grade 1." (personal communication, 5/19/89) Hornberger, for example, observed a teacher of one preschool class, who, upon her supervisor's instructions, conducted her classes only in Spanish (including teaching rhymes!) although she was fluent in Quechua. The children's response was "uniformly unencouraging": either they did not respond at all, or they occasionally repeated the last word of an often repeated Spanish phrase in chorus (Hornberger, 1989).

Not all preschool teachers, however, even speak the mother tongue of the children they teach. This was the case in a preschool in Pichacani, a community in the Department of Puno, in November 1988:

We had gone to visit a PEEB school in this community and during lunch break were spontaneously invited to the preschool, located almost next door. The two preschool teachers had time and agreed to talk with us. One of them told us she spoke some Aymara, but only used it in the classroom as a "last resort" (i.e. if otherwise communication would have broken down completely); the other teacher spoke no Aymara, but said she wanted to learn it, because it was necessary. One leaned more towards "Spanish only" - because "the children will have to learn it any way," whereas the other one saw merit in using Aymara, because "communication would be better." Neither was, however, fervently defending her position, and both agreed that "the parents don't want it" [Aymara in the classroom]. Printed materials in the two rooms were in Spanish and most pictures on the walls represented non-Indian people and reality quite removed from that of these Highland Indian children. (Heise-Baigorria, 1988, fieldnotes).

On a different note, we should mention the results of some psycholinguistic research of four year olds in Lima and Tacna: Using the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (Kirk et al., 1969), Zavala Aparicio (1982) compared psycholinguistic abilities of four year olds in urban areas of Lima and Tacna, both with and without (or only minimal) access to basic commodities (such as water, sewerage, electricity, transportation, health services, schools). The main conclusions of this study were that:

- 1) "Access" vs. "minimal or no access" to commodities had a significant effect on all measured psycholinguistic abilities of these four year olds: children with access scored significantly higher on all measures than did children without access;
- 2) Whether the children were from the (coastal) LIMA area or the (south-eastern-Andean) TACNA area did not make any significant difference.

Two additional observations are notable. First, there is no reference to any kind of preschool program, and whether any of the children of either group did or did not

participate in a preschool program is uncertain. Second, in the "with access" group, parents were mostly monolingual Spanish speakers, whereas a large part of parents of the "without/minimal access" group were bilingual (42% Quechua-Spanish in the Lima sample, 76% Aymara-Spanish in the Tacna sample). Looking at the "no significant differences" in outcomes when Lima and Tacna are compared, but at the much higher incidence of bilingual parents in the Tacna sample, we could conclude that the areas' linguistic composure in terms of parents' monolingualism or bilingualism did not matter. If this conclusion were to be accepted, one might go a step further and assume that it does not matter whether a possible (existent or future) preschool program is monolingual or bilingual and that the only relevant variable is "access to services." But then, these [services] include schools [and presumably preschool centers], which entangles the variables even more. What we can safely deduct from this research is that a) "access" is one significant factor for psycholinguistic language ability and b) that it might be quite risky to come to policy decisions based on a hasty evaluation of research even when this is experimental in design and based on familiar and generally accepted "Western" paradigms.

Conclusions

In some ways, Peru would seem to have outstanding pre-requisites for establishing language maintenance preschool programs, in fact remarkably more than other countries with similar multilingual backgrounds and similar levels of economic development:

- 1) Since the early 1970s, preschool education has been considered a priority for governmental efforts in education and there is a well established system of preschool education. The importance given to preschool is--in the bureaucratic realm of the Ministry of Education--reflected by elevating the former Office of Early Childhood Education to the level of General Department (Dirección General), the highest ministerial level.
- 2) Apart from a formal mode of preschool education, there is a wide-spread decentralized net of non-formal preschool education centers which stand and fall with community involvement. These centers' programs are (at least in theory) based on the socioeconomic and cultural realities of the communities they serve.
- 3) "Bilingual education" (in conjunction with the officialization of Quechua) has been one of the cornerstones of the Revolutionary Government's education reform in the early seventies. Though much of the fervor had been lost in the late 70s and early 80s, and the Constitution of 1979, for example, markedly de-emphasized the need for the teaching of Quechua, "bilingual education" has once again gained status within the Ministry. One indication is the elevation of the Office of Bilingual Education to the level of General Department (Dirección General) in 1987. (See the same occurrence under 1). Much to its advantage, the director of this new General Department is not only an educator, but a former longtime team member of the PEEB-Puno. Bilingual primary education is not a rarity any longer in many areas of Peru; a lot of it is considered successful at least at the classroom level (Hornberger and many others), and many teachers and teacher representatives from indigenous language areas testify to the need for bilingual education.
- 4) Whereas in many countries, preschool and primary education belong to different organizations, in Peru, both are part of the Ministry of Education (and are located in the

same building). This should prove an enormous advantage: as we have pointed out elsewhere, continuity between preschool and primary education is particularly important for language development, and it is therefore highly desirable to adopt language policies geared towards language program continuity. This kind of integrated approach is much more difficult where the two levels of education are administered by different entities. Moreover, where the latter is the case, preschool education is usually the responsibility of the Welfare Department (or a similar entity) and is thus almost automatically considered not only "compensatory," but of inferior status.

However, being under the same ministerial administration unfortunately does not guarantee that continuity of programs is achieved (or even planned). Such is the case in Peru, and we must conclude that there are other factors which hinder (and conversely might foster) first the acceptance and then the realization of an "integrated approach." Two such factors are the allocations of funds and political instability.

With respect to the allocation of funds, financial resources are severely limited and must be distributed among different departments in the Ministry of Education. The priority positions given preschool and bilingual education in the reform area of the early 70s did not find reflection in adequate financial support. In the case of preschool education in particular, the government put into effect a policy based largely on community participation, and bilingual education projects were to a large extent financed with the help of foreign aid. Until the mid seventies, the government's investment in infrastructure had resulted primarily in the construction and outfitting of classrooms, equipment improvement for basic education schools, renovation of equipment in 22 State Universities and the very costly "launching of 24 Upper Schools for Professional Education," the so-called ESEPs (Ministerio de Educación, 1977). (The ESEPs were abolished within a decade).

By political instability, we mean here that the idea of revaluing the indigenous populations was not followed through, the official positive attitude towards Quechua as a national language did not last, and inconsistent attention was given rural (and in particular rural bilingual) education. All this, because the political outlook changed. With the end of the first phase of the Revolutionary Government which had--at least on paper--brought about an educational reform which was researched and acclaimed worldwide, interest in bilingual education and preschool education subsided. With the last two governments, preschool education became again a focal point of interest, but it took much longer for bilingual education to be a priority once again. Considering the volatile political situation Peru has been in since the early eighties, it is difficult to make predictions on what will be priorities in education in the near future.

An example from the van Leer Foundation projects gives an indication how the political situation can force a change not only of strategy, but beyond that of the core of the program: Instead of continuing to go to the province of Andahuaylas, a remote area in the Andes, the project started to bring potential trainers (capacitadores) to Lima. This new approach seems to undermine exactly some of the "beauty" of the project which by being in Andahuaylas had (probably) somehow shown "respect" for and "revalued" this remote rural Andean area. Typically, in Peru, there is a strong tendency to appreciate things that come from Lima, and give little or no credit to something from rural areas. This program had set out to approach things differently, but could not follow through because of the increasing

(real) dangers presented by the ever stronger terrorist movement "Sendero Luminoso" (Shining Path). Unfortunately, this change of strategy also directly affects the issue of language: the further away from remote Andean areas, the less perceived is the need to develop programs that foster the use of Quechua and/or Aymara. Incidentally, the PEEB-Puno did not venture any more into all areas where it had gone before, either. (Heise-Baigorria, 1988, fieldnotes.)

At present, the situation in Peru's large Amazonian region (where the linguistic situation is much more complex than in the Andean region) is one of confusion, too. This region is attracting more and more migrants from the Andes because of the promise of employment in the coca-growing business. (Morales, 1989). The language situation for these migrants becomes even more complex, and any kind of language maintenance model more difficult. Moreover, the situation of teachers here is even more precarious in face of the dominating presence of both the large-scale coca-growers and Sendero Luminoso which is tied into the coca-growing business. Representatives of Amazonian provinces rest ited this over and over at the aforementioned bilingual education seminar in Lima.

WESTERN ISLES, SCOTLAND: A GAELIC MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

[This five documents referred to in this text are the following:

- (A) Scottish Education Department, 1987.
- (B) Proiseact Muinntir Nan Eilean, 1987.
- (C) Comhairle Nan Eilean, 1986.
- (D) Bernard van Leer Foundation, October, 1987.
- (E) Murray & Morrison, 1984.]

The Western Isles extend over an area of 120 miles from north to south and consist of many islands of strikingly different size; the two largest being Lewis and Harris. "Western Isles" became a local government unit in 1975. The newly formed Islands Council brought together all the islands which had formerly been administered by two separate mainland authorities. "Western Isles" is a rural, sparsely populated area, which includes many small and isolated communities. Access to some communities is quite difficult. Principal occupations include crofting, fishing and sheep farming. In some areas unemployment is as high as 20%, and emigration is on the rise. With continued emigration, the age structure of the population is changing, and this has had an effect on formal education (see document A), though not [yet?] on the non-formal preschool provisions which we will discuss here.

While this area cannot be described as socially or culturally disadvantaged in terms applied to Third World Countries, the sparsity of population, related to the absence of a strong economic infra-structure, does mean that children (and their parents) in the community do not have access to the wide range of educational opportunities available in other parts of the country. (Document C, p. 4.)

Linguistic situation and history of bilingual education

(Page numbers in this section refer to Murray & Morrison, 1984, unless otherwise noted).

Of a total population of approximately 30,000, 82% of Western Islanders are Gaelic/English bilingual. There is considerable variation in the degree of bilingualism and the use of Gaelic or English as home/community language. The case studies reported in Murray (1984) highlight this range: in one case, for example, the children's use of English is confined to the school, whereas in another one, the children's use of Gaelic is confined to the school (p. 157). In the past (that is until about 1975 "when Scotland joined the growing list of countries conducting pilot programmes of bilingual education (p. 1)," schools in the Western Isles had been an "anglicising force ... alienating children from their linguistic and cultural background (p. 10)." In schools with predominantly Gaelic-speaking children, many teachers had been using Gaelic long before the issue of bilingual education was brought up, but only "[out] of necessity ... [and] only as a bridge until such time as the children acquired sufficient English for Gaelic to be abandoned as a teaching and learning medium (p. 16)." The dilemma teachers found themselves in is poignantly described in Murray and worth quoting here in full, because it is transferable to teachers in many parts of the world where children's home language is different from their school language:

...because the educational system had not in the past considered Gaelic as one's mother tongue a "positive contribution," schools had been led to regard strength in Gaelic as weakness in English, to

concentrate upon teaching English and through English from the earliest stage as a means of compensating children for an imagined 'lack' in their background. Teachers in bilingual areas were themselves educated in this way; their professional training took virtually no account of the existence of bilingualism. Thus they found themselves in their classrooms perplexed by contradictory pressures. On the one hand, they were being asked to practise a relevant, child-centred method; on the other, they felt they had to teach through English only, to relegate the stronger language of the child to a language-lesson compound... (P 16).

What this 'language-lesson compound' might have entailed is described by one teacher as follows: "A few years ago [before the bilingual education project] there were gasps of dismay from the children and sighs of despair from me when it was time for Gaelic on the timetable (p. 151)."

Bilingual (Primary) Education

Bilingual (primary) education and community-based preschool emerged at around the same time (in the middle 70s) in the Western Isles, but not related to each other. The bilingual education project for primary schools, sponsored by the Western Isles Islands Council and the Scottish Education Department, began as a three-year pilot program in 1975 and ended, after a second phase, in 1981. A detailed account of this project is in Murray, 1984, from which we have quoted above, as it provides valuable information on the background which is the same for the preschool education project. As we are concerned primarily with preschool education, our focus in the following is on the preschool project. However, we will refer to the bilingual [primary] education project, when warranted, particularly in light of the fact that dis/continuity between preschool and primary education is a major issue for language maintenance programs, as we discuss elsewhere.

The Community Education Project

In 1976, the Bernard van Leer Foundation initiated a project in the Western Isles which was to become known as the **Community Education Project** (henceforth referred to as the "preschool project" to avoid confusion with the bilingual education project). This project is of interest to us first of all because of its Gaelic language preschool playgroups and efforts in Gaelic materials production. In addition it illustrates how difficulties can arise--and also the potential that is there--when different projects work in the same area at the same time, and when a community-based project is about to be incorporated into an institution.

Program's components. In the first 5-year phase, the project concentrated its efforts on a range of community developments as well as the establishing and growth of local preschool groups. Initiatives on one island, for example, included establishing the area's first local Historical Society, a community co-operative, a club for physically disabled elderly people, a playgroup, and a mother and toddler group.

In the second (and final) 5-year phase, work with adults of the community remained basic, but the earlier broadly based approach was replaced by one of narrower focus on parent and early childhood education. Specific efforts during the course of the project revolved around four areas which we will briefly call 'parent networking', 'Gaelic language playgroups', 'materials production' and 'project-school-linkages'. These are described in the following:

(1) Parent networking included: an islands-wide network for parents of young children; establishment of home - school links; and several parents' forums which drew participants from the preschool groups' parents and served all islands. Basic to these efforts was the idea to overcome the isolation of parents with young children. The forums, in particular, served to disseminate preschool education-related information as well as stimulate exchange of concerns and ideas regarding practical preschool problems as well as family and broader social issues (Document A, p. 11). As a culmination to these efforts, the third annual all-islands seminar in 1986 established the "Guth nam Parant" (Voice of the Parents), a Western isles association which became a strong interest group and played a significant role in the final stage of the project (see below).

(2) Gaelic language playgroups: During its lifetime, the project helped establish 52 preschool playgroups. These are run by parents, and emphasis is on the use of Gaelic. A 1985 external evaluation considered "the network of preschool groups [as] clearly the major success of the project so far" (as quoted in Document C, p. 3). Unfortunately, in none of the documents obtained are these playgroups described in detail, and it is not clear to what extent the use of Gaelic was systematically supported and enhanced, except that we know of the specific efforts made in developing Gaelic language materials (see below). (We will discuss the issue of language further in the conclusions.)

(3) Materials production: The project developed a scheme for producing materials of local relevance, "particularly with regard to Gaelic, which can be used by preschool groups and the early primary classes [and] can provide an element of continuity for the children and potential common ground for parents and teachers." (Document A.) In cooperation with local schools and the bilingual education project (see E), the preschool project developed a series of Gaelic language materials, including a cassette with Gaelic rhymes and songs (E). According to (A), "some excellent materials have been produced which have been welcomed by schools, and are valuable tools for the field staff (p. 12)."

(4) Project-school linkages: Besides the above mentioned cooperation in Gaelic language materials production, the preschool project assisted 13 primary schools to run a programme of visits by parents and children in 1984 and 1985. These were visits to the schools in which the children were about to be enrolled. In 1986, these 13 and further 8 schools were offered the same assistance, but only eleven pre-entry meetings were held. According to the Inspector's 1987 report, this low response illustrates the primary schools varied attitudes towards parental involvement. While this might certainly be so, another issue might well be an inadequate system of cooperation between the preschool project and the primary schools.

The issue of language

The foundation's newsletter states that "The focus [...] has been to encourage the use of the Gaelic language and culture to overcome many of the problems traditionally identified with disadvantage (D, p. 15)." However, in the project's Final Year Work Plan, 'Gaelic language and culture' is not among the five aims in the 'initial set of Project aims' for the second phase (1983-87). (Document B, p. 1.) Although there is no strong goal statement as to the maintenance of Gaelic, this same work plan refers to former, and suggests future, specific

language-related actions: It mentions the "successful Project initiative in Breascleite [on the isle of Lewis] which led to the forming of a Gaelic preschool group [which] in turn [has] led to the creation of the Western Isles first Gaelic medium primary education unit." This is difficult to understand in view of Murray's account that the bilingual education project began before the Foundation's preschool project. The Final Year Work Plan further states that "the Project will respond positively to requests received from groups to run Gaelic lessons for mothers and children simultaneously in preschool groups where there are large numbers of Gaelic learners. This, and the pressures coming from parents for Gaelic medium education are obviously areas where the fullest co-operation is required between the Project and the Bilingual Primary Staff Tutors." (ibid.) [These tutors are a component of the bilingual education program, see Murray, 1984.]

Conclusions

The evidence gathered from the various kinds of documents consulted, including the account of the bilingual education project, suggests that this project was successful in a) establishing sound community-based early childhood provisions, b) co-producing useful educational materials of local relevance, particularly with regard to Gaelic, and c) building a very strong parent network across the Western Isles.

During its 10-year existence, there were, of course, some rather usual difficulties of implementation, such as difficult accessibility to remote places, initial parents' reluctance to participate, and having to deal with a variety of actors and institutions. However, apart from these, it seems that the main problem--and one that was eventually not overcome--was a certain lack of co-operation between this project and the education authorities [and their project]. Even the accounts as to when and how the project started differ depending on who wrote them. According to the Murray account (Document E), a feasibility study for the preschool project was begun in 1977, and it was planned within the Education Department of the Western Isles Islands Council (WIIC) in consultation with the Bilingual Education Project [which itself was started in September 1975] and other bodies such as the Scottish Education Department and the University of Aberdeen. Document C also describes the project as a joint undertaking of the Western Isles Islands Council (WIIC) and the van Leer Foundation. Document D, however, mentions "partnership with WICC" as from 1983 on. (A) speaks of a degree of separation between the Project and the Education Department that has not always been beneficial to either. The transition and integration of the project into the WIIC's education department at the end of the second five-year project phase did not work out as the Foundation had wished for. Not even a compromise was reached; "the Council kill[ed] off the project (D)." In a final move, the Foundation gave the money that had been earmarked for the very Council (WIIC) for the transition period to the recently established parent association ("Guth nam Parant" or "Voice of the Parents"). Thus, in the end, despite lengthy negotiations for a smooth transition neither the Foundation itself, nor the Council continued the work of the project. [Guth nam Parant intended to use the funds "to strengthen the existing 52 preschool playgroups and improve communications and training amongst the parents of young children in the Western Isles (D)"]. Synthesizing information from the various documents, it seems to me that two issues were of paramount importance to the Council, but not the main issues of the foundation's project:

- 1) the use of Gaelic as the first language (including a "bridge programme" to help support

secondary gaelic medium education) and

2) establishing and enhancing stronger links between the preschool children (and their parents) and their local primary schools. This apparent discrepancy in goals and the inability to work out a common denominator might have been among the main factors that led to the rather unfortunate end of this project. However, a much more detailed analysis would be needed to substantiate this assumption.

Two final comments: First, if it had not been for the variety of documents consulted, description of this project might have turned out quite one-sided. It is a case in point that in general a "one-source-only" view of any project or program might be limited and that it is important to consider what kind of source was consulted. Second, reading the account of the bilingual [primary] education project (Document E) is recommended not only for those interested in primary education: a number of issues apply similarly to preschool. The "why" and "how to" of the desired "role changes" for Gaelic (from being a "necessary evil" in a dual-medium situation to becoming an equally appreciated and mastered language) are vividly reported and a recurring theme in language preservation and revitalization efforts in preschool and primary school alike.

NEW ZEALAND: A MAORI REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

The Maori are the indigenous people of New Zealand. They are now approximately 10% of the population and a higher percent of the country's children.

Since 1982, a network of more than 500 Maori language immersion preschools--language 'nests', Te Kohanga Reo (TKR)--have been established from an initiative of the Dept. of Maori Affairs. In September, 1988 a bilingual, bicultural government review team, acting at the request of the Social Equity Committee of the Cabinet, issued their report, "Language is the life force of the people." Unless otherwise indicated, our summary here is taken from that document.

TKR was started by the Department of Maori Affairs in response to Maori concern to ensure the continuing survival of the Maori language. As of March, 1988, they serve some 8000 children, approximately 15% of Maori children under five, the age when formal education begins in New Zealand. 7% of the enrollees are under one year. The aim of the coordinating body, Te Kohanga Reo National Trust (hereafter, the Trust) is to include 75% of the Maori preschoolers within 10 years. TKR is a significant part of three social movements: Maori language revitalization, Maori development more generally, and New Zealand preschool education.

History

The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi between Maori chiefs and representatives of the British crown is now interpreted as establishing a bicultural partnership between Maori and Pakeha (the non-Polynesian, European, or 'white' population). But that interpretation is an important change from previous governmental policies of cultural and linguistic assimilation (Kennedy, 1989). During the 1960's and '70's, Maori people began to take stronger action in pressing their claims to increased rights of self-determination and a fairer share of the country's resources.

By the late 1970's, survival of the Maori language--a single language spoken by all New Zealand tribes--had become a major Maori concern. Governmental policies of discouraging or even forbidding use of the language, migration from rural Maori communities into cities in search of jobs, and television had all taken their toll. National meetings of Maori elders in 1979 and 1980 affirmed the importance of language, Te Reo, and asked the Department of Maori Affairs to make language a policy priority for 1981. In response, TKR was begun: a program for young children from birth to school age of immersion in Maori language and values.

Administratively, each TKR and its whanau (extended family in the broadest sense) is accountable to the Trust, established in 1982 as a charitable trust to facilitate a partnership between the people and Government. It receives administrative support from the Department of Maori Affairs and, since 1984-5, help from the Department of Labor for adult whanau training.

The most common center size is 10-19 children. Only 10% of the adults involved in the

centers are paid, and some TKR have no paid staff. Half of the centers are located on marae, traditional Maori land and building for both religious and secular functions; others are in community centers, public schools, churches and private homes. They have been funded by a combination of operating grants from the Department of Maori Affairs through the Trust on a per center basis, regardless of number of children or hours open, and koha (donations) from each family and from the whanau and tribe.

Each center is formally and financially accountable to the Trust. In the mainstream Pakeha world, it is this aspect of accountability that is stressed. But in Maori culture, accountability has cultural aspects as well. Members of TKR whanau expressed to the government review team a sense of urgency about the need to maintain and reaffirm the Maori language and culture. "They feel they have to get it right, because in the long term there may not be time for a second chance at this important kaupapa [objectives, principles]... Therefore they give what is needed, although this is often more than they can afford: time, labor, food, building materials, educational supplies and money (Government Review, p. 42)."

During 1989, as part of a reorganization of New Zealand government structures and functions, the Department of Maori Affairs was transformed into a Ministry of Maori Affairs with power only to make policy. Implementing policies in actual programs has been devolved and decentralized to tribal structures throughout the country. These will presumably become the responsible authorities for TKR operations.

As of February, 1990, the funding base will also change. Government allocations for TKR will be put on the same footing as other early childhood education programs. Each center will receive funds on a child per session basis, with a higher rate for children under two years (The Dominion, August 28, 1989, p. 5).

The Program

At the time of the government review, no official statement of the philosophy and principals of TKR existed in written form. The review team concluded from oral and written testimonies and from available literature that the aims of TKR are:

children will learn the Maori language and culture, including the spiritual dimension, through immersion;

language and cultural learning will be fostered and supported for all members of the kohanga reo whanau [the extended family, traditionally based on kinship, but now often extended beyond such ties in cities];

members of the kohanga reo whanau will learn a range of other skills (for example, administration) within the whanau setting;

collective responsibility for the administration and operations of the kohanga reo will be fostered through whanau development;

the content, context and control of learning will be Maori (Government Review, p. 21).

It is clear from this list of objectives that the program aims to empower and re-educate adults as well as nurture and educate children.

Learning for adults

To achieve both aims, training programs for adult members of the whanau are essential. The need for more bilingual and bicultural caregivers is the most urgent concern. Caregivers must be fluent speakers, native to both language and culture. In some communities, such caregivers are in short supply. In addition, some people believe that training in child development and teaching skills would also be desirable qualifications.

Adult members of the whanau also need education in the larger objectives of Maori development. Sometimes conflicts have arisen between fluent speakers, usually women elders, and younger parents. "The fluent speakers came from a secure Maori base and were bilingual and bicultural. The parents wanted access to this cultural security, but came at it from a monolingual and monocultural base (Government Review, p. 22)." Such parents often expected that TKR would be just like mainstream New Zealand preschool except for a change of language from English to Maori.

In response to such conflicts, the Trust developed a syllabus to facilitate adult whanau learning. It outlined modules of knowledge and practical training that totaled 900 hours. Course objectives are:

- To develop the values inherent in Maori language and culture;
- To develop fluency in Maori language;
- To gain an understanding of language development in children;
- To acquire a sound knowledge of Tikanga Maori (Maori customs) and the effects of such knowledge on the spiritual, cognitive, and social development of children;
- To enhance the effects of Maori life in contact with Western culture;
- To gain experience in the shared care of children in a Kohanga Reo Centre;
- To develop the ability to observe, record, interpret and evaluate situations relating to child development and whanau management (TKR Trust Certificate Syllabus, p. 5).

According to the government review, TKR whanau across the country consist mostly of women. This is of concern for a number of reasons:

- The women are carrying the load;
- The KR whanau will be denied the skills and expertise of the men;
- The men are left behind by the learning of their women and children;
- There is a danger that children will grow up to perceive that whanau means women;
- Most importantly, the kaupapa [principles and philosophy] demands that the whole whanau, both men and women, should be involved (Government Review, p. 25).

There is general agreement that Maori women have carried a very heavy load in the TKR

movement during these eight years. But there is also general agreement that this work, whether paid or unpaid, has entailed great learning about Maori language and culture, administrative and organizational skills, and a sense of personal and public empowerment.

Learning for children

One observer writing in 1983 summarized her understanding of TKR objectives for children:

The philosophy of the kohanga reo revolves around the desire of the Maori people to 'stand tall' and to overcome adversity by producing a generation of bilingual and bicultural children who are capable of interacting in the Maori and pakeha world. Within this framework, the primary kaupapa is the promotion of the Maori language and Maori whanau values in a caring environment where children are lovingly ensconced by Maori speaking persons. For the child the ability to speak Maori is seen as stimulating a pride of race, a growth of personality, character and morals as well as an awareness of a positive self-image. Alongside the development of language, the kohanga is expected to develop the practical skills of the child at the social and cognitive level in order to facilitate entry into school on an equal basis. Taken together, the ultimate objective of the kohanga is nothing less than the renaissance of the Maori as an equal but separate component in the mosaic of New Zealand society (Fleras, 1983, pp. 9-10).

Beyond a shared set of general objectives for children as well as adults, there has been no attempt to standardize TKR centers around the country. The result is considerable variation in materials, activities and teaching practices. We know of only one evaluation of children's learning, and that only of the acquisition of Maori language skills in one of the first centers after two years of operation (Smith, 1984).

From the outset of the TKR movement, Maori people realized that the transition of graduates into the public school would pose many problems. The whanau want schooling to follow on, and build on, the learning experienced in the preschool centers, particularly the learning of, and in, Maori language. But this can only happen with considerable school support. Otherwise:

The learning environment, linguistically and culturally, ceases to be Maori;

The children become a Maori minority and experience whakama (shyness) about their status;

Learning becomes secular and is divorced from its spiritual dimension;

learning no longer takes place in a whanau context; children are separated from each other and from siblings and adult members of their whanau;

the teachers are no longer Maori, so role models are lost (Government Review, p. 44).

A Pakeha linguist whose research documented the decline in Maori language speakers and thus contributed to the initiation of TKR movement put it even more strongly in 1984:

If the present *ad hoc* and token gestures by the Department of Education and Maori Affairs are not replaced speedily by adequately funded and carefully thought out policies in support of the language, the bilingual education schemes ... will be transformed from bold and timely initiatives into a cruel fraud

(Benton, p. 265).

In a few public primary schools, excellent partnerships have been established with the kohanga whanau. In a few schools, there is a commitment to bilingual classes at each grade level. In one community, TKR graduates return to the kohanga (in this case, on a marae) for part of each school day. In another, the kohanga is on primary school grounds and there is a close relationship between it and the Maori bilingual classes, with children visiting back and forth (Cazden, in press). But in other communities, schools have not been responsive to the needs of these children and the demands of Maori adults for more extensive bilingual/bicultural education.

One result has been growing demand for primary schools under Maori auspices, following the precedent of religious schools, which receive public funds while retaining church control. As part of the restructuring of the entire New Zealand educational system as of October 1, 1989, comparable status is being negotiated for Maori schools.

The Maori linguist who evaluated children's language acquisition in one center concludes his report with these words:

Ten years ago, Waiwhetuu and the Hutt Valley were part of this country's first major socio-linguistic survey conducted by the Maori Unit of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research. In 11 of the 12 households visited in Puketapu Grove, everyday communication was carried out entirely in English, although 9 of the 13 household heads were able to speak Maori either fluently or quite well. There were no Maori speakers among children under the age of 15 at that time.

The establishment of Te Kohanga Reo in Waiwhetuu has brought many social, cultural and linguistic changes to this community, and indeed in many homes these pre-schoolers are the agents of this change. Parents are now attending night classes at Waiwhetuu Marae, and elsewhere, in order to communicate in Maori with their own children. This is vital if the children are to develop the linguistic skills sown within the Kohanga Reo. These skills, as I have tried to show, are already highly developed. But the experience of many adults today, who no longer speak (though nominally understand) Maori should remind us that languages may be lost as readily as they are learnt.

Any hesitation on the part of the local schools to accommodate, and to build upon the foundations laid in Kohanga Reo will be seen by the Maori people as a disguised form of the "unofficial" suppression of New Zealand's indigenous language which existed within the state education system up to the 1950s.

I encourage all who are involved with this exciting challenge to save the Maori language from extinction, to consider the wider implications that Te Kohanga Reo graduates will have on their community in the future. While a bilingual (Maori/English) unit within the Waiwhetuu Primary School is an obvious extension of the Kohanga Reo next year, by that time the precedent of an alternative Maori school might already be established (Smith, 1984, 20-21).

PLANNING PRESCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS

In reviewing descriptions of preschool programs from around the world, we have noticed an important difference in the attention given to language planning: Where some kind of language change is a program goal--whether from children's mother tongue to a national language or to a heritage language that is being revitalized--then language goals are prominent in the overall curriculum. But where no language change is intended, language seems to recede in importance. It then too easily becomes part of the background, taken for granted, something that will take care of itself, not consciously attended to by planners or teachers. Because of the importance of language in child development, as well as in readiness for primary school--as we have discussed in the first section--we believe that all preschool must give it focal attention, and we hope this report will be a 'consciousness raiser' in this regard.

The need to specifically address the issue of a 'language-development aware' preschool curriculum is positively reflected in the new (1980/1981) preschool curriculum of the Dominican Republic, which was elaborated with cooperation from UNICEF and UNESCO. This curriculum is structured around four areas of development, one of which is the "area of communication." It "includes all those activities through which the child expresses his experiences, ideas and feelings either through art, music or oral or written language. Getting ready for reading and writing is also considered part of this area." (Rosario & Pérez de Zapata, 1983, p. 199; translation by C.H-B.)

Planning for Language Learning

Whatever language is being used as the medium of conversation in the preschool, careful consideration needs to be given to how to create an environment in which children's language and cognitive development will be nurtured as richly as possible. Unfortunately, this doesn't happen without such consideration. Observational studies that compare children's talk at home and at school consistently find that homes are the richer environment.

One such comparative study was carried out in England. Tizard and Hughes (1984; Tizard, 1981) found that the average child had almost three times as many conversations per unit of time with a parent at home as with a caregiver in nursery school, and that the home conversations continued for twice as many adult/child turns. As Tizard says about these results,

A brief conversation may suffice for demands to be made and either met or denied, encouragement to be given, suggestions to be made, information or orders to be given, and even for a question to be answered. But any deep exchange of meaning takes time to achieve. (1981, p. 20.)

There are several often converging reasons why adult-child conversations in a preschool are apt to be so limited: the low adult-child ratio and the way the adults and children are organized into working groups; and lack of continuity in the adult-child relationships resulting in teachers' relative ignorance of each child's out of school life. With careful consideration, these aspects of the center environment can be made more beneficial.

Adult-child ratio, group size and organization

Adult-child ratio and group size are related, and both are important. Summary statistics in program descriptions and governmental regulations usually give or prescribe the adult-child ratio. In the Tizard study, for example, the average ratio was 1 (adult):10 (children). In situations where infants are in group care, recommended ratios in the U.S. usually drop to 1:4. In developing countries, reports of the ratio of adults to young children are much higher: 1:28 in a Bolivian study (Barrera de Martinez, 1985); 1:55 in one preschool in Kenya (Kakamega Dicece, n.d.).

The number of paid staff is a major, probably the major, budget item. But they can often be augmented by volunteers. In many cases, mothers become the para-professional teachers, while fathers are primarily involved in building the centers--e.g. Ate-Vitarte in Peru and Nezahualpilli in Mexico (see annotated bibliography for those countries). But in an Islamic preschool in Kenya, construction of two huts was shared by 30 fathers and 60 mothers, who worked with male and female trainers, respectively (Kenyan Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, 1986). Older members of the community not now in the work force are another available group, and their language abilities are especially valuable in programs of language revitalization.

But ratio is not the only number that counts. A large national study of day care in the United States found that group size mattered as well:

Across all sites, smaller groups are consistently associated with better care, more socially active children and higher gains on developmental tests (Ruopp, 1979, p. 2).

Thus, 1 adult for 10 children is preferable to 2 for 20 or 3 for 30, even though the adult-child ratio is the same in all three cases. And a reduction to 200 children in one kindergarten in Mexico (Logan in Lall & Lall, 1983) is still an unfortunate size, no matter how many care-givers are present.

Three influences can be suggested for the importance of group size. First, the larger the group, the more hectic the environment is apt to be and the more control adults will need to exert. Under such conditions, adult talk will be more managerial than informative, and such talk requests compliance and invites silence, not dialogue. Conversely, in a smaller group, control problems will be lessened, and adult-child conversations more apt to focus on activities and ideas than behavioral control.

Second, in any group with more than one adult, relationships among the adults become important. The most obvious danger is that the adults will talk among themselves and interact with the children only enough to maintain control. But even where the adults are careful to give their attention to the children, adult relationships can affect how that attention is expressed. A study of residential nurseries in England found, for example, that the quality of conversations was affected by hierarchical relationships among the staff. If two staff were on duty with a group of children, the junior of the two tended to interact less with the children than when she was alone, considering her job only to "mind the children" when her superior was also present (Tizard et al, 1972).

We should not be surprised that adults, as well as children, are influenced in their

interactions by relations of interpersonal power within any given speech situation. Such relationships will be especially important among adults who see themselves as having unequal status outside of school--for example, certificated teachers vis-a-vis community adults, community elders vis-a-vis younger parents, or members of dominant vis-a-vis non-dominant ethnic groups. In such situations, the particular language ability of the adults with the lower societal status may be crucial to the preschool objectives. Yet those very language abilities will only be fully expressed in interactions with children if all adult speakers are fully respected for their important roles.

The third result of the size of group and sheer number of adults is their effect on the continuity of adult-child relationships.

Continuity in adult-child relationships

Group caregivers are inevitably less familiar with their children than members of a child's family. Family members are superb conversational partners for young children not only because of a powerful affective relationship but also because they know the child's world - and therefore what the child is likely to be talking about - so well.

When children in their second year of life can utter only a few meaningful words, a family member is most likely to understand the child's intent and make a meaningful response. Later, when children's pronunciation has become intelligible, their highly individual choice of words can continue to make communication difficult with strangers. Anthropologist Margaret Mead used her experience as a grandmother to speak of the importance for children of a shared world:

I was walking along a Cambridge street with my two-year-old granddaughter, and we stopped in front of a florist shop. She started in the window and said, "Never be a cat." What would you say? Most grandmothers would say, "Yes, dearie, see that nice doggie," but I knew what she was talking about. Because I knew she was referring to a song that my grandmother sang to me, that I sang to my daughter, that my daughter sang to her, which said, "Always be a pussy, never be a cat./ They call me pussywillow, and what do you think of that?" There was a pussy willow in the florist window. Now, this is what our children don't have and this is what we have to begin to put together for them. This is the reason for bringing parents into the child care center and into the nursery school. It is the reason for bringing the teachers into the homes of the children. It is an attempt to establish at least a certain degree of commonality so that people can talk to each other and have some identity (1973, p. 327).

Mead's recommendations are important: welcome parents in the school and encourage teachers to visit children's homes--of course, after discussion to make sure such visits would be welcomed.

Then the benefits of such relationships for extended adult-child conversations in the preschool will be maximized if a teacher is assigned special responsibility for contact with a small number of children and their families within the larger group, and if the daily schedule ensures that each adult and child group will spend some time together each day.

The benefits of such parent/teacher relationships go well beyond their influence on children's language development--for example, in helping to build networks of families in sparsely populated areas, as in the Western Isles of Scotland and the Saami in Norway.

We have emphasized the importance of opportunities for children to talk with adults

because these opportunities require the most careful planning. Children's language development is also nurtured by talk with other children. We assume opportunities for such interactions, whatever activities the children are engaged in. But talk with adults has special value for 2-3 children. This value is accentuated in situations where the entire child group is learning a second language that initially only the adults know, as in the Maori immersion preschools in New Zealand.

Planning for Emergent Literacy

Although we are concerned with preschool education for children younger than formal school age, there is enough research evidence of the importance for later school success of beginning, or 'emergent', literacy experiences during the preschool years to merit consideration here. The research is admittedly concentrated in England and the U.S. But to the extent that children in Third World countries also face western-type educational expectations once they enter primary school, this research should have general relevance.

The importance of early literacy

The most extensive evidence is from Wells' large-scale longitudinal study of children in Bristol, England (1985). He found that the single most important influence on children's success in learning to read in primary school was the extent of their direct experience with print during their preschool years. Such experience can include both being read to and trying to write. Wells could only report with confidence about the benefits of regular book-reading to young children because he found little evidence of their attempts to write during his visits to the home. But other researchers have documented the benefits of early writing activities, and of their observations of reading and writing in their environment.

As far as we now understand, there are several specific ways in which preschool literacy experiences prepare children for primary school:

- (1) Deciphering the written language code: Following along as an adult reads aloud, asking questions about words in books or signs in the social environment, and trying to write for oneself--even in "invented spelling"--all serve to focus children's attention on written language symbols, and on how they combine to represent oral language.
- (2) Comprehending text meaning: Discussions about the text being read helps to accustom the child to deriving meaning from words alone, apart from the momentary physical and interpersonal context. The fact that books often contain more varied vocabulary and sentence patterns than everyday conversation is an added benefit.
- (3) Appreciating the functions of reading and writing: Being read to contributes to a personal motivation to learn to read; and seeing people writing helps children understand how writing is a useful activity in their community.

While these benefits of deciphering, comprehension and appreciation are important for all children, they may be especially important in communities where having books to look at and materials to write with, and seeing adults engage in literacy activities, are not widespread outside of school. For these reasons, if a preschool has as one of its objectives

reducing the risks of primary school failure, we recommend that preschool programs include such beginning literacy experiences.

Literacy in which language?

Fortunately, the particular language in which children have such literacy experiences does not seem to matter as much as the fact that they happen, consistently and regularly, in some language. Canadian psychologist Cummins has reviewed research evidence in support of what he calls the "linguistic interdependence hypothesis." In formal terms, considering two languages in the children's environment, L_x and L_y:

To the extent that instruction in L_x is effective in promoting proficiency in L_x, transfer of this proficiency to L_y will occur provided there is adequate exposure to L_y (either in school or environment) and adequate motivation to learn L_y (1989, p. 44).

Cummins goes on to explain in more detail:

In concrete terms, what this principle means is that in, for example, a Spanish-English bilingual program, Spanish instruction that develops Spanish reading and writing skills (for either Spanish L₁ or L₂ speakers) is not just developing Spanish skills, it is also developing a deeper conceptual and linguistic proficiency that is strongly related to the development of literacy in the majority language (English). In other words, although the surface aspects (e.g. pronunciation [and word order] etc.) of different languages are clearly separate, there is an underlying cognitive/academic proficiency which is common across languages. This "common underlying proficiency" makes possible the transfer of cognitive/academic or literacy-related skills across languages (p. 44).

Although in principle such transfer can happen from any language to any other, Cummins suggests that

Transfer is more likely to occur from minority to majority language because of the greater exposure to literacy in the majority language outside of school and the strong social pressure to learn it (p. 44).

This formulation speaks specifically to situations of minority language communities embedded in a larger majority language society--as is the case of Spanish-speaking communities in the US. One of Cummins' examples is of a Spanish-only preschool that had a significant effect on California farm workers' children's later success in the English-medium primary school through an intensive program of language and literacy-related experiences (Campos & Keatinge, 1988).

A more dramatic example of children's transfer of an underlying proficiency from one language to another comes from a primary school immersion program in the Mohawk language in the Native Canadian community of Kahnawake (or Caughnawaga, as Mithun and Chafe [1979] transcribe the name) near Montreal. Local parents and educators started the program in an attempt to revitalize a language that would die with the current older generation. They then invited the McGill researchers who had successfully evaluated now well-known French immersion programs 20 years earlier to conduct a longitudinal evaluation of the Mohawk children's language learning and academic achievement. (Mithun and Chafe mention a nursery school as well as primary school program, but the McGill evaluation started with children in first grade.)

The program is conducted entirely in Mohawk in grades 1-3. Then, in grade 4, instruction

during 40% of the day shifts to English (the first language of the students). An important question for parents, teachers and researchers was how the children would cope with reading and writing in English.

Through the third grade, while all of the children's instruction--orally and in writing--was in Mohawk, they showed no ability to transfer their proficiencies to English, their first language. This surprised the researchers, because in other immersion programs children who learned to read in a second language made the transfer to their first language easily and usually without explicit instruction. The fact that English orthography is more different from Mohawk (which has symbols for glottal stop, vowel length, and vowel pitch) than it is from Spanish or French seemed the probable reason.

So fourth grade, when instruction in English reading began, became the critical year. And at the end of that year, "After one year of instruction in English, the Immersion students performed as well [on an English achievement test] as Mohawk students in the regular all-English program on all measures except spelling and capitalization (Holobow et al, 1987, p. 3)." Cummins's "common underlying proficiency" theory thus receives additional support.

Most preschool programs that mention preliteracy experiences limit them to helping children learn to read. But preschool children, especially when 5 or older, can also enjoy, and benefit from, trying to write--not just copying, but also composing. Delpit includes samples of original tok ples writing by children in the vernacular preschool programs in Papua New Guinea (1984, Appendix G).

The Question of Materials

All this requires materials--especially little books, for teachers and/or children to read--and caregivers who are literate, or interested in becoming literate, in the language being used in the preschool. In many situations, this is a tall order, and we can only encourage creativity in devising the best possible local solutions.

A curriculum evaluation of a program for home learning in Gaza by a British preschool educator for the sponsoring agency (the American Friends Service Committee) includes important suggestions about materials (Dorling, 1989). In the program, called MUMS--Mothers Understanding Methods of Schooling--staff members visit mothers with 4-year-old children, mostly in refugee camps. They demonstrate activities, centered around books and exercise sheets, which the mothers are expected to continue between visits.

The program began in 1975 and, as Dorling writes, "There is now a greater emphasis placed on the child's efforts as a thinker, concept former, knowledge gatherer ... and greater faith in, and value upon, the parents' contribution as 'prime educator' of their child." Dorling recommends, therefore, shifting away from worksheets that require right answers and copying to materials that invite more open-ended parent-child conversation, and that engage the child in prereading and prewriting activities.

Dorling also raises important questions, that need to be asked everywhere, about the cultural content of the books. Reporting her observations and her concerns, she writes:

Many mothers said how much their children loved the stories, that they were "the favorite part," and were read frequently to their other children, and neighbors' children, and were a help in times of curfew.

However, to an outsider, the stories, although part of an excellent English series and well translated into Arabic, are so culturally irrelevant as to seem quite inappropriate. They must surely waste the children's powers of understanding and usurp an opportunity to enhance their self-image. No one complains, but people could see, when I introduced the topic, that the children were muddled by mothers in short dresses--"Is she a girl?" they ask; and by [red and green traffic lights], hedgehogs, pet dogs, dolls' prams, let alone friendly policemen (Dorling, 1989).

In Dorling's memo on a follow-up visit a few months later, she reports with admiration the new materials illustrated by a local artist that are duplicated, in black and white, in the program office and then colored in by the mothers themselves.

MUMS also encourages children's drawing--on the backs of pieces of paper that would otherwise be discarded--as an important part of children's symbolic development.

If children become writers, then their own stories can become 'books' for other children to read. In a combined Kindergarten and Grade 1 Hawaiian language immersion preschool--which follows an immersion preschool, Punana Leo, modeled after the Maori Kohanga Reo--Slaughter and Watson-Gegeo found 25 of the 42 Hawaiian texts in the book corner in one classroom, and 11 of the 49 texts in the other classroom, had been written by the children themselves (1988, p. 32). Teachers themselves, local secondary school students, and accessible tertiary experts are other possible authors and illustrators.

The question of attitudes

Attitudes toward reading and writing in the vernacular may pose as much of a problem as lack of materials, because of the residue of the colonial experience. Surprisingly, perhaps, the people surveyed in the North Solomons province of Papua New Guinea were very clear about the importance of the language of their community, orally and in literacy. This was true of both "sophisticated tertiary educated with considerable experience of urban industrial life, and among village parents with limited modern education":

The impetus behind the call for early schooling in the children's own language and culture thus appeared to lie in the perceived importance of establishing a sense of local cultural identity in children, of emphasizing its continued worth and meaning. This was the point of learning to read and write in one's own language, using a relatively newly introduced skill (literacy) to support the transmission of an oral culture. While knowledge of English was still expressed as a valuable goal, knowledge of the local language was viewed as essential to a community member's sense of inner dignity. This was not the reaction of a conservative, traditional society resistant to the modernizing changes compelling the nation, but rather a reassertion of pride in their own culture and identity (Delpit, 1984, pp. 80-81).

Where such positive attitudes toward vernacular literacy are not present when a preschool program is started, then the school may itself become an agent of attitudinal change. That is what happened in the Navajo community described by Holm and Holm (1990). Over the years, under the influence of the school and the church--with Navajo literacy valued and used in both settings--there was what another educator in that same school calls the "indigenization of literacy (McLaughlin, 1989)."

We emphasize the value, in many settings, of emergent literacy experiences in the

vernacular. But where this is not possible, preschool programs should do whatever they can to avoid a situation where children with few literacy experiences outside of school confront, for the first time, both literacy and a second language when they enter primary school.

The Preschool Staff

Because group care of young children of approximately the same age is not part of traditional community life, adults working in preschools--whether called 'teachers' or 'caregivers'--may be in a new situation for which there are no tried and true cultural models. This is true whether the teachers are men and women in their 20's or 30's who have had 6 years of primary education, as in the vernacular preschools in Papua New Guinea (Delpit, p. 161), or whether they are community elders, primarily women, who may have had even less formal education, as in the Maori Kohanga Reo.

The problems that are apt to arise are not due to teachers' lack of formal education. In Papua New Guinea, Delpit found no relationship between the classroom performance of teachers and whether they had completed only 6 years of school or were high school graduates (1984, pp. 164-5). The problem rather is that their personal experience with formal education may provide an inappropriate model to fall back on when improvisation is required, especially with young children. Where that personal experience was in colonial schools with very large classes and predominantly rote learning of, and in, an unfamiliar language, remembered models will be especially inappropriate (Delpit, 1984, p. 245).

Where preschool teachers are drawn from the ranks of primary or secondary teachers now in excess because of a falling birth rate, as in the case of Thailand (Raudenbush et al, 1990), the problem will be similar, though for a different reason. A 1977 study of Kuwaiti preschool teachers revealed that most had been trained as elementary, or even secondary, teachers. In the absence of special training for work with preschoolers, they "tended to follow what was traditionally practised at the elementary level [as] manifested in overemphasis on formal instruction and scholastic achievement (Nashif, 1985, p. 180)."

The importance of preservice and inservice training

For all such groups, training courses specifically focused on young children can be of great value. In Kuwait, the in-service (re-training) course extended over 3-9 months (Nashif, 1985, pp. 180-1). In Papua New Guinea, the pre-service course for new vernacular preschool teachers was for six weeks, plus in-service workshops and supervisory visits (when transportation was possible) during the school year.

Two reports of successful education in indigenous communities--in Inuit communities in northern Quebec and on the Navajo Reservation in the United States--emphasize the importance of arranging for teacher training in the local community. From the Inuit experience, Stairs describes the benefits of not removing teachers to a foreign cultural environment for training:

Inuit teachers are chosen by community standards, not formal qualification, and begin immediately as "Teacher"--not as aides or students. Most remain fully integrated in their communities throughout their training. This avoids (a) depriving settlement life by removal of what are often key members, (b) disrupting personal lives with deep cultural shock, homesickness and family separation, and (c) training

Inuit as essentially southern teachers outside of their cultural context....Resulting from this is a broad base of educators with varied experience, still firmly placed in their cultural setting (Stairs, 1988, p. 315).

Writing of their long experience in developing a Navajo school at Rock Point, Arizona, Holm and Holm discuss the benefits of the resulting indigenous curriculum development:

'Navajo teaching' like 'Navajo education' has been an ambivalent if not a multivalent term. Not conceding that there can be any virtue in teaching in Navajo, some Anglocentric educators seem to have assumed that 'education is education': that teaching in Navajo would involve using the Navajo language in the same ways and for the same purposes Anglo teachers use in teaching middle-class Anglo students. Others, who might be termed the 'anthropological romantics', seem to have assumed that there is a Navajo style of teaching which would-be Navajo teachers need only (re-)discover and apply. Unfortunately, almost all their examples came from the less verbal performance of traditional skills.

The Rock Point experience would suggest that while there are certainly Navajo ways of interacting with others and of transmitting verbal knowledge, these are not waiting to be simply 'discovered' and applied. They must be integrated with new ways and used with new content. Rock Point teachers created, over time and by a combination of theory and trial-and-error, not the Navajo way, but a contemporary way, to go to school. (A Rock Point Way [in press]).

Both of these examples come from bilingual state schools where the indigenous language is used exclusively (Inuit) or predominantly (Navajo) in the early grades. Because preschools are a smaller unit, with fewer staff adults, teacher training at each school site would not be feasible. But the principle of local training devoted to the discovery and creation of indigenous forms of curriculum and teaching suggests keeping the training as close to the local community as possible.

Language issues in the training programs

With respect to language aspects of the preschool curriculum, the training needs to focus on organizing group life so that interaction among the children and with the adults is as rich as possible. There is no need to strive for activities typical of western-type preschool centers. Any activities are grist for conversation and thereby for language learning. In fact, research consistently finds that where adults and children are active together in some kind of joint activity, there is more informative talk than when children are expected to "play" apart from the adults. So, for example, preparing food can be just as valuable as playing with blocks or painting--as long as conversation, about the activity or anything else, is encouraged.

Again because of the influence of teachers' own prior schooling, they may need encouragement to conduct preschool activities out of doors. Delpit found reluctance to go outside in Papua New Guinea, even though "natural materials are readily available for nature study, mathematics, and cultural studies... [and] outdoor lessons are more likely to make VTPS [the vernacular preschools] seem less a separate institution and more a part of the village community (1984, p. 179)."

Where objectives of the preschool include helping the children become better prepared for primary school, then teacher training needs to include specific work with beginning literacy. Surprising as it may seem, many adults need help in learning how to talk with children in ways that extend conversation, rather than cut it off. Greenberg reports on a workshop session for teachers in the Child Development Group of Mississippi, a Headstart program in the 1960's with an explicit empowerment goal:

Talking about children didn't work. If people don't habitually talk lengthily with children, they don't know how to talk lengthily with children. So we actually practised it:

Tape plays:

Teacher: Oh, you tease, Tom, what are you telling Winston?

Tom: I tellin' him my brother Gary a bad bad boy.

Teacher, Oh, now that ain't nice.

The group analyses and discusses this. Then the same teacher goes to find Tom, who is waiting for our staff meeting to be over so one of the teachers will drive him home. The same teacher runs through the same conversation. I tape this conversation too, and afterward we discuss it: to see if and how the teacher prolonged and enriched the verbal exchange.

Teacher: Tom, what was you tellin' Winston this morn' when you was playin' with the ball?

Tom: I tole him Gary my brother.

Teacher: You like Gary?

Tom: Yeah, I laik him, but he bad.

...(three Teacher-Tom exchanges)

Teacher: Whay's dat?

Tom: 'Cause he walked up and set with his friend when they was singin' 'bout Jesus and the preacher was preachin'.

Teacher: Who whipped him?

Tom: Daddy--he tuk him outside and whupped him with a red belt.

Teacher: Did Gary cry?

Tom: Oh, yeah, he got tears in his eyes. Mama wiped his eyes with a rag when he come back in. Then he popped his fingers. That boy can't never be quiet.

...(and so on for at least five more Teacher-Tom interchanges) (1969, pp. 165-6).

Whereas the teacher's first response to Tom stopped the conversation with her criticism of what he had said, her second response invited him to say more about an experience that was important to him and that he was eager to share when invited to do so.

Adult participation as community empowerment

While the primary objective of preschool education is the development of the youngest members of the community, it can also contribute to adult development. In New Zealand, the empowering effect of participation in the Kohanga Reo on Maori women of all ages is widely acknowledged. A linguist working with a preschool language renewal program for Native American (Tachi Yokuts) in California reports how the young teacher from the community became familiar with a language she had heard as a child and could now help to teach, as she "began to learn from the elders, who came to be seen as the real teachers in the program and who in turn learned from each other and from the teaching process itself" (Britsch-Devany, 1988, p. 298):

The elders who participated in the Tachi language program...began to create a community of memory within multiple worlds: the world of the school began to incorporate the histories of their personal worlds as part of the larger world of a community remembered, a community that seeks to reestablish its own rituals, its own spiritualism, and its own language.

This retelling began during the program's weekly planning sessions, at which the head teacher and the two elders would discuss both the language and the activities to be used throughout the week. To the teacher's surprise, these meetings were quite often extended and they began to evolve into discussions of past experiences evoked by the use of Tachi in discussions of classroom planning.

During one meeting, for example, the two elder women began to recall various plants that grew at or near the community when they were younger, the dietary uses of these plants, and the seasonal experience of gathering plants with their own mothers and grandmothers. These recollections prompted the inclusion of a unit in which the children and elders picked fiddleneck and prepared it for eating in the classroom (p. 300).

The preschool contributed directly to the reconstruction and enlargement of this "community of memory" by its need for the elders' knowledge, by the planning discussions which prompted their recollections long forgotten, and by the subsequent process of sharing them in activities with the children.

This young 'Anglo' teacher was ready to learn from the Native American community elders, and to share planning and teaching fully with them. That is not always the case where a credentialed teacher is working with non-credentialed adults--whether paid or volunteer. For example, in the Nezahualpilli Community Preschool Education Project in Mexico:

[One of the numerous problems in curriculum development is] the lack of acceptance on the side of some teachers and educators of the role of mothers as teachers of their children. Unfortunately, the educator is used to seeing him/herself as unique and not as someone who gives an impulse to and pushes on collective work. [However, as we have seen in our project, persons] with experience in education (which includes first of all the fathers and mothers) are capable of working with preschool children if they base their further training on their own values and experiences, and preschool teachers [can] be an integral part of community work and become key elements not only for education but also for community research (Pérez Alarcon et al., 1986).

If the talents of the community adults are to be fully utilized with the children, and if the adults are themselves to grow, their sense of personal empowerment is critical. Where the credentialed/non-credentialed difference among the adults coincides with membership in the more and less powerful groups in society, respectively, potential barriers to productive relationships are compounded.

In a Native American Navajo/English bilingual school in Arizona, the program developers worked hard to avoid the typical pattern of Anglo teacher and Navajo aides. At one point in the development of the school, a new group of Anglo teachers was hired at the last moment (when last-minute funding became available) and underwent orientation while the Navajo teachers had charge of the students alone.

In retrospect, it was one of the best things that could have happened. The Navajo Language Teachers now knew they could do it; successful education didn't necessarily depend upon the presence of either Anglos or diplomas (Holm & Holm, 1990).

The authors explain that in the particular conditions of Native American education in the U.S., "few of the Navajo employees had ever had a Navajo teacher. None had ever had a teacher who used Navajo as the medium of instruction." And, in a footnote, they generalize to other situations of de-colonialization:

This is not written to denigrate either Anglo teachers or diplomas....But there comes a time in the de-colonialization process in which such symbols must be de-valued as being causative or effective in and of themselves. Indigenous people have to come to believe that it is possible for them to do what theretofore the conventional wisdom had said they couldn't or shouldn't (Holm & Holm, 1990, fn. 15).

Although the Holms are writing about a primary and secondary school, what they say applies to adults working in preschools just as well. And because interpersonal relationships within any setting have such a powerful effect on the interaction patterns of the participants, it applies with special force in any setting where use of language is especially important.

Negative attitudes toward community adults such as teachers may be held, at least initially, by some parents. One preschool promoter ("animadora") in the Ate-Vitarte, Peru project described how parents were at first very hesitant to send their children to the new preschool center because there was no "Senorita" (a professional woman teacher) and the 'teacher' was only a mother from the community. Such reports only indicate that the de-colonization process of which the Holms write needs to extend to parents as well, and that attention to such attitudes should be part of the conscious objectives of all institutions, including preschools.

The Administrative Context

The relationship of preschools to primary education is an international concern (Bettelheim & Takanishi, 1976), and there seems to be no ideal arrangement. We focus here on concerns related to preschool language goals, and how administrative arrangements affect the realization of language goals through their effect on program continuity, personnel, and status.

Program continuity

It is more difficult to achieve continuity between preschools and primary schools if they are part of different departments or ministries. Continuity is a very important issue for language education. It does not make sense to have an elaborate language maintenance/revitalization program that starts in grade 1, but have a preschool program in which use of the mother tongue is not promoted or even actively discouraged. (For examples, see Puno/Peru and Kärnten/Austria.)

The reverse is just as unfortunate: a preschool language maintenance/revitalization program that is not continued in primary school. (For an example, see Maori/New Zealand.) Both cases of discontinuity will work against both children's readiness for primary school and achieving the social language goals.

Personnel

A critical question for preschool education is the criteria for selecting teachers/caregivers. With respect to language, teachers should be fluent, ideally native, speakers of whatever language will be the medium of communication in the program. In the case of language revitalization programs, the largest, maybe the only, pool of such persons will be older adults, 'elders,' in the community. Such people are not apt to have formal teaching credentials. Whatever the benefits of having preschools part of the educational system, such placement may make it difficult, or even impossible, to employ these adults except in the low status of aides. And then that status of the speakers of the focal language influences public perception of the status of the language itself.

Status

If preschools are outside the educational system--for example, part of the welfare system--they may be considered 'inferior.' Where that is the case, that perception may be transferred to any special language program, such as for mother tongue revitalization. A consequence could be stronger resistance to it because of this perceived low status.

Similarly, wherever the program is situated, if it seems to be only for children who usually achieve poorly in school, then the program may become stigmatized as only 'remedial' or 'compensatory,' and some parents may shun it for this reason.

Examples of different arrangements

From India, we know of two experimental models which address the issue of preschool/primary school continuity. One is a program in the State of Rajasthan, where preprimary classes are attached to a primary school, and where the primary school teacher (after a short orientation and with continued in-service training) also teaches the preschoolers. The second is the Vikaswadi in the State of Maharashtra for rural 'tribal' children. It integrates a creche, a "Balwadi" (public preschool under the control of the Central Welfare Board) and a primary school into one organizational unit.

From her experience in Papua New Guinea, Delpit includes an extended discussion of these administrative issues. The vernacular preschools in Papua New Guinea, called Viles Tok Ples Skul (VTPS) are for children older than usual preschool age. Until these schools were established on an experimental basis in the North Solomons Province, children started primary school--called the "community school" but conducted in English--at age 7. After a decentralization of governmental authority gave communities in the North Solomons more autonomy, a working group of PNG university researchers and graduate students conducted a province-wide survey of opinions about education.

Community wishes and aspirations which emerged were for preschooling for children before Grade 1 in community school; delayed entry into Grade 1 until children were nine or ten years old; mother tongue literacy; and an education for the young in the customs, culture, and acceptable behavior of their local community and language group....[The children would then be] completing the six year primary program around age fourteen, when those who were not successful in attaining a high school place would be mature enough to enter some form of vocational training or return to take on a useful role in the village (Delpit, 1984,78,82).

With these goals, Delpit asks, "Should the VTPS be closely affiliated with the community school--under its rules and the headmaster's supervision--or should VTPS be a completely

separate entity under the full jurisdiction of 'the community,' however that is defined." She goes on to explore the trade-offs of benefits in possible answers:

Initially, VTPS was seen as a completely separate institution from the community school, with separate grounds and separate governance. As the scheme developed, communities felt it more practical to locate schools on existing community school campuses ... [and] under the same Board of Management.... They explained, "After all, it's the same parents, isn't it?"...

The benefit of VTPS being completely separate ...lies in its subsequent ability ...[to] become a school that parents and community would see as their responsibility and become more involved in its day to day operations. Perhaps it could also become a more integral part of the village as it was originally hoped it would be.

On the other hand, closer affiliation with the community school could provide some undeniable benefits too. Several tok ples schools have suffered high teacher absenteeism, leading community members to eventually complain to the VTPS supervisor or even to the central office in Arawa....If the community school headmaster took on that responsibility as he does for the community school teachers, the problems might be prevented before they become acute. Headmasters could also provide some supervision ... [although] Such supervision could only be of a limited nature at this time because headmasters ... are frequently unfamiliar with the purposes and method of VTPS, and those posted outside of their language areas cannot understand the local tok ples.

Furthermore, while VTPS has a specific purpose and aims, most people who support those aims would like to see them continued into community schools. Complete separation might prevent the kind of cross-fertilization that could influence the community school in a more community-sensitive and culturally responsive direction. The danger to be guarded against, of course, is that such cross-fertilization leads not to positive changes in the community school, but to greater bureaucratization and subsequent distancing from the community of the VTPS. Finally, should the two schools become more closely linked, coordination of curriculum elements could be undertaken more readily. Consultation between Grade 1 and VTPS teachers could provide a VTPS curriculum more relevant in facilitating community school achievement and a Grade 1 curriculum better able to enhance and build upon skills developed in VTPS (Delpit, 1984, pp. 193 - 5).

CONCLUSION

A major item on the developmental agenda for the child aged 0 to 6 is language. Accomplishments during this period typically include development of control over one's native language sufficient to enable participation in social interaction with peers and with adults, to provide the resources for telling and understanding stories, for giving and getting explanations of interesting phenomena, and for problem-solving using language. Furthermore, language development during this period typically culminates in the development of some metalinguistic and rhetorical abilities that will contribute to the achievement of literacy during the early school years,

Despite the centrality of language achievements in the developmental agenda of the first five years, language issues are rarely in the forefront of thinking about how to plan environments for young children. When designating programs to provide care and promote development during the preschool period (whether these programs are formal and classroom based, or more informal, community or home-based), optimizing the language environment becomes an issue typically only in cases where complex linguistic situations highlight it. For example, in multilingual societies where group care involves native speakers of several different languages, or in societies where preschool teachers are likely to use a national language different from that spoken by the children, some form of language planning for preschools might occur. We would argue that the quality of the language environment deserves attention for every young child, especially those in group care settings, whether monolingual or multilingual.

There is some basis in the research literature for describing the optimal language environment for preschool-aged children. This is an environment in which children have one-on-one interaction with adults as well as peers, in which adults attend and respond to children's communicative attempts, in which a rich array of interesting topics of conversation is made available, and in which real communication (rather than language teaching) is the primary activity.

In group care settings for preschool-aged children, a number of factors can be identified as constituting likely obstacles to an optimal language environment. Very large groups of children and high child/adult ratios both reduce the likelihood of the kind of one-on-one interactions between children and adults that are desirable. Repeated failure on the part of the adult to respond to the child's communicative attempts (either because of disinterest, because of commitment to more adult-centered activities, or because they do not share a language) constitutes another environmental obstacle. Failure on the part of adults to value the child's native language as a useful and valid communicative system similarly constitutes a risk to the child's language development. Failure on the part of the adult to recognize the need to attend to *all* children, including those who may seem shy, less interested in group activities, less responsive, or less competent, can further diminish the quality of the environment for them. A strong programmatic emphasis on teaching academic skills (letters, numbers, colors, rote memorization of materials) may absorb energies that could better be devoted to real communicative activities and language-enriching conversations. The absence of appropriate books and materials that provide the context for conversations that build oral vocabulary and readiness for literacy may likewise reduce the value of the language

environment to the child.

The prevalence of multilingualism in the world adds a particular urgency to the recommendation to attend to the quality of preschool settings as environments for language development. It is estimated that 60% of the children in the world will grow up in situations that will require some use of more than one language; for many of these, the second language will first be encountered at school or in a preschool group care context. Bilingualism does not constitute by itself any risk to children's development-- on the contrary, bilingual children may have some cognitive advantages over monolinguals, beyond the obvious advantage of knowing two languages. But multilingual environments may represent some risk to optimal development (by which we mean development to full control over all the modeled languages), simply because the quality of the information available about each of the languages to be learned may be compromised. Thus, multilingual societies in particular must attend to issues of the quality of the language environments available to preschool-aged children. At least in formal preschool programs, the options that have been chosen to introduce children to a second language include bilingual programs that utilize the native and the second language, immersion programs in which an entire group of children from the same language background interact with specially trained group leaders from another language, and submersion programs (entailing the greatest risk) in which a few children whose first language is not known to the staff are literally submerged in a second language setting without any provisions for language learning support.

Language development is not normally a perilous matter. Most children learn to talk quite easily and efficiently, because traditional patterns of child care provide adequate access to interaction and other sources of support. However, group-care settings for preschoolers, especially when combined with situations in which acquisition of a second language is expected, constitute potential problems; there is need to ensure attention to the quality of the preschool language environment when the situation is complicated in these ways. Furthermore, since age-appropriate language skills are crucial to effective functioning in school, we are threatening children's long-term optimal development by failing to ensure that they arrive in formal school settings with a full set of the language resources needed to support further learning.

References

[Entries followed by (*) are included in the "Annotated Bibliography"]

Arnberg, L. (1987). Raising children bilingually: The pre-school years. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Barrera de Martinez, S. (1985). La educación campesina. Testimonio de un conflicto cultural. [Rural education. Testimony of a cultural conflict]. La Paz: UNICEF and Editorial Offset Millan Ltda. (*)

Benton, R.A. (1984). Bilingual education and the survival of the Maori language. Journal of the Polynesian Society, 93, 247-266.

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1986). Alternatives in early childhood care and education: Report of the Bernard van Leer Foundation, 1984 - 1985. The Hague: Bernard van Leer Foundation. (*)

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1986, September). "Norway: Saami project teams meet." (Short Network News item). Newsletter 44, 12. (*)

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1987, January). "The Multicultural Context. 'Yes, I am a Saami'." Newsletter 45, 14-15. (*)

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1987, April). Reports from the field: From Rabat to Lima: contrasts and comparisons. Newsletter, No. 46, 15.

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1987, October). "Western Isles project praised by Scottish education inspectors." Newsletter 48, 15-16.

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1987, October). "Health and Nutrition." Special focus section of Newsletter 48, 1-10. (*)

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1989, January). "Bilingualism. Norway: changing mainstream attitudes." Newsletter 53, 5-6. (*)

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1989, July). Training: a process of empowerment. Peru: a joint venture. Newsletter, No. 55, 7-9.

Bernard van Leer Foundation. (1989, October). The right to read. Enriching children's language in Peru. Newsletter, No. 56, 4.

Bettelheim, R. & Takanishi, R. (1976). Early Schooling in Asia. McGraw-Hill. (*)

Blondin, G. (1989). The Development of the Zhahti Koe Slavey Language Program. Canadian Journal of Native Education. 16, 89-105.

Boelens, K.R. (1976). Frisian-Dutch bilingual primary schools. The Hague: Netherlands

Ministry of Education and Science. (*)

- Britsch-Devany, S. (1988). The collaborative development of a language renewal program for preschoolers. Human Organization, 47, 297-302.
- Campos, J. & Keatinge, R. (1988). The Carpintera language minority student experience: From theory to practice, and success. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.). Minority education: From shame to struggle. Clevedon (UK): Multilingual Matters.
- Cazden, C.B. (in press). Richmond Road: A multilingual/ multicultural school in New Zealand. Language in Education.
- Cazden, C.B. (1988). Environmental assistance revisited: Variation and functional equivalence. In F.S. Kessel (Ed.), The development of language and language researchers: Essays in honor of Roger Brown. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cornhairle Nan Eilean. [Western Isles Islands Council]. (1986). The Western Isles Community Education Project: Proposals for Integration and Enhancement. Report by Director of Education. Unpublished report. Obtained from Bernard van Leer Foundation.
- Constitución Política. (1988). Constitución política del Perú. (This is the currently valid Constitution, promulgated in 1979). Lima: Ediciones Palma.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 18-36.
- Cummins, J. (1989). Empowering minority students. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Delpit, L. (1984). Language, culture and self-determination: An ethnographically based evaluation of an experiment in schooling in Papua New Guinea. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University. (*)
- Dorling, B. (1989). Assessment of MUMS for the American Friends Service Committee. Philadelphia. Manuscript.
- Fantini, A. (1985). Language acquisition of a bilingual child: A sociolinguistic perspective. San Diego, CA: College Hill.
- Fasold, R.W. (1984). The sociolinguistics of society. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fleras, T.A. (1983) Te Kohanga Reo: Preparation for life or preparation for school. A preliminary report on the organization, objectives and implications of Maori language nests presented to the Department of Maori Affairs. Manuscript.
- Government Review Team. (1988, September). Report of the review of Te Kohanga Reo: Language is the life force of the people. Wellington, New Zealand.

- Greenberg, F. (1969). The devil has slippery shoes: A biased biography of the Child Development Group of Mississippi. New York: Macmillan.
- Heize-Baigorria, C. (1988). Fieldnotes Puno and Lima, Peru.
- Hoem, A. (1983). The situation of the Sami people in Norway. In: CERI/OECD [Centre for Educational Research and Innovation/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] (Ed.), The Education of Minority Groups. An Enquiry into Problems and Practices of Fifteen Countries. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower.
- Holm, A. & Holm, W. (1990). Rock Point, A Navajo way to go to school: A Valediction. In C.B.Cazden & C. Snow (Eds.). English plus: Issues in bilingual education. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March.
- Holobow, N.E., Genesee, F. & Lambert, W.E. (1987). Summary of Kahnawake test results, Spring 1987. Montreal: McGill University, Dept. of Psychology. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hornberger, N. (1988). Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance. Dordrecht-Holland: Foris.
- Hornberger, N. (1989). Pupil participation and teacher techniques: Criteria for success in a Peruvian bilingual education program for Quechua Children. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 77, 35-53.
- Hornberger, N. (5/19/89). Personal communication.
- Hornberger, N. (in press). 'Nucleos', 'Brigadas', and the PEEB: Policies becoming practice in schools of Puno, Peru. To be published in Ruiz, Richard (Ed.), Language, education, and politics. University of Texas Press.
- Ibañez Salazar, J. C. (1977). Non-formal education programmes for children and parents in Peru. Prospects, VII, 549-556.
- Johansson, Henning. (n.d., probably 1976). Investigations concerning the Lapps (Saamees). Summary of the research at the Department of Education, University of Umeå. Unpublished manuscript. Obtained from Bernard van Leer Foundation. (*)
- Kakamega Dicece [Kakamega District]. (n.d., probably 1988). Use of preschool as a base for providing integrated services. District based research report. Unpublished manuscript. Obtained from Bernard van Leer Foundation. (*)
- Kennedy, G. D. (1989). The learning of English in New Zealand by speakers of other languages. New Language Planning Newsletter (Mysore, India: Central Institute of Indian Languages), 4 (1), 1-5.
- Lall, G. R. & Lall, B. M. (Eds.). (1983). Comparative Early Childhood Education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

- Lall, G. R. & Poddar, S. (1983). Preschool education in India. In G. R. Lall & B. M. Lall (Eds.). Comparative early childhood education. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas. (*)
- Ley General de Educación. (1988). Nueva Legislación Actualizada de Educación y sus reglamentos y modificatorias. (This includes the currently valid Education Law [Ley No. 23394] of 1984). Lima: Ediciones MAS.
- López, L. E. (1988). Los Aymarahablantes en el Perú y su educación. [Aymara speakers in Peru and their education]. la educación, XXXII, No.3, 17-41.
- McCartney, K. (1984). Effect of quality of day care environment on children's language development. Developmental Psychology 20, 244-260.
- McLaughlin, D. (1989). The sociolinguistics of Navajo literacy. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 20, 275-290.
- Mead, M. (1973). Can the socialization of young children lead to greater acceptance of diversity? Young Children, 28, 322-332.
- Meyer, C. (1989). The role of peer relationships in the socialization of children to preschool: A Korean example. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Ministerio de Educación. (1977). Main Trends in Education. (Translation from the Spanish by INIDE). Lima: INIDE. PERU. (1981, 1982, 1983, 1984). Mensaje anual al congreso del Presidente de la República Arquitecto Fernando Belaúnde Terry con anejos informativos y estadísticos. Lima: Presidencia de la República.
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology [Kenya]. (1986). Kwale district centre for early childhood education. Report of the district based research project 1985 - 1986. Unpublished manuscript. Obtained from Bernard van Leer Foundation. (*)
- Mithun, M. & Chafe, W. L. (1979). Recapturing the Mohawk language. In T. Shopen (Ed.), Languages and their status. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop. (Reissued 1987 in paperback by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia). (*)
- Modiano, N. (1984). Bilingual-bicultural education in Mexico: Recent Research. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 9, 254-259. (*)
- Modiano, N. (1988). Public bilingual education in Mexico. In C. B. Paulston (Ed.), International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. (*)
- Morales, E. (1989). Cocaine. White gold rush in Peru. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Murray, J. & Morrison, C. (1984). Bilingual Primary Education in the Western Isles, Scotland. Report of the Bilingual Education Project 1975 - 1981. Stornoway, Isle of Lewis: Acair Ltd.
- Naik, C. (1978). Growing up at Kosbad Hill: A study of the Vikaswadi experiment. Kosbad:

Gram Bal Shiksa Kendra. (*)

Nashir, H. (1985). Pre-school education in the Arab world. Dover, N.H.: Croom Helm.

Pérez Alarcon, J., Abiega, L., Zarco, M. & Schugurensky, D. (1986). mezahualpilli. educación pre-escolar comunitaria. [Community Preschool Education]. México, D.F.: Centro de Estudios Educativos, A.C. (*)

Pla i Molins, M. (1983). El bilingüisme escolar a Barcelona. [Educational bilingualism in Barcelona]. Barcelona: Ediciones de la Magrama. (*)

Plan de Educación. (1971). (Approved 4 August, 1971). Lima: Presidencia de la República.

Proiseact Muinntir Nan Eilean. [The Community Education Project of the Western Isles]. (1987). Work Plan: Final Year 1 May 1986 - 30 April 1987, Unpublished work plan. Obtained from Bernard van Leer Foundation.

Raudenbush, S.W., Kidchanapanish, S. & Kang, S.J. (March, 1990). The effects of pre-primary access and quality on educational achievement in Thailand. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Institute of International Development & Harvard Graduate School of Education, Project BRIDGES. Casual Paper.

Rosario, F. M. & Pérez de Zapata, A. (1983). Estado del arte de la educación pre-escolar en la República Dominicana [State of the art on preschool education in the Dominican Republic]. Santiago de los Caballeros, República Dominicana: Centro de Documentación de Investigación Educativa: Centro de Investigaciones, Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra.

Ruopp, R., Travers, J., Glantz, F., & Coelen, C. (1979). Children at the center: Final results of the National Day Care Study. Boston, MA: Abt Associates.

Saunders, G. (1988). Bilingual children: From birth to teens. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Scott, Phyllis M., and Darbyshire, Margaret. (n.d., but after 1972). Early education programs and aboriginal families in Victoria. Bernard van Leer Foundation pre-school report Monash University: 1969 - 1972. Unpublished report. (*)

Scottish Education Department. HM Inspector of Schools. (1987). Community education in the Western Isles. Report of an inspection between May and October 1986. Edinburgh: Scottish Education Department.

Scotton, C. M. (1988). Patterns of bilingualism in East Africa (Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania). In C. B. Paulston (Ed.), International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. (*)

Siguan, M. (1981). Plurilingüismo en España y sus nuevas perspectivas [Multilingualism in Spain and its new perspectives]. In Cireel (Ed.), (1982). Statut et gestion des langues. Actes du 2e colloque international "Langues et coopération européen." [Status and management of languages. Proceedings of the second international colloquium on

"Languages and European cooperation."] Clamart, France. (*)

- Siguan, M. (1988). Bilingual education in Spain. In C. B. Paulston (Ed.), International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education. Westport, CT: Greenwood. (*)
- Siguan, M. (10/4/89). Personal communication. (*)
- Siguan, M. (1989). Catalan and Castilian in school. A first evaluation. In E. Zuanella Sonino (Ed.), Literacy in school and society. Multidisciplinary perspectives. N.Y. and London: Plenum Press. (*)
- Shorish, M. M. (1988). Bilingual Education in Soviet Central Asia. In Paulston, C. B. (Ed.), International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education. Westport, CT: Greenwood. (*)
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), Minority education: From shame to struggle. Clevedon & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Slaughter, H.B. & Watson-Gegeo, K. (1988). Evaluation report for the first year of the Hawaiian language immersion program. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Manoa. Manuscript.
- Slobin, D.I. (Ed.) (1985). The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition. Volume 1: The data. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Smith, L.G. (1984, March). "Pono ki te Kaupapa": An evaluation of the acquisition of Maori language skills in the kohanga reo at Waiwhetuu. Wellington (New Zealand): Polytechnic School of Languages.
- Snow, C.E. (1989). Understanding social interaction and language acquisition: Sentences are not enough. In M. Bornstein & J. Bruner (Eds.), Interaction in human development. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spolsky, B. (1986). Overcoming language barriers to education in a multilingual world. In B. Spolsky (Ed.) Language and education in multilingual settings. Clevedon (UK): Multilingual Matters 25.
- Stairs, A. (1988). Beyond cultural inclusion: An Inuit example of indigenous educational development. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), Minority education: From shame to struggle. Clevedon & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Styngner, L. H. (1983). Early childhood education in Norway. In G. R. Lall and B. M. Lall (Eds.), Comparative Early Childhood Education. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas. (*)
- Szepe, György & Dovala, Marta. (1989). Literacy problems in Hungary. In E. Zuanelli Sonino (Ed.), Literacy in school and society. Multidisciplinary perspectives. N. Y. & London: Plenum Press. (*)

- Tabors, P.O. (1987). The development of communicative competence by second language learners in a nursery school classroom: An ethnolinguistic study. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Taeschner, T. (1983). The sun is feminine: A study on language acquisition in bilingual children. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Teasdale, G. R. and Whitelaw, A.J. (1981). The early childhood education of aboriginal Australians. A review of six action-research projects. Hawthorn, Victoria: The Australian Council for Educational Research Limited. (*)
- Te Kohanga Reo Trust. (n.d.). Certificate syllabus. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Test, J. (1988). Communicative interactions between infants and adults at day care and at home: A comparison of Sweden and the United States. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Tichy, Heinz & Wiener Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Volksgruppenfragen-Volksgruppeninstitut (Eds.). (1987). Unterricht und Bildung in den Volksgruppensprachen. [Schooling and education in the ethnic groups' languages]. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller Universitätsbuchhandlung. (*)
- Tizard, B. (1981) Language at home and at school. In C.B. Cazden (Ed.). Language in early childhood education. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Tizard, B., Cooperman, O., Joseph, A., & Tizard, J. (1972). Environmental effects on language development: A study of young children in long-stay residential nurseries. Child Development, 43, 337-358.
- Tizard, B. & Hughes, M. (1984). Young children learning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tobin, J. J., Wu, D. Y. H., & Davidson, D. H. (1989). Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China, and the United States. New Haven: Yale University Press. (*)
- Trillos Amaya, M. (1987). El Euskera: Patrimonio Lingüístico del Gran País Vasco. [The Basque language: Linguistic heritage of the Basques provinces.]. Glotta, 2, 8-19. (*)
- UNESCO. (1953). The use of vernacular languages in education. Paris: UNESCO. Excerpt in J. Fishman (Ed.) (1968) Readings in the sociology of language (688-716). The Hague: Mouton.
- Wells, G. (1985). Preschool literacy-related activities and success in school. In D.R.Olson, N. Torrance & A. Hildyard (Eds.), Language, literacy and learning (229-255). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zavala Aparicio, A. (1982). Estudio exploratorio de los procesos psicolingüísticos en niños de 4 años: casos de Lima y Tacna. Lima: INIDE.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY
to
"LANGUAGE PLANNING IN PRESCHOOL EDUCATION"

This Annotated Bibliography is a supplement to a report with the same name. Both were prepared at the request of the Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development, UNICEF (New York), July 1990, with the support from the International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	Pg. 1
Australia - Aborigines	Pg. 2
Austria - Stable Language Minorities	Pg. 5
Bolivia - Aymara	Pg. 7
Canada - Native Canadians (Mohawk)	Pg. 9
Canada - Native Canadians (Slavey)	Pg. 10
China	Pg. 12
Hungary - "Nationalities' Languages" and "Gypsy"	Pg. 13
India - Tribal Children in "Vikaswadis"	Pg. 15
Kenya - Arabic and Swahili	Pg. 18
Mexico - Various Indian Languages	Pg. 20
Norway - Saami	Pg. 21
Papua, New Guinea - Vernacular Preschools	Pg. 23
Spain - Catalan and Basque	Pg. 26
Netherlands - Frisian	Pg. 30
USSR - General, and Soviet Central Asia	Pg. 32

INTRODUCTION

1. The following "annotated bibliography" is in one way less and in another way more than an annotated bibliography: less, because not all documents included are annotated separately; more because it is organized around themes, and closer to the genre of essay reviews rather than annotations. We have opted for this approach, because it allowed us to not only present documented information, but also include more extensive comments which tie in with the main body of the paper.
 2. The "themes" are countries/communities which have specific features in terms of the role of language/s at the preschool level. Thus, the entries are listed alphabetically by country/community.
 3. With the purpose of making some kind of comparison easier, most entries follow the same scheme: Specific features of the document/s discussed are organized under a set of headings. These are:
 - Document source/s (what kind of document/s were consulted);
 - Community (including language situation);
 - Educational system specifics (of the country or community involved);
 - Program with the following subheadings characteristics/components
 - a) Characteristics/components
 - b) Origin
 - c) Program goals
 - d) Specific objectives
 - e) Difficulties in Implementation
 - f) Outcomes
 - Comments (these are our comments, not additional ones made by the authors of the documents)
- "N.a." following any of these headings or subheadings means "not applicable" or "not available", according to the situation and document/s. A few entries differ slightly from this organization, either because less or more material was available which did not fit into the set of headings.
4. For documents in languages other than English a translation of the title is given in [..] following the original title.

Australia - Aborigines

BERNARD VAN LEER FOUNDATION. Newsletters No. 45 (January 1987), No. 48 (October 1987). (A)

BERNARD VAN LEER FOUNDATION. (1986). Alternatives in early childhood care and education. Report of the Bernard van Leer Foundation, 1984 - 1985. The Hague: Bernard van Leer Foundation, pp. 18 - 20. (B).

SCOTT, PHYLLIS M., and DARBYSHIRE, MARGARET. (n.d., but after 1972). Early education programs and aboriginal families in Victoria. Bernard van Leer Foundation pre-school report Monash University: 1969 - 1972. Unpublished report. (276 pages). (C)

TEASDALE, G. R. and WHITELOW, A.J. (1981). The early childhood education of aboriginal Australians. A review of six action-research projects. Hawthorn, Victoria: The Australian Council for Educational Research Limited. (175 pages). (D)

Document sources: (A), (B) and (C) contain short descriptions by the main sponsoring institution of four of the six projects referred to below. (C) is a detailed account of one project written by the project coordinator and a project-employed psychologist. (D) is a research/evaluation report by two Australian scholars.

The documents consulted cover six different projects all concerned with educational provisions for aboriginal Australians. In the following, after a brief summary of the main issues of all six projects (section I), we concentrate on the language issues of two of these, the "Bourke Project" and the "Queensland Project" - the only two of the six which have a specific language component (section II).

I. General Issues - All Projects

Communities: Aboriginal communities in various parts of Australia (Bourke project involved aboriginal and white children). Projects only in communities where standard English and/or aboriginal English are spoken. Depending on project, aboriginal English seen as "impoverished" English or as dialect in its own right. No attempts made in these six projects to revitalize any tribal language/s.

Origin: Expansion of aboriginal preschool facilities a direct result of change in federal government policy. Projects timely to serve two functions: accelerate government action in field of aboriginal education and focus interest at early childhood level (D, p. 147).

Common goal: Help overcome some of initial educational disadvantages encountered by aboriginal children, pave way for higher levels of school achievement (D, p. xiii).

Difficulties of implementation: "usual problems of action-research: too much pressure to achieve results quickly; poor communication between project staff; ...conflicting demands of human need versus research design...(D, pp. 136/7)." In addition because of location: huge distances, extreme climate.

Outcomes: actual establishment of preschool facilities; positive effects on children's general academic and social development including easier adjustment to formal schooling; less shy at school; more regular attendance; clearer and more fluent speech; improved general health and nutrition. But all based on impressionistic reporting, not objectively measured outcomes. Very little research output.

II. Language issues - Bourke project and Queensland project

The **Bourke Project**, started in 1969 by child psychiatrists and psychologists, established a compensatory highly structured preschool program in the town of Bourke (New South Wales). Main feature: strong emphasis on language development. Based on deficit hypothesis (that the children's major handicap is impoverished English), project was based on so-called Bereiter-Englemann method where preschoolers receive "verbal bombardment [here of standard Australian English] by trained teachers in a special setting (D, p. 53)" and 'participate' by shouting out speech patterns, drills, etc.

Comments

The Bereiter-Englemann approach has come under a lot of criticism, and it seems unlikely that anyone would openly support its use (or a similar approach) in preschool and/or early primary school settings that encourage language maintenance or promote language revitalization actively. However, classroom observation in a rural primary school in the Department of Puno (Peru), showed that the "shouting out" of speech patterns, drills, and shouted out chorus repetition of the teacher's answers is still relied upon by--in this case primary school--teachers. (This approach was used in a Spanish-medium as well as in an Aymara-medium class). The observer's impression was that the children were well used to this method and that attempts at other methods such as eliciting non-drill, non-repetitive individual responses largely failed (Heise-Baigorria, 1988, fieldnotes). Is this simply more evidence that 'meaningful' teaching cannot take place unless the teacher and children "speak the same language"--i.e. understand each other? Or to what extent does this reflect antiquated, insufficient, or non-existent teacher training? We raise this question, because--irrespective of level--teacher training is a major component in many education projects. Policy makers must be informed not only about what really goes on in the classroom, but also about the motives teachers have for choosing particular teaching styles and methods. Unless these motives are understood it seems fruitless to try to 'convince' teachers of 'better' approaches; and to get to know teachers' motives, dialogue with teachers must take place.

The **Queensland Project**, for 5 - 8 year olds also put great emphasis on language development. It started out with a similarly strong compensatory approach which described the children's language (i.e. aboriginal English) as inadequate and impoverished. However, due to the personal philosophies of some of the fieldworkers and large amount of data collected on children's usage of language in their natural settings, the concept of "language deficit" quickly changed to one of "language difference". Extensive language research was done and distinctions between aboriginal English and standard English clarified. They were both described as dialects and it became one of the principal goals of the project to help the child become fully bidialectal: facilitate the use of standard English in school settings; enhance the use of aboriginal English in out-of-school settings; actively support switching between aboriginal English and standard English. In the "oral language" part of the program,

language units that were introduced moved "progressively from words and sequences common to both aboriginal English and standard English, to those constructions not found in aboriginal English (D, p. 159)."

Characteristic of this project--and in this markedly different from Bourke project--was combination of four 'strands' integrated around language units: oral language patterns of standard English; reading and writing skills; perceptual skills; problem solving and critical thinking. Project has been described as most thoroughly researched and carefully prepared program for aboriginal children in Australia. Soon became adopted in aboriginal schools throughout the State and had major impact on language arts curriculum for all primary schools in Queensland.

Austria - Stable language minorities (1987)

TICHY, HEINZ and Wiener Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Volksgruppenfragen-Volksgruppeninstitut (Eds.). (1987). Unterricht und Bildung in den Volksgruppensprachen. [Schooling and education in the ethnic groups' languages]. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller Universitätsbuchhandlung. (142 pages).

Document source: Collection of papers presented at a 1983 symposium organized by the "Wiener Arbeitsgemeinschaft..." [Vienna Working Group for the Concerns of Ethnic Groups - Institute for Ethnic Groups]. Majority of contributors to this volume are of an ethnic minority in Austria (e.g. Croat, Slovene, Czech, Hungarian).

Community: various ethnic groups, but mainly Slovenes in the state of Kärnten and Croats in the state of Burgenland. Hardly any monolingual Slovenian or Croatian speakers. No details about language use.

Educational system specifics: Federal laws determine national language and specific rights for ethnic groups, but education is "Länder" [states] -responsibility. Schooling for ethnic groups in Kärnten and Burgenland substantially different; participation in bilingual (Slovenian/German) schooling in Kärnten based on parental decision; in Burgenland on percentage of size of ethnic (non-German L1 speaking) group in the area and subsequent decision of the Land's superintendent. Provision of bilingual or ethnic group language kindergartens not obligatory.

Program

a) **Characteristics/components:** Some kindergartens or kindergarten-groups exist in all ethnic group languages, but availability differs. Kärnten has no public, and only three (!) private bilingual kindergartens; but there are 67 (!) elementary schools where children are registered for the bilingual or Slovenian program. Kindergarten teachers are not adequately trained for work in bilingual kindergartens: Slovenian language is only an optional 2 hour/week course in kindergarten teacher training; nothing else is offered.

b) **Origin:** Federal laws of 1955 concerning ethnic rights; Burgenländish Education Law of 1937 and Kärnten Education Law for Minorities of 1959. Slovene and Croatian cultural and/or religious groups and some parent initiatives promote public bilingual kindergartens.

c) **Program goals:** To help support successful development of ethnic groups.

d) **Specific teaching objectives:** n.a.

e) **Difficulties in implementation:** Pedagogical arguments were not heard; plans for an obligatory bilingual education program victim to political interests; main problem is parent resistance: parents pressured by political and social groups against Slovene in general and bilingual kindergartens and schooling in particular. Slovene/bilingual kindergartens receive less financial help. Too few qualified teachers. In case of Croatian: children's language (Burgenländish-Croatian) different from standard Croatian-Serbian (as promoted in elementary school).

f) **Outcomes:** n.a.

Comments

- Education for Hungarians in Burgenland and Vienna and for Czechs in Vienna are further topics, but only briefly treated, and only concerning formal schooling (which excludes kindergarten).

- Book deals extensively with legal bases for and political fights over ethnic group education (term "minority" is specifically rejected).

Bolivia - Aymara (1985)

BARRERA DE MARTINEZ, SUSANA (1985). La educación campesina. Testimonio de un conflicto cultural. [Rural education. Testimony of a cultural conflict]. La Paz: UNICEF and Editorial Offset Millan Ltda. (226 pages).

Document source: In-depth case-study-based investigation sponsored by the Canadian International Development Research Centre, published by UNICEF.

Community: Rural Andean Highland Aymaras in Santiago de Huata District near the Titicaca Lake, province of Omasuyos, department of La Paz, Bolivia. District's pop. approx. 20,000; about 1,100 of these in town of Santiago de Huata; about 5,500 in the 10 communities under investigation. These chosen as representative of Bolivia's large rural Aymara-speaking population, and characterized as in the "heart of the Aymara world" with a "strong language loyalty"; use of Aymara is preferred over use of Spanish by large majority, particularly in the home. In province of Omasuyos by 93%; in Omasuyos 50% are bilingual (Aymara/Spanish); 1% is monolingual Spanish. 53% illiteracy in Omasuyos.

Undernourishment and high infant mortality rate are chronic problems. Parents' progressive impoverishment and loss of land motivate younger generation to migrate to cities and other regions.

Educational system specifics: Educational segregation depending on type of school (rural, urban fiscal, private). Many rural children start working as early as 3-4 years old; most 4-5 year-olds are integral part of family work force. Pre-school is defined as the two levels of structured, formal pre-elementary education for four-to six-year olds. Non-obligatory. Nationwide about 28% of 4-5 year-olds assist. Two to three times more in urban than in rural areas.

Program

a) **Characteristics/components:** Two national official programs for rural pre-school education are in use. Objectives and contents are very similar to those for urban programs. Curriculum not based on rural reality; e.g. agrarian activities only tangential; teachers give them no importance. **Language of instruction is Spanish.** Aymara proficient teachers use Aymara only as a "last resort" when children do not understand what was said in Spanish, particularly at beginning of school year. Pre-school teachers promote individualism and competition among children, whereas Aymaran communities are characterized by solidarity and mutual cooperation.

b) **Origin:** 1981 "Programa Mínimo para el Nivel Pre-Primario Rural" [Minimum program for pre-primary rural education] under the national supervision of pre-primary education of the Ministry of Education and Culture and the "Contenidos Mínimos del Programa de Educación Prebásica Rural" [Minimum contents for the rural pre-primary education program]. Both come from and are under supervision of national public institutions (ministry of education and national directorate of initial rural education). Since 1918 eight education plans of diverse orientations for pre-school; majority with emphasis on socializing child into formal school life (i.e. Spanish only education); plan of 1918 was the only one that contained as a teaching objective "various exercises in the mother tongue."

c) **Program goals:** Prepare children for formal primary education. Adapt them to a learning environment that is removed from their ethno-cultural reality. Help children "overcome the archaic ways of their parents' life" and teach them "modern models."

d) **Specific teaching objectives:** Castellization. Teachers' objectives as expressed in this investigation, reflect to some extent parents' expectations. Many parents expect children to a) learn Spanish, b) learn to read and write in pre-school. Parents' expectations reflect dominant group's pressures: Spanish seen as (only) way to better future, higher social status.

e) **Difficulties in implementation:** Aymara is seen as principal "obstacle" in pre-school teaching and learning although almost all involved (children, parents and most teachers) dominate it. Language becomes a problem even whith Aymaran proficient (i.e. bilingual) teachers, because methodologies and materials for fostering bilingualism are not available. Lack of these reinforces teachers' negative attitude towards Aymara as medium of instruction and towards Aymaran culture in general.

- Pre-schoolers desert program for various reasons, prominent among these are: Children have to work; whole families migrate in hope of better income possibilities; and pre-schoolers suffer severely because of tremendous clash between Aymaran family/community life and Spanish-only urban-style formal education.
- High student teacher ratio (28:1); lack of facilities and materials.

f) **Outcomes:** In highlands of Department of La Paz 13% do not finish pre-school. Children experience serious confusion.

Comments

- Book investigates a "what-is" situation, but in view of Ministry of Education's intent to expand pre-school education and rural education for adults . The Ministry's objectives as regards pre-school education include: extend rural pre-school education and consider native languages [Aymara and Quechua] in new curriculum.

- Investigator's recommendations include: health and nutrition programs alongside and related to pre-school program; program based on rural life reality with emphasis on continuity between home and community life and school environment; bilingual program with corresponding texts, teaching materials and trained teachers. Administrative bases to ensure continuity of this type of program through all levels; foster parent participation and parent further education through non-formal education programs.

Canada - Native Canadian (Mohawk)

MITHUN, MARIANNE, and CHAFE, WALLACE L. (1979). Recapturing the Mohawk language. In SHOPEN, T. (Ed.). Languages and their status. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop. (Reissued 1987 in paperback by University of Pennsylvania Press, PA).

Document source: Description of program by two supportive insiders.

Community: Mohawk community in Caughnawaga, Quebec, just North of the US border. English/Mohawk bilingual situation with few monolingual Mohawk speakers, but about 1000 Mohawks speak Mohawk perfectly. Mohawk is spoken primarily by adults over 30 - 40 years old and by many children. Most teenagers are confined to English.

Educational system specifics: n.a.

Program

- a) **Characteristics/components:** Bilingual program. Mohawk taught to all children from nursery school through grade 6 and to those who want it in high school.
- b) **Origin:** Grassroots level and voluntary. A dedicated group of Mohawk teachers learned to master Mohawk and designed language curriculum in their spare time over a period of several years.
- c) **Program goals:** revitalize Mohawk; provide for Mohawk children a link with their past and source of solidarity; recapture personal and social identity.
- d) **Specific teaching goals:** Teach a "way of thinking" in Mohawk, and get an understanding of the polysynthetic nature of Mohawk and of its rich metaphorical and idiomatic usage. Enable children to participate in a form of enjoyment specifically related to their language (linguistic manipulations for teasing, entertainment).
- e) **Difficulties/problems of implementation:** unavailability of materials; little everyday exposure to written language outside of school; limited funds; but major problem was community resistance. For many Mohawk speaking adults, speaking Mohawk had been a reason for ridicule and difficulties in school, and less than excellent command of English later in life a reason for job discrimination. Convincing parents of usefulness of Mohawk revitalization and soliciting their help and that of wider community in general therefore became one of the major components of the program.
- f) **Outcomes:** overcame community's resistance; gained community's active interest and participation in program; demand for adult Mohawk classes; children again use Mohawk spontaneously among themselves and with adults outside of school.

Comments: Substantial part of chapter describes characteristics of Mohawk language and invites reader to "learn" some Mohawk while reading the chapter. This is helpful in understanding vast differences between Mohawk and English and fun to read.

Canada - Native Canadians (Slavey)

BLONDIN, GEORGINA (Gina). (1989). The Development of the Zhahti Koe Slavey Language Program. Canadian Journal of Native Education Vol. 16, No. 2., pp. 89 - 105.

Document source: Description of program and account of how it developed by supporter of program. Author relies heavily on information and opinions provided by two persons involved in program since its early stage.

Community: Small community (called Zhahti Koe, in English known as Fort Providence) of Native Americans along Mackenzie River, Northwest Territories. Population of 602 (in 1981): 76% Dene, 11% Metis, 14% others. Different dialects spoken in region are understood by most of the Dene (in English known as South Slavey). Slavey, French, English are spoken; French because of remaining impact of Roman Catholic mission established in mid-1800s.

Educational system specifics: n.a., but education still influenced by earlier Roman Catholic missionary work.

Program

a) **Characteristics/components:** A "three-stage" program: **First stage:** "initiation period" (1980-81) included preliminary research (see below under "Origin"), meetings, consultations with other communities involved in indigenous language programs. Hiring of research team. A short **second stage** (summer 1981): Teacher training, research and development of curriculum and Slavey teaching material. **Third stage:** implementation in school and continuation of research.

Main components:

- Ongoing research projects on traditional Dene way of life to gather materials for oral Slavey program were based on interviews with elders and parents;
- All researchers local, of Dene descent and Slavey/English bilingual, most already involved in education (as teachers, aids, parents);
- Home visits to parents by school principal and LEA chairperson to inform of program;
- **Oral Slavey language program:** Kindergarten in Slavey; grades one through nine one-half hour of oral Slavey each day implemented in ([the] one) school;
- Intensive Slavey language evening course to adult population (oral and written language);
- Above led to decision to put **written Slavey in school curriculum**; - establishment of Slavey Program Development Committee to insure ongoing implementation and coordination of program in school;
- Since September 1982: full (oral and written) Slavey language program **made compulsory** to all children with at least one part of Slavey descendant; recommended for those of non-Slavey descent;
- Since 1983: Slavey a required program.

b) **Origin:** Started as research project in 1980: a community survey documented community's wish to incorporate more Slavey culture and language into school program. Grew into "Slavey Research Centre"; then became a program. Author stresses that involvement of

variety of people and groups was essential to program's initial development. Apart from research team, these included the Chief and the Dene Band Council (representing the community); Settlement Council (representing Local Government); LEA (some kind of local school authority; not specified in text, and Appendix not available); area superintendent; school principal. Significant that first funding proposal was signed by Chief of Dene Band, all members of research team and two 'informants to this study'.

c) **Program goals:** Raise overall low academic achievement of students who had [all] followed English-medium instruction; make learning fun and interesting; improve communication between elders and children; save knowledge about Dene traditional way of life values and culture and save and revitalize the language; address needs identified by community itself.

d) **Specific objectives:**

- Develop Slavey teaching materials for full oral program of immersion at Kindergarten level and half-hour daily instruction for grades 1-9;
- Establish a full "bilingual program".

e) **Difficulties in implementation:** reservations about including written Slavey into the program; parental opposition to making program compulsory.

f) **Outcomes:** "children's language skills improved to the point where "non-fluent" category was eliminated (all now "passively bilingual or fluent"); "increasingly positive self-concept among Dene students"; "strengthened and affirmed use of Slavey today"; saved traditional knowledge; increased community's participation in decision making; strengthened community; established important precedent; "pioneered approach to community language development." Outcomes attributed not least to ability to combine mobilizing community support with working within the "political machinery."

Comments

- Article mentions rather fleetingly that there were reservations to the move from oral language to a written standardized form and that there was opposition to making the Slavey program compulsory for (part-) Slavey descendent children. The comments on how this was handled are confusing: on the one hand, "the project [the research team?] and the LEA decided to introduce written Slavey..." and the "LEA unanimously [established] the [above mentioned] policy [on compulsory program participation]"; on the other hand, the author implies that the "collective process" and "traditional Dene methods of decision-making, based on consensus" were instrumental in solving these difficulties.

- The "LEA" is presented as a major force in the establishment of this program, and the reader is referred to "Appendix K" which (presumably) specifies what "LEA" stands for and who is part of it. Unfortunately, though, this Appendix (and Appendices A through J) are missing.

China

TOBIN, JOSEPH J., WU, DAVID Y.H., and DAVIDSON, DANA H. (1989). Preschool in three cultures: Japan, China, and the United States. New Haven: Yale University Press.

In chapter 3 (Dong-feng: A Chinese Preschool) and chapter 5 (A Comparative Perspective) we find information about the role of "language" and "language teaching" in the Chinese preschool: Preschools begin educating the children in the civic virtues that "lie at the heart of the revolution" (p. 220). This has its reflection also in language teaching which "is centered on encouraging children to express that which is socially shared rather than, as in the United States, on that which is individual and personal (p. 191)."

"...[H]elping children develop language skills is believed central to the mission of the preschool...The emphasis in language development is on enunciation, diction, memorization, and self-confidence in speaking and performing. Chinese children learn in preschool to recite stories and inspirational moral tales ... [they] flawlessly deliver long, rehearsed speeches...(pp. 188/89)."

"Oral skills are approached as an academic subject: Chinese teachers frequently correct children's mispronunciations and misusage and encourage them to learn public speaking as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic (p. 191)."

With this stated emphasis on language education, we find it unfortunate that nowhere is there any mention of the use of different languages in different provinces or communities or of the possibility of more than one language in one preschool.

Hungary - "Nationalities' languages" and "Gypsy"

SZEPE, GYÖRGY and DOVALA, MARTA. (1989). Literacy problems in Hungary. In SONINO, ELISABETTA ZUANELLI (Ed). Literacy in school and society. Multidisciplinary perspectives. N.Y. & London: Plenum Press.

Document source: Descriptive chapter by scholars.

Community: Population of 10.7 million, considered monolingual by and large with about 95% belonging to Hungarian nationality. Rest know Hungarian to a certain extent. Non-Hungarians divided into regular "nationalities" (e.g. Germans, Slovaks, etc.) and an "ethnic group", the Gypsies (with three language groups).

Educational system specific: Cost of education mostly covered by the state. Very high attendance of preschool: In 1984, almost 90% of 3-6 year olds attended the regular (non-obligatory) preschool. An additional 4% took a 192-hour preparation course. Following eight-class primary is compulsory. Special education exists at primary and nursery school levels.

Program

a) **Characteristics/components:** (For children with L1 other than Hungarian): Three types of preschools available: 1. "Nationality-language preschool" : same program as Hungarian preschool, but working language is that of nationality; three times a week Hungarian is medium of activity. (Most children here are bilingual with slight predominance of Hungarian over their parents' language). 2. "Language-teaching preschool": Hungarian preschool with three times a week nationality language as medium of activity, and 3. the most recent: preschool which employs one of the Gypsy dialects jointly with Hungarian as means of communication. Decision between use of 1. or 2. lies in competence of local education authority and is conditioned by availability of bilingual trained preschool teachers and aids.

b) **Origin:** n.a.

c) **Program goals:** prepare children for primary school; in the case of Gypsies address the problem of unproportionately high presence in "correctional first class" and high drop out rate.

d) **Specific objectives:** develop communicative skills; literacy readiness (but not teaching reading or writing).

e) **Difficulties in implementation:** for program in "nationalities languages": lack of professionally trained bilingual nurses and aids; for Gypsy dialect program: no training of Gypsy educators so far.

f) **Outcomes:** In 1984, about 5% had grade repetition of some kind (before joining normal first grade); but document does not provide separate data for Hungarian L1 and others (and in this group for participants of different programs).

Comments

- Parental influence on choice of type of preschool is unclear.
- Continuity of preschool-primary school approach is ensured for children of national minorities who learn reading and writing in their own language if they attend a nationality primary school. (Acquisition of Hungarian reading begins in second grade in these schools).
- Few primary schools have a Gypsy dialect as an auxiliary language. In these, (any) reading and writing begins in second half of first year; "speech development" (in Gypsy) is given in first half instead. This latter approach is as yet an unsystematic attempt to find a more promising way of schooling for Gypsies. Whether this is exclusively a "compensatory" approach or also includes a concern about maintaining or revitalizing Gypsy languages and culture cannot be deduced from the text. "Gypsy education" would most likely be a fascinating and informative area of study in relation with language maintenance and revitalization.

India - Tribal children in "Vikaswadis"

BETTELHEIM, RUTH and TAKANISHI, RUBY. (1976). Chapter 8 ('India') in Early Schooling in Asia. McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 131 - 156. (A)

LALL, GEETA R. and PODDAR, SUSHILA. (1983). Preschool education in India. In In LALL, GEETA RANI and LALL, BERNARD MOHAN (Eds.). Comparative early childhood education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, pp. 32 -47. (B)

NAIK, CHAITRA. (1978). Growing up at Kosbad Hill: A study of the Vikaswadi experiment. Kosbad: Gram Bal Shiksha Kendra.

Document sources: (A) and (B) are descriptive accounts of the history and organization of preschool education in India. Of these, (A) seems the more thorough. (C) is a book-size account written by an ardent advocate of the "Vikaswadis". Of the three documents this is of most interest to us. To put the Vakiswadi document into context we first give minimal background information on preschools in India:

General situation and issues

Types of preschools: There are different types of preschools: The (private) Montessori system and Froebelian kindergarten (the influence of Montessori and Froebel are very widespread in India); the 'minimum-standard preschool (literate rural women conduct these preschools; children and expectant mothers are being fed here; there is no special equipment and there are no special buildings); the 'mobile creches for working mothers' children (for communities that consist mainly of migrant workers, e.g. in construction work; improvised facilities; the (two dozen) 'laboratory preschools' attached to universities which have well structured programs, are well staffed, well equipped and the public so-called 'Balwadis', public preschools, controlled by the Central Welfare Board.

Language/s in (preschool) education: (Based only on document A; document B has nothing about language/s). Language used in most **private [pre-] schools**, except those catering to the upper classes [!], is generally mother tongue of the children. Schools for the upper classes use English (as do exclusive primary and secondary schools.) But language of instruction in Indian **primary schools** is the predominant language of the state, **which may or may not be the children's mother tongue**. Fourteen state languages out of more than 105 Indian languages are used for instruction. If instructional language used is not Hindi, children must learn it as well as English. Thus, Indian children must often learn to read and write minimum of two and sometimes four languages, including two or more alphabet systems.

Educational priorities: With high rate of adult illiteracy and many parents' unfamiliarity with the school system, preschool is seen as critical to prepare children for entrance into primary school. However, despite the strong interest in preschool education in India (prebasic education for children under 7 as the first part of basic education for all Indian children was a Gandhian concept), priority lies in universal primary education and eradication of illiteracy. In 1979, only 2% of three to five year olds attended preschools.

(1982: about 12700 preschools in India, compared to about 15200 in Japan in 1984). (UN Statistical Yearbook 1984/5).

Remedial character: As in many other countries, preschool education is associated with the problem of failure in the primary schools. Hence, preschools have a compensatory origin much like those of 'Headstart' in the USA.

Continuity preschool-primary school: Two experimental models are mentioned: 1) The program in the state of Rajasthan, where preprimary classes are attached to primary school: the first-grade class is reduced to a half-day session, and the (same) primary teacher (after a short orientation and with regular in-service training) also teaches the preschool. 2) the "Vikaswadi" (in the state of Maharashtra) which integrates a crèche, a Balwadi, and a primary school into one organizational unit. This is described in more detail below:

THE "VIKASWADI": education for tribal children
(The following is based on document C).

The Vikaswadis, a combination of crèche, Balwadi and preschool, were developed out of the so-called Anganwadis, "courtyard centres" [for which the "Western" term "open preschools" is not really adequate.] Anganwadis, developed in the late 40s, early 50s were decentralized preschool centres "held in any available spot" (a courtyard of a house, under a tree, etc..) where teachers went out to attract children, and the first educational provision, where Harijan children (untouchables) were also induced to come. Children from ages six months to 15 years gathered in Anganwadis which were also an informal training ground for older siblings--mainly girls--and for parents. The Vikaswadis were an effort to bring together in one unit the different age groups of the Anganwadis and to provide a more organized and stable, but non-formal educational program for tribal children. The first Vikaswadi was started in 1954, and by 1956, the Indian government provided financial assistance for conducting Vikaswadis as "a special project for the education fo tribal children (p.35). Objectives and characteristics of Vikaswadis are: non-directive child education, right of child to learn in an atmosphere of freedom and creativity, educate parents alongside with children, first step for educators: to go among the people to learn (part of Gandhian approach), avoid heavy expenditure and ostentation.

The Vikaswadi in Kosbad

Community: People of the Warli tribe. **Language situation:** Main regional (non-tribal) languages in the Kosbad area are Gujarati and Marathi. Tribals speak their own language. The observer contends that "The vocabulary of the tribal dialect is extremely limited and most adults can manage with just about 300 words at their disposal. By habit, the tribals are reticent and there is not much conversation between parents and children either (p.38)."

Educational system specifics: n.a.

Program

a) **Characteristics/components:** 1. Most important feature is its integrated approach: not only that the three levels: crèche, Balwadi and preschool are integrated, but moreover, there

is a training center; there also evolved a night school which was later converted into a center for youth and adult education where literacy and post-literacy work was done, as well as training in skills that could help to improve the economic and family life (e.g. health, hygiene, better farming practices, sewing, etc.). The teachers were oriented towards working with the people through home visits, parents' meetings and health work. 2. Language component: curriculum was adjusted to the agricultural operations. Songs about paddy-cultivation, stories adapted from Warli folk-tales narrated by the children themselves, reading lessons prepared on the spot partially using the Warli dialect. Tribal language, socio-economic conditions of the tribals, their art, music, dance, drama and games were some of the features of the specially designed training programme.

b) **Origin:** see general description above.

c) **Program goals:** Spread among tribals "such education as would lead to their all-sided development and would be relevant to their life (pp. 41/42)."

d) **Specific objectives:** Reduce rate of primary school dropouts in the Kosbad area; evolve appropriate teacher-training programs.

e) **Difficulties in implementation:** main constraints of work among the Warlis are poverty, "their traditional belief in magic," language barriers.

f) **Outcomes:** n.a.

Comments

- This kind of integrated approach, and particularly the importance of the community's involvement is characteristic of programs in other countries. 'Community involvement', as well as 'learning across generations' are often singled out as two of the most basic features necessary for a successful language revitalization program.

- 'Growing up at Kosbad Hill' is a fascinating account of the emergence of preschool education for rural children, and in particular tribal children, undertaken by Tarabai Modak (soon joined by Anutai Vagh), two pioneers in Indian early childhood education. It is fascinating on several accounts of which three are mentioned here: 1) it describes exactly how a rural preschool for tribal children was established, beginning with "enticing" the children to come out of the woods where they were hiding; 2) it gives an insight into the relevance of history, politics and social class structure for (preschool) education (e.g. how the preschool movement derived from Gandhian thinking; how resistance to equal treatment of children in preschools had its roots in the caste system; the influence of the British educational system, etc.); 3) it is testimony to the pioneering educational work of two women in a "non-Western" country who are perhaps not as widely known as they should be.

Kenya - Arabic and Swahili

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY [Kenya]. (1986). Kwale district centre for early childhood education. Report of the district based research project 1985 - 1986. Unpublished manuscript. Obtained from Bernard van Leer Foundation. (30 pages).

KAKAMEGA DICECE [Kakamega District]. (n.d., probably 1988). Use of pre-school as a base for providing integrated services. District based research report. Unpublished manuscript. Obtained from Bernard van Leer Foundation. (25 pages).

BERNARD VAN LEER FOUNDATION. (1987). "Health and Nutrition." Special focus section of Newsletter 48, October 1987, pp. 1 - 10.

SCOTTON, CAROL MYERS. (1988). Patterns of bilingualism in East Africa (Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania). In PAULSTON, CHRISTINA BRATT (Ed.). International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 204 - 224.

Document Sources: Reports from van Leer Foundation supported projects. Only Kwale District report includes issue of language. Kakamega District report used for obtaining illuminating background information (please see "Comments" below). The following refers to Kwale District unless otherwise specified.

Community: In South Eastern part of Kenya, in Coast Province. Consists of arable and lowland dry agricultural zones. Main occupation is subsistence farming. In whole district with population of estimated 440 000 by 1989, 20%+ are children under six. Child mortality higher than national average (which is 1 in 8). High malnutrition rate. Clean water only sparsely available. Predominantly Muslim society. No details about language/s usage in communities.

Educational system specifics: Traditionally child care and education done by older siblings and grandparents when parents engaged in farming. Now more (older) children in primary school, and decline of extended family ties. Preschool therefore more accepted as alternative for child care. About 200 preschools with 11,000 children. In addition: 3000 preschool-aged children in "madrassa" (muslim schools). Complete madrasa education takes 12 years. About 20 subjects taught, including Muslim religion, Arabic language, kishahili. Before the project, preschool-aged madrasa children were learning religion through memorization (in Arabic only). They did not do any activities, nor use materials or equipment. Teacher's only materials were Arabic books, chalk, blackboard.

Program

Project is in two sites: Mahuka Islamic Education Centre and Matuga pre-school Centre. Unless otherwise specified, following refers to the Mahuka part of project, since language issues are only addressed there.

a) **Characteristics/components:** Integrated madrasa (Islamic)/preschool (secular) curriculum includes daily: "pillars of Islam" (Islamic belief and law); "how a Muslim

child should behave"; Arabic (read and write in Arabic script); outdoor activities; readiness activities (including literacy readiness); environmental and creative activities; oral skills (including music and movement, but as per Islamic law). Madrasa teacher training in secular curriculum components and child-centered approach.

b) **Origin:** Through initiative of a Muslim leader and in cooperation with a team from DICECE (District centers of early childhood education), Education Islamic Centre was started in 1981. Madrasa, mosque and water well were completed by 1983; Muhaka preschool started in 1984 using one of the madrasa classrooms. Islamic center principal requested from DICECE to train their teacher in preschool curriculum. (Matuga preschool was started in 1974). Van Leer Foundation supports DICECE preschool-teacher training courses.

c) **Program goals:** Integration of Islamic and secular preschool education. Using Matuga pre-school and Muhaka madrasa/preschool as entry point to community to improve health, nutrition, care, and education of young children ("integrated approach"). Raise awareness of importance of child-centered preschool education. Increasing community commitment.

d) **Specific objectives:** Change curriculum; increase use of Swahili in preschool, decrease use of Arabic and of memorization. Develop resource centers, train teachers, involve community in preparing facilities and material.

e) **Difficulties in implementation:** Preschool education in very poor state (e.g. 100 children with one teacher in one small unequipped room). All emphasis was on primary school. Educators as well as parents had to be convinced of value of preschool and in particular of a "non-academic" preschool.

f) **Outcomes:** Parents who had been reluctant sent children to preschool. Enrollment increased dramatically. Children had fun learning. Even Islamic components were being taught through child-centered approach. Community (including siblings) got involved in building sites and preparing materials.

Comments

• Not even the Kwale document mentions the use of languages other than Arabic and Swahili in either community or preschool. One is left wondering whether any vernaculars are used in the preschools described here. Speaking more than one language (and this does not refer to Arabic or English as a second) "is the natural state of affairs all over East Africa... Kenyan policy once again sanctions the vernaculars as media [of instruction]...[and] the present policy to use vernaculars as a medium in the first three years of primary school is highly flexible... (Myers Scotton, p. 211). There are about 10 official school vernaculars, with Swahili one of them in the coastal areas" (Myers Scotton, p. 211). The situation is further complicated by the fact that although Swahili was recently made a compulsory subject on the primary school-leaving examinations, these are still held in English.

Mexico - Various Indian languages

MODIANO, NANCY. (1984). Bilingual-bicultural education in Mexico: Recent Research. Contemporary Educational Psychology, Vol. 9, pp. 254 - 259.

MODIANO, N. (1988). Public bilingual education in Mexico. In PAULSTON, C.B. (Ed.), International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education. Westport, CT. pp. 313 - 327.

PEREZ ALARCON, JORGE, ABIEGA, LOLA, ZARCO, MARGARITA, and SCHUGURENSKY, DANIEL. (1986). nezahualpilli. educación preescolar comunitaria. México, D.F.: Centro de Estudios Educativos, A.C. (271 pages).

Bilingual kindergarten education: Even Modiano who has extensively worked in bilingual education in Mexico as an educator, language planner, program developer and researcher, provides hardly any information on bilingual preschool education. The Office of Indian Education within the Secretariat of Public Education (to which Modiano is affiliated) houses a large-scale program of formal education for Indian children for grades K-6. It includes over 4000 kindergarten centers for about 150,000 children aged five to seven. The program was mainly designed by Indian teachers. All teaching is in the children's mother tongue (L1). Spanish is introduced at the end of the school year via songs and common greetings. The program's goal by the end of grade six is to have children who are bilingual in their L1 and in conversational and academic Spanish. Modiano cites an evaluation of the Indian language kindergarten which found--not surprisingly--that most children achieved the program's objectives when they were instructed in a language they understood. Although the original (Spanish) title of this report speaks of "el preescolar indígena", the context and Modiano's own translation make clear that the "preescolar" is the child who attends kindergarten within the formal public school system, not the child we consider "preschool" here.

Community - based preschool: Pérez Alarcón et al., on the other hand, present us with a detailed account of a community based preschool project for four and five year olds who (according to this source) are considered the preschool-age population in Mexico. In all Mexico, approximately 48% of five- and 32% of four year olds are enrolled in preschool. The project described here, Proyecto Nezahualpilli, was started in 1980 in two marginal urban settlements in Cd. Nezahualcóyotl, East of Mexico City. Although this project does in no way address questions of bilingual preschool or language maintenance/revitalization, we mention it here as an interesting contribution for people involved in setting up community based preschool programs from scratch. The book is a somewhat curious mix of something like a practical guide, a detailed account of problems envisioned and/or encountered (and often overcome) and a simplified course in childhood development and preschool education theories. It contains a wealth of useful suggestions (but unfortunately also an often overly didactic and righteous tone).

Comment

A combination of what both, the large scale bilingual kindergarten program for Indian children and the much smaller scale community based (non-bilingual) preschool project have to offer, might result in a very interesting language maintenance program for Indian preschoolers in Mexico.

Norway - Saami

BERNARD VAN LEER FOUNDATION. (1986, September). "Norway: Saami project teams meet". (Short Network News item). Newsletter 44, p. 12. (A)

BERNARD VAN LEER FOUNDATION. (1987, January). "The Multicultural Context. 'Yes, I am a Saami'." Newsletter 45, pp. 14 - 15. (B)

BERNARD VAN LEER FOUNDATION. (1989, January). "Bilingualism. Norway: changing mainstream attitudes." Newsletter 53, pp. 5 - 6. (C)

STLYNGNER, LISA HEBER. (1983). Early childhood education in Norway. In: LALL, GEETA RANI and LALL, BERNARD MOHAN (Eds.). Comparative Early Childhood Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, pp. 136 - 163. (D)

HOEM, ANTON. (1983). The situation of the Sami people in Norway. In: CERI/OECD [Centre for Educational Research and innovation/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] (Ed.). The Education of Minority Groups. An Enquiry into Problems and Practices of Fifteen Countries. Aldershot, Hampshire: Gower, pp. 325 - 335. (E)

JOHANSSON, HENNING. (n.d., probably 1976). Investigations concerning the Lapps (Saamees). Summary of the research at the Department of Education, University of Umeå. Unpublished manuscript. Obtained from Bernard van Leer Foundation. (14 pages). (F)

Document sources: (A) through (C): journalistic descriptions/notes of foundation's project in Norway, written for funding foundation's own newsletter. (D): descriptive country-study in a comparative volume. Author involved in student teaching in Oslo. (E): scholarly contribution from researcher at University of Oslo to a large documentation carried out by CERI. (F): summary of research presumably done only by the one author, as all 8 same-author-references indicate. Deals with Saami population in Sweden. (D through F consulted for background information on Saami and their language/s, and education system in Norway.) Sources used in the following are (A) through (C) unless otherwise noted.

Community: Formerly nomadic reindeer-herding Saami population now mostly settled on both sides of Swedish/Norwegian border. (1987: less than 10% of total Saami population are reindeer herders). Target communities are scattered in three areas: Tysfjord, Hattfjelldal and Lavangseidet. Traditional Saami way of life kept alive by reindeer herders rather than others. 1976 data from Swedish Saami: adults' use of Saami language/s in conversations with children much higher (60%) among reindeer-tenders than among non-reindeer-herders (35%) (F). Saami consists of different mutually hardly understandable languages (5 according to (B)); 3 main groups with a total of about 50 dialects according to (F).

Educational system specifics: Primary education begins at age 7. Everything up to age 7 not part of formal educational system. Pre-school education is responsibility of local communities but federal subsidies are provided. Since 1975 legal provisions for pre-school education; under jurisdiction of Ministry of Consumers and Administration which provides guidelines, sets standards (D). Since 1967: per government decision Saami children have

opportunity to be taught in Saami during first three grades of primary. (Before, only regular Norwegian medium primary education was available to Saamis). Since 1974 specialization of teachers' training for the Saami school. Since 1975: Saami Council of Education: responsible for pedagogical development in the Saami school (E).

Program

- a) **Characteristics/components:** bicultural early childhood education project, initiated in 1984, still running in 1989. Funded by Bernard van Leer Foundation; operated [since when?] by Nordlands Research Institute in Bod. Helps establish Saami language kindergartens and parent groups. Promotes learning of Saami among non-Saamis. Produces teaching materials for use in Saami districts; collects Saami stories; co-operates with print media and radio in disseminating positive image of Saami culture; organizes workshops for teachers; helps build larger local networks among teachers, kindergarten teachers, school administrators; promotes correspondence and exchange visits with Saami children in school nearby in Sweden.
- b) **Origin:** Initiated in 1984. (Foundation had already started similar project in Sweden in 1979). Beginning in Hattfjelldal where a Saami School and Saami cultural Center already existed. Work in Lavangseidet started in 1985, in Tysfjord area in 1986.
- c) **Program goals:** Build up positive racial and cultural attitudes among majority community; help Saami children build up positive self-view; improve children's performance; equip them to cope with demands of school system and challenge of living in a culturally mixed society.
- d) **Specific objectives:** Increase use of Saami language by pre-school-age children, students and parents; arouse interest in and increase knowledge of Saami culture nationwide (i.e. among non-Saami); integrate Saami studies into normal curriculum.
- e) **Difficulties in implementation:** Population lives in scattered areas; not easily accessible. Parents' reluctance to children's learning Saami (assimilation seen as only way to get on in competitive Norwegian society). Variety of Saami languages. Lack of written materials in Saami languages. (South Saami written language officially recognized in 1978).
- f) **Outcomes:** "Saami culture is no longer regarded as a handicap for children [in Lavangseidet area] (B)." "Increased interest in integrating Saami studies into the normal curriculum (C)." Collection of stories and other traditional materials. Production of some Saami teaching materials. Marginal interest of non-Saami in learning Saami.

Comments

- Document (D) makes reference to children of 'foreign workers', their problems in regular day-care centers and the establishment of small centers where they can "learn their mother tongue." However, the same document does not once mention Saami.
- In the case of Sweden: Special law regulating reindeer-husbandry has to some extent a dividing effect on Saami population, expressed in difficulties of keeping up former close relations and solidarity between reindeer-herding and other Saami; the latter rapidly losing contact with the former, once they leave reindeer husbandry and are being pushed into a marginal position not only with respect to mainstream culture, but their own as well (F).

Papua New Guinea

DELPIIT, L. D. (1985). Language, culture and self-determination: An ethnographically based evaluation of an experiment in schooling in Papua New Guinea. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University. (266 pages)

Document source: An evaluation case study of a vernacular preschool program conducted in 1982 at the request of the provincial government three years after the program was started. It includes extensive discussion of the value of ethnographically-based evaluations, as well as the history, social and political context of the program, and detailed observations and interviews.

Community: North Solomons Province (1 of 20) in Papua New Guinea (PNG). 21 language areas in the province. Tok Pisin is the lingua franca throughout the province, but the 86% of the population living in rural areas use local languages for everyday communication. Tok Pisin is not now considered a language suitable as a medium for school instruction because it is less precise than either Tok Ples (the term for each vernacular language) or English, and people fear it will destroy Tok Ples. In 1982, the Villes Tok Ples Skuls (VTPS) was operating in two language areas, around Buka and Buin. The schools could start most easily there because linguists from the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) had worked in these two areas for more than 10 years.

Origin: PNG became independent from Australia in 1975, and the new constitution included provisions for decentralizing many government powers. Moves to initiate mother tongue education began immediately after independence. They became a reality after the establishment in 1978 of the North Solomons Education Research Project, which conducted a province-wide survey of desires for educational change via interviews conducted in the local language by a group of university students.

Education system specifics: Before VTPS, children started the English-medium primary school at age 7. The VTPS is planned as a two-year vernacular preschool for 7- and 8-year olds, delaying primary school entry until age 9. The parents consider that a better age for coping with English instruction; and when the children graduate six years later, they are more ready for jobs and other responsibilities in the community. In 1981, the program was in 30 schools, and the first VTPS-educated children entered primary Grade 1.

Program

a) **Characteristics/components:** Daily program includes religious instruction, reading and writing, math, nature study, and cultural studies. The literacy materials were developed by SIL linguists. All instruction is in the Tok Ples ((Telei in Buka; Halia in Buin).

b) **Origin:** n.a.

c) **Program goals:** Educational benefits from letting children start literacy and gain other preschool skills in their mother tongue. Social benefits from giving children knowledge, skills and values that prepare them for participation in their community after school, and enabling them to complete primary school at a later age. Cultural benefits from allowing children to

receive the foundation of their education in the language and culture of their community, and encouraging their tok ples to have equal status with English in their minds.

d) **Specific Objectives:** n.a.

e) **Difficulties in implementation** specifically related to language: First, the choice of language for the teachers' guides. Tok Ples languages lack vocabulary for technical issues (e.g. words for 'word' or 'syllable'); Tok Pisin is not precise enough; and English many teachers read with difficulty. The best solution seemed to be to put the guides in both Tok Ples and English. Second, the problem of maintaining the VTPS learnings in the primary school. Constraints include the cost of Tok Ples curriculum materials and the fact that many primary school teachers are not assigned to schools in their own language areas.

Delpit suggests one possibility for the primary school curriculum:

Considering these constraints, one solution might be to approach teaching tok ples through creative writing classes where children write and illustrate short stories about their life and environment. The best of their work could be duplicated and made into books for sharing with other classes and other schools. This would provide a means to maintain and develop children's literacy competence in their tok ples, create a body of written material in the indigenous languages, and prepare children for the task parents wish them to eventually undertake--writing books in tok ples about what they learn from their Western education for their village communities (p. 201).

Third, before the VTPS can expand to other North Solomons language areas, orthographies have to be established; and decisions made about the language of instruction in town schools enrolling children from various tok ples areas.

f) **Outcomes:** With respect to educational benefits, Grade 1 teachers believed the VTPS graduates were superior to children without VTPS experience. (The VTPS children were also 2 years older.) On the basis of tests of metacognitive language skills, an international reading researcher, John Downing, concluded that the VTPS children were superior to children who received all their education in English. Delpit tested the children's oral reading achievement and found they could not only read in their tok ples, but could also use their training to decode Tok Pisin, a language that they could not yet understand. The social benefits can only be evaluated over a longer time period. The cultural achievements were less than with language:

The young, Western-educated teachers frequently knew little about their own culture; the children are often too young at ages seven and eight to be presented with cultural knowledge traditionally transmitted to older youth; and two years is generally considered too short a time to pass on significant cultural instruction. Furthermore, the secret nature of much cultural knowledge limits what can be taught....[And] the expectation that elders would freely come into the classrooms to share cultural knowledge runs counter to the tradition of reciprocity in which the value of knowledge is acknowledged by the willingness to pay for its acquisition (pp. 246, 248)."

Comments Delpit ends with a strong statement for education in both mother tongue and a world language:

Some scholars concerned with development issues have suggested that such a planned integration of the past and the present is impossible, that a people must make an all or nothing choice between outward-looking, nation-

oriented modernity and inward-looking, village-based traditionalism. This view is reflected in two commonly held presumptions:... In one instance indigenous people are seen as unable to reach a state of modernity without the wholesale forfeiture of their own identity and adoption of another under the constant tutelage of outside advisors; and, in the other, they are seen as needing to be protected from any exposure to outside information which can only serve to destroy and debilitate their culture....The people of the North Solomons are striving to integrate the two cultures on an equal footing. When they speak of "preserving their culture," no, they do not mean hermetically sealing it away from all possible contamination of change, rather they seem to mean maintaining the integrity of their core values in the process of responding to new ways of life....Literacy and the school have become a means of cultural transference and cultural pride (pp. 237, 238, 240).

In addition, the significance of the VTPS program is in the process of letting decisions about language choice be made by those served by the educational system. With access to information to inform their decision-making, "their advice on their own aspirations, motivations, and expectations is invaluable in structuring workable learning environments for their children (p. 249)."

Spain - Catalan and Basque

PLA I MOLINS, MARIA. (1983). El bilingüisme escolar a Barcelona. [Educational bilingualism in Barcelona]. Barcelona: Ediciones de la Magrama.

SIGUAN, MIGUEL. (1981). Plurilinguismo en España y sus nuevas perspectivas. [Multilingualism in Spain and its new perspectives]. In Cireel.(Ed.) (1982). Statut et gestion des langues. Actes du 2e colloque international "Langues et coopération européen". [Status and management of languages. Proceedings of the second international colloquium on "Languages and European cooperation"]. Clamart, France: 1982, pp. 89 - 98.

SIGUAN, M. (1988). Bilingual education in Spain. In PAULSTON, C.B., (Ed.). International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 449 - 473.

SIGUAN, M. (1989). Catalan and Castilian in school. A first evaluation. In SONINO, ELISABETTA ZUANELLI, (Ed.), Literacy in school and society. Multidisciplinary perspectives. N.Y. and London: Plenum Press, pp. 77 - 90.

SIGUAN, M. personal communication Oct. 4, 1989.

TRILLOS AMAYA, MARIA. (1987). El Euskera: Patrimonio Lingüístico del Gran País Vasco. [The Basque language: Linguistic heritage of the Basque provinces]. Glotta, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 8 - 19.

Document sources: For Catalan: Scholarly papers of sociolinguistic descriptive and evaluative nature by University of Barcelona professor. For Basque: the same; in addition: paper with emphasis on linguistic aspects; excerpts of Basque Education Department curriculum.

Communities: Catalonia in northeastern part of Iberian Peninsula; most industrially developed region of Spain with Barcelona as industrial and long established cultural center. Catalan (derived from Latin) is mother tongue of 50% of population (total 6 million); additional 30% understand it. It is the language of the middle-class and intellectuals in Barcelona and of the rural population. Most industrial workers (largely migrated from South of Spain speak Castilian ("Spanish") only. (But Castilian is also official language of the state). Basque provinces (Euskadi) in northeast (territories of Navarre and French Pays Basque not included here), population around 2 million. Depending on province between 8 and 45% speak Basque. Before revival of Basque, it was still spoken in rural, isolated districts, but people who spoke Spanish had lost use of Basque.

Educational system specifics: 1978 Statutes of Autonomy grant full autonomy to the regions in administering education. For latest developments, please see under "Comments" below.

Programs

a) **Characteristics/components:** Catalonia: Decree on Bilingual Education (see below) only refers to formal schooling from grade one on. At preschool level there is a Catalan immersion program for children with Castilian L1: begins at age four or earlier; teachers

use Catalan systematically, but allow children's use of Castilian and respond when children use L1. Idea is not to devalue L1 and discriminate because of it, but present learning in L2 as enrichment. Affective relation between teachers and children is stressed. L2 immersion in context of child's playful (i.e. not academic) activities resembles child's first contact with his/her L1. Children are not rushed. Reading in L2 begins only after solid oral competence of L2. Throughout later formal schooling, child also receives instruction in L1. **Basque:** Types of schools and percentage of enrollment (elementary school students): public (42%), private (37%), and "ikastolas"(10%). All might include preschool. Ikastolas are Basque-language schools beginning at preschool level. Originally private and in opposition to government, now gradually being integrated into public system. In original form, Spanish L1 children admitted, but instruction only Basque (i.e. total immersion program). Because of numerous difficulties some now feature gradual introduction of Basque to Spanish L1 children, "leading in some cases to true bilingual education" (Siguan, 1988, p. 465). Number of ikastolas increased rapidly (figures for development of school enrolment in ikastolas include preschool and basic general education).

Continuation of language policy throughout education:

In all regions with local language/s : compulsory at all levels and grades of Basic Elementary Education (ages 6 - 14) to have minimum of three to five hours of instruction in local language. Can be more if school wants it. In secondary education, same guidelines are followed (in Catalonia, however, secondary academic programs use more Catalan than secondary vocational programs). **Universities in Catalonia** use both languages. Anyone there has right to use either language in any given situation. **University education in Basque provinces** is new (even in Spanish). Recently established university offers about 20% of courses in both Spanish and Basque. Goal is to teach all disciplines in both languages.

b) **Origin:** According to Pla I Molins, issue of bilingual education in Spain has been going on for two centuries. (Her book includes an appendix with documents about bilingualism of school children from 1758 to 1938). Decree of Bilingual Education (implemented in 1981): in areas with local languages. **In Catalonia:** an earlier experimental bilingual project under auspices of University of Barcelona (1970) which had positive results (introduction of Catalan improved children's competence in Catalan considerably, did not adversely affect their competence in Spanish nor their academic achievement). **In Basque provinces:** Ikastolas first established in 1967 (still during Franco government) as one expression of Basque people's struggle against Franco and for Basque political and cultural autonomy.

c) **Program goals:** **In Catalonia:** Avoid separation of the two communities along linguistic lines. Maintenance of Catalan in a region increasingly populated by Castilian L1 speakers. **In Basque provinces:** Strengthen language as symbol of national identity. Revitalize language which until recently had been in total regression and used only in rural and family settings.

d) **Specific teaching objectives:** **In Catalonia:** Enable students to use both languages freely (inclusive academic settings) after finishing basic education. **In Basque provinces:** increase number of full bilingual students.

e) **Difficulties in implementation:** **In Catalonia:** with rapidly increasing number of Spanish L1 speaking students from less advantaged South requires new approaches within Catalan

education that can be beneficial to all groups. **In Basque provinces:** large dialectal variety of language; lack of written materials, particularly textbooks (partly because language was not standardized); few trained teachers (lack of teacher training in Basque); great differences between two languages; earlier low status of language.

f) **Outcomes:** (Not limited to preschool). **In Catalonia:** Catalan-L1 children can be educated in their own language without suffering adverse effects. Whether a mainly Catalan education is equally beneficial for group of Spanish-L1 children (particularly with increasing proportion of children from socioeconomically disadvantaged migrant families from the South) remains to be studied. **In Basque provinces:** "Thanks to a great educational push, the Basque language has passed from a state of regression to one of expansion" (Siguan, 1988, p.469). Not only has number of Basque speakers increased dramatically, but also its official and urban use.

Comments

- Reform proposals to be implemented over the period 1991-1996 include: "Pre-school education (0-6 years) will become a formal part of the educational system, although not compulsory. For the age group 0-3 years capacity will be developed in co-operation with the local authorities and other interested institutions." However, the Pre-school Education Federation (Federación Española de Escuelas Infantiles, FEDEI) is doubtful about this division into two separate stages and furthermore concerned about the proposals' lack of clarity concerning the financing of pre-school education and the qualifications of those who would be working with pre-school children. (Source: Council of Europe, Newsletter 2/89, pp. 32 - 33). In March 1988, the Spanish Federation of Parent Associations had recommended that pre-school education should be divided into three stages (0-2; 2-4; and 5-6 years) and be compulsory from the age of 4 years; whereas the Catholic Parent's Federation recommended that institutionalized pre-school education should not start before age 3. (Source: Council of Europe, Newsletter 1/88, pp. 27/28).

- The cases of Catalan and Basque in Spain (i.e. two different minority groups/languages within the same political and educational system) highlight a number of factors which should be taken into consideration when developing educational language policies whether for preschool or other levels of education :

- 1) The status of the people who speak the minority language as their mother tongue: although Catalan and Basque are both minority languages in Spain, and at the same time official languages in their respective areas, Catalan speakers' socioeconomic status is in general higher than that of Castilian speakers in the region, whereas with Basque this is not the case.

- 2) Oral "vs" written languages: Whereas Catalan is "supported by an old and significant literary and academic tradition, ...completely standardized [and] lexical, grammatical, and orthographic norms accepted without question" (Siguan, 1988, p. 453), this is not the case with Basque which is fragmented by many dialects, hence was not standardized until recently and has little literary and academic tradition.

3) The degree of un/relatedness of the (two) languages involved is important, particularly when it comes to learning reading. In the case of Catalan/Castilian, for example, the "arbitrary rules that link letters and sounds are relatively similar in the two languages" (Siguan, 1989, p.85). On the other hand, Basque is totally different from Castilian so that learning it requires a conscientious sustained effort over a long period of time.

4) Continuation of language policy is important. These are two outstanding cases in as much as education in the minority language starts in preschool and carries on through university (albeit to different extents).

5) The same educational language policy can have divergent results: If 'education in Catalan' is not adapted to the growing number of migrant Spanish L1 children from the South, Catalonia might become a case for the claim "that identical systems of bilingual education may have quite different effects according to the social and cultural level of pupils for whom it is provided" (Siguan, 1988, p. 460).

The Netherlands - Frisian

BOELENS, KR. (1976). Frisian-Dutch bilingual primary schools. The Hague: Netherlands Ministry of Education and Science. (86 pages).

Community: Dutch Frisians in province of (West) Friesland (about 560.000 inhabitants, ca. 4% of total population in the Netherlands). No monolingual Frisian speakers. 97% understand, 83% speak, 69% can read, 31% can (but rarely need to) write Frisian. Frisian spoken by 71% at home. Use of Frisian as home language diminishes with higher level of education and further distance from home. Dutch used by majority when speaking to strangers or authority figures.

Educational system specifics: "Nursery" education attended by almost all four to six year olds, though not compulsory. Almost all nursery schools have own school board, are self-sufficient, can decide individually on language/s of instruction.

Program

a) **Characteristics/components:** about 2/3 of nursery schools use Frisian, mostly for storytelling and conversations. Of 559 primary schools half teach Frisian as subject, 73 are bilingual with Frisian as language medium in years 1 and 2; increasingly former monolingual Dutch schools use Frisian in oral communication for initial few weeks or months; flexible education plan offering Frisian-speaking and Dutch-speaking grammar and reading groups side by side in one first form in several villages; cooperation between nursery and primary school teachers in curriculum development; 7 Colleges of Education and the 3 Training Colleges for nursery school teachers working towards common goal; student training in and by means of Frisian promoted in 8 of these teacher training institutions; interaction between schools and advisory service of "Fryske Academy" and parents; school visits by advisory centre a crucial program feature.

b) **Origin:** a mix of educational experimentation (9 experimental schools started using Frisian as language of instruction in 1950) and political pressure (proceedings started by a Frisian poet and editor to accept Frisian in the law courts that led to political violence). A 1955 amendment to the 1920 Primary Education Act officially sanctioned use of Frisian as language medium in primary school (up to year 3). In 1974 Frisian was made compulsory subject in primary schools and its use as language medium in all classes authorized. Since 1959: educational advisory board established by the Fryske Academy, fully state subsidized serves bilingual schools, promotes Frisian in nursery and primary schools. Teachers involved in materials design and testing. Individual school boards decide (after hearings with parents) which language policy to opt for. Decision for bilingual education means acceptance of advisory board's services.

c) **Program goals:** **For nursery school:** although nursery school should not deny opportunities for intellectual performances it should in no sense be preparatory primary education, therefore it should stick to the child's native tongue. **For primary school:** for non-Frisian speaking pupils: being able to appreciate Friesland's bilingual culture; for Frisian-speaking pupils: willingness and ability to contribute to this culture at one's own level. **For both:** make equal allowance for Frisian-speaking and Dutch-speaking children; foster sound

incorporation of Frisian in nursery and primary schools.

d) **Specific teaching objectives:** language should "come to life" at school; ensure smooth transition between nursery and primary school.

e) **Difficulties in implementation:** lack of materials; inadequately trained nursery school teachers; different language policies in nursery and primary school, sometimes in the same village (e.g. Dutch medium nursery and bilingual primary school); little or no attention has been paid to written use of Frisian; predominance of Dutch mass media.

f) **Outcomes:** About half of the primary schools feature Frisian in curriculum; Frisian used freely among children and between them and teachers Frisian gaining status; opinion moving in favor of bilingual education after experience showed that Dutch does not suffer.

Comments

- Only third of book deals with present day Frisian situation. Other chapters are about bilingualism in general; summarize wellknown case studies from other countries; describe situations in other parts of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (including overseas).

- A 1975 evaluation of pre-school education ("child centres", "kindergartens" and "playgroups and day nurseries") in The Netherlands done under the auspices of the Council of Europe (Kohnstamm & Wagenaar-Hardon, 1975) does not even mention non-Dutch or bilingual pre-school.

USSR - General and Soviet Central Asia.

LALL, GEETA RANI and LALL, BERNARD MOHAN LALL (1983). Early childhood education in the USSR. In LALL, G.R. and LALL, B.M. (Eds). Comparative early childhood education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

This chapter describes preschools in the USSR as an integral part of Soviet society with nurseries/creches for ages 2 months to three years and kindergarten for three to seven year olds. The program is divided into six groups, corresponding to the first six years of life. The role of language education and languages is not systematically dealt with, but some information is given: The goals for language education for each of the six programs are briefly outlined (e.g. "know the names of a few objects" (program 1); "express his needs in words" (program 3); etc.

Mention to other languages is only made three times:

- By the end of the fifth year, the child should be able to pronounce all the Russian sounds correctly and "they are also able to tell stories in their mother tongue (which might not be Russian)" (p. 13).
- In the sixth year, "[o]ther important objectives include training in their natural language" (p. 15); (supposedly, mother tongue is meant).
- In the six year, too, "they memorize and recite or write out poems in their native tongue" (p.16).

There is no mention of how these skills are achieved, and what the specific language policies are. For example, in which language/s are children in the fifth year taught to "learn to read and recite with expression and feeling (p. 14); and in the sixth year "to count from one to ten" (p. 17)? But if the children are supposed to be able to tell stories in their mother tongue in the fifth year, then, clearly, we must assume that this or similar activities have been practiced in the mother tongue before.

SHORISH, M. MOBIN. (1988). Bilingual education in Soviet Central Asia. In PAULSTON, CHRISTINA BRATT, (Ed.), International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, pp. 429 - 447.

General language policy: A 1958 document states the official view that instruction in the Soviet schools is **conducted in the native language** (our emphasis). However, (and this since 1938), Russian is compulsory in all schools of the non-Russian people. Teaching Russian as a second language has, according to the author, not met with the expected success, particularly in Central Asia and here specifically among rural children "who are unable to speak and write a simple Russian sentence after ten years of in-class instruction" (p. 436).

Kindergarten: Referring to a 1972 (!) document, the author refers to the teaching of Russian in some of the kindergartens as "another innovation" which is not uniformly administered in the USSR. The amount of Russian-only hours varies greatly from republic to republic, but an overall increase of Russian in kindergarten is envisioned in the 1985 Education Reform. Unfortunately, there are no details about this.