DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 318 48 FL 000 256

By-Freeman, Stephen A., And Others
An Evaluation of the NDEA Title VI Modern Language Fellowships.
American Council of Learned Societies, New York, N.Y.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Pub Date Dec 65
Contract-OEC-5-14-057
Note-139p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.05
Descriptors-Degree Requirements, Evaluation Techniques, Federal Programs, *Fellowships, *Graduate Study, Language and Area Centers, Language Enrollment, Language Teachers, *Modern Languages, *Program Evaluation, Scholarship Funds, Statistical Data, Statistical Surveys, Student Evaluation, Study Abroad, Uncommonly Taught Languages, *Undergraduate Study

NDEA Title VI fellowships are evaluated in terms of (1) the selection, quality, and trends in competition of fellows, (2) the results of the fellows in completion and use of training and their placement, (3) the impact on the educational community with respect to curriculum, interdisciplinary cooperation, and teaching staff and techniques, (4) the regulations and administration of the program, (5) undergraduate study, (6) study abroad and cultural immersion, and (7) academic, governmental, business, and professional manpower needs. Numerous statistical tables covering the period 1959-1966 are provided, and the final section offers a summary of recommendations. The appendixes include the terminal report form, questionnaire, and interview forms for administrators, graduate students, and undergraduates involved in the project. (JH)

An Evaluation of the NDEA Title VI

Modern Language Fellowships

by

Stephen A. Freeman

Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont

and Staff

December 1965

An Evaluation of the NDEA Title VI

Modern Language Fellowships

by

Stephen A. Freeman, Project Director,
Director, Middlebury College Language Schools

Donald D. Walsh, Assistant Project Director,
Formerly Director, Foreign Language Program, M.L.A.

John J. Adams, Research Assistant,
Graduate Student, Columbia University

Miss Carlene Richardson, Secretary

---

with the assistance of Special Interviewers, and an Advisory Committee

* * * * * * *

under the supervision of Gordon B. Turner
Vice President, American Council of Learned Societies

Submitted in completion of Contract OE 5-14-057 (June 1, 1965) between the American Council of Learned Societies, 345 East 46th Street, New York, New York, and the U.S. Office of Education, Division of Foreign Studies, Bureau of Higher Education. This Report, with tables and appendices, was submitted to the Language Section, Research Branch, Division of Higher Education Research, Office of Education.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, under the provisions of Title VI, Public Law 85-864, as amended, Section 602.

Dated at the expiration of the contract, December 31, 1965

A

OUTLINE

A. History of the Project
   - I. NDEA Title VI, 601 (b)
   - II. Fulbright-Hays Act, 102 (b) (6)
   - III. Contract with ACLS
   - IV. Precedents
   - V. Staff and Advisory Committee

B. Objectives of the Evaluation
   - I. Terms of the legislation unclear
     - a. "advanced"
     - b. "needed," "adequate"
     - c. "other fields"
     - d. "any institution"
     - e. "teaching a language"
     - f. "other service"
   - II. Major Aspects of the Evaluation listed

C. Activities
   - I. Advisory Committee meetings
   - II. Offices
   - III. Materials in Washington
   - IV. Questionnaire Survey
   - V. Interviews
   - VI. Limitations

D. Statistics
   - Table I Summary
   - Table II Major Statistics
   - Table III Awards by languages

E. Major Aspects: Problems and Questions
   - I. Quality of The Fellows
     - a. Personal Testimony
       1. The language requirement
       2. Aptitudes
     - b. Selection
       - Table IV Comparison of Applications and Awards
       - Table V New and Renewals, 1963-1964
       - Table VI New and Renewals, 1965-1966
         1. Fellowships easier to obtain in very neglected languages
         2. Some very important languages are very neglected
     - c. Trends
       1. Stability of applications since 1962
       2. New awards and renewals
     - d. Creation of interest
       1. Causes
       2. Importance of undergraduate instruction
   - II. The Results in the Fellows
     - a. Subjective judgments
     - b. Statistical evidence
       1. Table VII Career Goals
          Table VIII Fellows now teaching
       2. Project Questionnaire, analysis, difficulties
          Table IX Language usage

OUTLINE continued

c. Degrees earned
  Table X Degrees by field
  Table XI Degrees, by language, 1964-1965
  Table XII Ph.D.s, from Questionnaire, by language and field
  Table XIII Ph.D.s, teaching, and foreign study
  Table XIV Dissertations in preparation, 1964-1965, by language
  Table XV Dissertations in preparation, 1965-1966, by field

d. The Problem of the Ph.D.
  1. Requirements too demanding?
  2. Requirements ill-defined?
  3. National consensus recommended

e. Changing languages

f. Multiple awards
  Table XVI Single and multiple awards
  1. Importance of good advising

g. Placement
  1. Inefficient communication
  2. Recommendation of a National Roster

h. Language competence greatly improved
  1. Teaching materials needed
  2. Adaptation of types of instruction
  3. Use of the language in other instruction
  4. Utility of the common languages

III. Impact on the Educational Community
  a. General
    1. Graduate studies
    2. Relation to the Centers
    3. Undergraduate Programs
    4. The Classical languages

  b. Interdepartmental cooperation
    1. Creation of Area Studies Committees
    2. Separation of language and area studies unwise

  c. Results in teaching staff and techniques
    1. The problem of shortages
    2. Shortage not uniform in all areas
    3. A basic problem
      (a) A traditional attitude
      (b) Status of the "language teacher"
      (c) The Ph.D. program needs greater flexibility
      (d) Recommending a change in attitude
    4. The audio-lingual, linguist-informant technique
    5. Techniques and materials
    6. Preparation of language teachers
      (a) Little opportunity to use the language
      (b) Complaints from the Fellows
    7. Placement or achievement tests
      (a) Tests needed for coordination

OUTLINE continued

IV. Regulations and Administration of the NDFL Fellowships
- a. Praise
- b. The new system of administration
  1. Implications
  2. Quality
  3. Distribution (Table XVIII)
  4. Relation to the Centers
  5. Title IV
  6. Student choice
  7. Review of quality
  8. Selection of the Fellows, dangers
- c. Application, reapplication, and notification
  1. New and renewals
- d. Length of support
- e. Amount of support
- f. Practice teaching
- g. Administration by the institution
  1. Publicity
  2. Application blanks
  3. Payments
- h. Summary

V. Undergraduate Study
- a. Liberal education
- b. Early preparation for graduate work
- c. Advanced training
- d. Overspecialization?
- e. The scholarship problem

VI. Study Abroad and Cultural Immersion
- a. Present situation
- b. Timing
- c. Criteria
- d. American programs abroad
- e. Substitutes on the home campus

VII. Manpower Needs
- a. An increasing need
- b. Accurate estimates unavailable
- c. Three major areas
  1. Academic
  2. Governmental agencies
  3. Business, industry, and the professions

F. Conclusion

G. Summary of Recommendations

H. Appendices

AN EVALUATION OF THE NDEA TITLE VI, MODERN LANGUAGE FELLOWSHIPS

A. HISTORY OF THE PROJECT:

I. The National Defense Education Act, enacted in 1958 and amended in 1964, provided under Title VI, Section 601 (b) that:

> "The Commissioner is also authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1968, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language (with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a)) and other fields needed for a full understanding of the area, region, or country in which such language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular session of any institution of higher education, including allowances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the Commissioner."

Beginning in 1959, fellowships for the study of modern foreign languages have been awarded to graduate students, post-doctoral fellows and under-graduates under the terms of this section. Through fiscal year 1965, some 4,550 individuals have held these fellowships, studying 63 different languages in over 63 different institutions. Over 21.5 million dollars have been obligated for the purpose.

II. In 1961, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, known as the Fulbright-Hays Act, was enacted "to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange. . ." Under Section 102 (b)(6), the President is authorized to provide for . . .

> "promoting modern foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities by supporting visits and study in foreign countries by teachers and prospective teachers in such schools, colleges, and universities for the purpose of improving their skill in languages and their knowledge of the culture of the people of those countries, and by financing visits by teachers from those countries to the United States for the purpose of participating in foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges and universities."

Beginning in 1964, fellowships for study and research abroad have been granted to graduate students and NDEA Center Faculty Members under the terms of this section. In fiscal years 1964 and 1965, 244 individuals have held these grants, for the study of 33 different languages and areas, at a cost of nearly 2 million dollars.

III. It was therefore highly desirable that an investigation be undertaken to provide a documented answer to the question whether these fellowship programs are fulfilling the aims of the legislation. At the request of the Office of Education, the American Council of Learned Societies agreed to undertake such a study. A plan of operation was submitted, and on June 1, 1965, Contract OE 5-14-057 was signed to cover the period from June 1 to December 31, 1965.

IV. No general evaluation of these fellowships had as yet been undertaken. There have been reports on the Centers (Axelrod and Bigelow's Resources, and Bigelow and Legter's NDEA Language and Area Centers); and there have been several reports on the Summer Language Institutes. Three studies especially have been useful for their evaluation of intensive summer courses in the critical languages: in 1962 the Yamagiwa Report, in 1963 the Shively Report, and in 1964 the Miller Report. These concerned themselves only with the summer programs and evaluated the Centers and their methods rather than the Fellows. The Diekhoff Report under an MLA contract refers only briefly to NDEA Fellowships during the academic year. There is therefore no real precedent for the present evaluation of Title VI Fellowships in the Critical Languages.

V. Work was begun on the project immediately, coordinated by Vice-President Gordon Turner of the ACLS. The following staff was appointed:

Project Director - Stephen A. Freeman, Vice-President Emeritus of Middlebury College, Director of the Middlebury Language Schools.

Assistant Director - Donald D. Walsh, until August 31, Director of the Foreign Language Program of the MLA.

Research Assistant - John J. Adams, graduate student at Columbia University.

Secretary - Miss Carlene Richardson.

Special Interviewers - W. Freeman Twaddell, Chairman of the Linguistics Department, Brown University.

Joseph Axelrod, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, San Francisco State College.

An Advisory Committee was also constituted, consisting of the following:

Morroe Berger, Professor of Sociology-Anthropology; Director of the Program in Near Eastern Studies, Princeton University. Chairman of SSRC Joint Committee on the Middle East.

W. Norman Brown, Professor of Sanskrit and Chairman of the Department of South Asia Regional Studies; Director of the South Asia Language and Area Center, University of Pennsylvania.

Albert H. Marckwardt, Professor of English and Linguistics, Princeton University; Member of the Regional Advisory Council, Office of Education.

Philip E. Mosely, Director of the European Institute, Professor of International Relations, Associate Dean of the Faculty of International Affairs, Columbia University.

William R. Parker, Distinguished Service Professor of English, University of Indiana; former Chief of the Language Development Branch, Office of Education.

John R. Richards, Vice-President of the Institute of International Education; former member, Advisory Committee, NDEA, Title VI; former Chairman U. S. National Commission of UNESCO.

Donald H. Shively, Professor of Japanese History and Literature; Chairman of the Committee of East Asian Studies; Director of the Language and Area Center in East Asian Studies, Harvard University.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION:

I. The basic objective of the Evaluation was, as stated above, to provide a documented answer to the question whether these fellowship programs are fulfilling the aims of the legislation. It would seem therefore that the first task was to arrive at a clear definition of the aims which the Congress had in mind in passing the Acts. The language of the NDEA, Title VI, is however general and vague on many points.

a. For example, Section 601 (b) describes no fellowship program, but simply authorizes the Commission to "pay stipends," the amount of which is not fixed. Individuals are to undergo "advanced training" in a language. The question arises whether undergraduates were to be excluded from fellowships, and whether "advanced" means study in intermediate or advanced courses in the language. Was a senior undergraduate in a third-year Japanese class to be considered eligible; or was elementary Hindi begun by a graduate student to be considered "advanced" training, since most of the neglected languages are begun only in graduate school?

b. The Section says "any modern foreign language" that the Commissioner determines under Section (a) as either "needed" or in which "adequate instruction is not readily available." This might under certain circumstances be determined by the Commissioner to refer to <u>any</u> modern foreign language, common or uncommon. The whole problem of what constitutes "need" is one of the most difficult as well as one of the most important questions posed by the legislation. There is little or nothing in the Congressional debates or discussions to serve as a guide. Policy was subsequently defined by the Commissioner's Policy Statement of March 10, 1959. In its implementation, the requirement of "adequacy" of instruction was largely forgotten. If adequacy were defined as reasonable competence in oral and written communication, even French and German might have been included.

Need was in fact loosely defined in terms of important languages (six in the top priority list, with special consideration given to Latin American Spanish), in which instruction both for manpower and materials was not generally available in 1959.

c. Advanced training may be undergone not only in a language, but in "other fields needed for a full understanding of the area, region or country in which such language is commonly used." These "other fields" have been interpreted as referring chiefly to the social sciences, and in fact a majority of the fellowships have been held by persons specializing in the social sciences. But the phrase "a full understanding" could have an even wider meaning; and the interdisciplinary emphasis is clear.

d. Stipend holders may study at "any short term or regular session of any institution of higher education." Although originally it may have been thought by some that the stipends in Section (b) would help to support the Centers created under Section (a), this is not explicit, and the Fellowships are clearly not tied to the Centers. An institution may have Title VI Fellows without a Center, or a Center without any Title VI Fellows.

e. Stipends are to be paid "only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients...will upon completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education...". One of the clear purposes of the Congress was thus to build up a reservoir of well-trained college and university teachers of the modern foreign languages. It should be noted also that the Section says "teaching a modern foreign language," not teaching the specific critical language which the Fellow may have been studying.

Disregarding for a moment the question of what is the exact meaning of "completion of their training," it is evident that the emphasis in this phrase of the law itself is on the preparation of teachers of the language with a full understanding of the area, rather than teachers of the area or of the social sciences whose teaching or research is improved by a knowledge of the language. The question may therefore be raised whether it was originally intended that a student of the economy of India should be eligible for a stipend if he has no intention of teaching Hindi. The context of Section (a), which expressly authorized the Centers to provide instruction in "other fields," the continuing phrase "or other such service," and the realities of the academic situation at present, have all resulted in an administrative interpretation "permitted in the regulations of the Commissioner," which does not require that the recipient of a stipend will become a classroom teacher of the language he studies, but is satisfied if he makes important use of it in research or in the teaching of "other fields needed." Whether this satisfies the original intention of the Congress is debatable.

f. Further flexibility of interpretation for other objectives was encouraged by the looseness of the next phrase... "or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted in the regulations of the Commissioner." Undoubtedly, in the spirit of the Preamble of the Act itself, this Section had in mind that the persons so trained would be available for the "defense of this nation" through the various branches of the United States government - the armed forces, foreign service, etc. In the first year of the Program, preparation for teaching was mandatory. In the second year, preparation for government service was included; and later, preparation for work with international services such as the United Nations, UNESCO, and non-profit organizations. There is now an official regulation defining "other service." The problem of whether some types of "profit" organizations might now be included is under review. We have come some distance from the primary aim of the preparation of college teachers of the "needed" modern foreign languages. The possible interpretations of "such other service" are very broad.

II. a. The flexibility and possible ambiguity of the language of Title VI, Section 601 (b), and the even more general and permissive language of the Fulbright-Hays Act, Section 102 (b)(6), make it unwise for us to base an evaluation of the Fellowships on our own interpretation of the aims of the legislation. This Project has therefore determined for itself as its most significant objectives the answers to seven major questions, or the evaluation of seven major situations and areas. These are derived not so much from the terms of the Acts themselves, as from their current implementation and operation, and from the questions or problems that have arisen in this operation, in the minds of government officials, officials of the academic institutions concerned, and the Fellows themselves.

b. They are as follows:

1. The Graduate Fellows: their selection, quality, trends in the competition.

2. The Results in the Fellows: completion of training, placement, and use of training.

3. The Impact on the Educational Community: curriculum, interdisciplinary cooperation, teaching staff.

4. The Operation of the Program: regulations and administration.

5. Undergraduate Study: early beginnings.

6. Study Abroad and Cultural Immersion.

7. Manpower Needs: academic, governmental, business and the professions.

C. ACTIVITIES

I. Advisory Committee Meetings. Immediately after the signing of the contract on June 1, 1965, the Project was organized, a staff was appointed and an Advisory Committee was constituted as indicated above. The first meeting of the Advisory Committee was held on June 5 at the offices of the ACLS. Two other meetings of the Advisory Committee were held, also at the offices of the ACLS, the second on October 1 and the third on December 12, 1965. Unless prevented by illness or other urgent business, all members of the Advisory Committee and the Staff attended these meetings; and also Mr. Gordon Turner, Vice President of the ACLS; Mr. D. Lee Hamilton and Mr. John Cookson of the Office of Education, and Professor W. Freeman Twaddell, Special Interviewer. The first meeting of the Committee was devoted to a study of the history and background of the Fellowship Program, and a discussion of the realistic objectives of the Project. The second meeting examined the materials gathered up to that point, and gave advice on the further activities of the Project. The third meeting was devoted to a careful discussion of the tentative conclusions and recommendations proposed by the Staff.

The Director wishes to express here his sense of deep obligation and his great gratitude to all these men who took time from their busy lives to give to this evaluation the guidance which it needed, from the richness of their wisdom and experience. The conclusions or opinions expressed in this report have profitted immeasurably from the breadth and depth of their knowledge of this entire field; and have been at times sharpened, at times tempered, by the committee discussions.

The Director trusts that he has been able to represent faithfully the consensus of these committee discussions when there was a consensus, as was usually the case, or the reasons pro and con when there may have been disagreement on detail. No one member of the Committee should be considered as agreeing with every statement in the report; the Director assumes full responsibility for what he has written. He is more than grateful, however, for the frank and full discussions through which the vast personal knowledge of the Committee members contributed to the shaping of this report.

II. The Offices. The Director used his office in Middlebury College as a base, making frequent trips to Washington and to New York as appropriate. During the months of June, July and August, the Modern Language Association at 4 Washington Place, New York, kindly provided space for Mr. Walsh and Mr. Adams to work on the material. From September through December, an office was provided by the Institute of International Education at 809 United Nations Plaza through the kindness of Vice President Richards. All necessary furniture, equipment and supplies were provided there to Donald Walsh and Carlene Richardson.

III. Analysis of Materials Available in Washington.

a. One of the first tasks of the Staff was to become acquainted with the vast amount of data and information contained in the files of the Office of Education, particularly in the Office of the Student Assistance Section. Mr. John Cookson and Miss Helen Ripley have been most cooperative and have been of all possible assistance. The Director, Walsh, and Adams each made several trips to Washington to examine the material, and were able to bring some of the documents, which existed in duplicate and were not confidential, to the Project office in New York on loan. The analytic and evaluative studies which the Office of Education had already done on much of this material were invaluable, and saved the Staff a great deal of time.

It quickly became apparent that it would be impossible for the three staff members to become familiar, within the limited period of time available, with the vast volume of information which had been accumulated. The problem was therefore how to discover the most significant items, and to take advantage of the analyses already made. Among the many files in the Washington offices, the following were found to be most useful, and are available for a more exhaustive analysis when, as we hope, some future study is undertaken:

A complete file of all applications which received awards since 1959, including the renewals, and including the year 1965-1966.

The complete files of the unsuccessful applicants.

A complete card file of everyone who has ever applied.

Punch card file of Fellowships, Alternates, Declinations since 1961.

Complete files of all annual or "terminal" reports from the Fellows, grouped by years, and by languages.

Complete files of the applications of undergraduates and post-doctorate candidates.

A four-year report on the Fellowships from 1959 to 1963, with statistics year by year and an analysis of the problems.

The file of 384 questionnaire replies received in 1963, on which the above report was based.

File of correspondence with institutions having Centers or Fellowships, together with reports by Government Consultants and Screening Committees (Confidential).

Confidential Reports from Directors of Language and Area Centers.

Important file on Program Policy, covering budget estimates, fiscal policies, eligibility, legal problems, precedents, "other service," and many statistical reports.

Minutes of the conference held in Ann Arbor, Michigan in October 1960 to evaluate the first year of the Program.

Description of seven pilot programs under Fulbright-Hays 102 (b)(6), known as Operation Mecca.

IV. Questionnaire Survey

Since no questionnaire survey had been made since 1963, it was decided to send out another questionnaire in an effort to supplement the information received on the annual or "Terminal" Reports. (Appendix A) In order to secure prompt approval from the Bureau of the Budget, the questions asked had to be identical with the questionnaire sent out in 1963, except for the explanatory material at the top of the page. Because of the shortage of time and the impossibility of revising the 1963 questionnaire, it was decided not to attempt a general questionnaire to all former Fellows but to send this questionnaire (copy attached as Appendix B) to 400 former Fellows whose names were selected according to a skillful sampling technique developed by Adams with the assistance of Cookson.

Fully cognizant of the difficulties and dangers of sampling, Adams used a technique quite the opposite of random sampling. Out of some 3,320 graduate fellowships which terminated before July 1964 (the terminal reports for those terminating in June 1965 are in hand), 400 names were chosen, keeping the same proportion (400/3320) to fellowships granted in each year since 1959, and in each language or area. Other criteria which were also followed as closely as possible were proportionate selection of names from the various sections of the United States, Fellows in Centers versus non-Centers; men to women; first fellowship and renewals; types of institutions; specialization in language-literature versus social sciences; career purpose, etc. Worked out with extreme care, the list represented adequate samples of all graduate Fellows since the inception of the Program, in the various years, in the various languages, and in the various categories of students.

The greatest source of possible error lies of course in the unknown information in the questionnaires which are not returned. With considerable effort at follow-up, 274 questionnaires were returned out of the 400, or 68.5%. This was somewhat better than the 1963 questionnaire survey when 384 questionnaires out of 600 were returned or 64%. Although by no means complete or entirely trustworthy,

much new information was secured to bring up to date or even to revise the conclusions derived from the 1963 survey. It is likely that no more reliable judgments can be obtained without sending a much expanded and improved questionnaire to all former Fellows.

V. Interviews. It was decided early in the Project that personal interviews with Fellows and with graduate Deans and Directors of Centers would be the most productive source of value judgments. Taking into account the staff and the time available, a schedule of visits to institutions and interviews in them was worked out. During the summer, Walsh and Adams interviewed a considerable number of undergraduate Fellows at summer programs at Harvard, Columbia, Yale and Fordham. From September through December, members of the staff and of the Advisory Committee interviewed a very considerable number of Deans of Graduate Schools, Directors of Centers, Professors in the critical languages and areas, Graduate Fellows and former Fellows. Limited time and personnel did not permit a thorough survey of any of the institutions visited, and the list shows glaring and regretted omissions, both geographically and in terms of their importance. A great deal of valuable information was nevertheless gathered from visits to the following institutions:

University of California, Berkeley
The University of Chicago
Columbia University
Duquesne University
Georgetown University
Harvard University
Howard University
Johns Hopkins University
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
New York University
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
Stanford University
University of Washington
Yale University

VI. Limitations. We wish to explain here, as it will be noted in the course of this Report, that primary attention has been given to the graduate and undergraduate fellowships awarded under NDEA Title VI. Both in size and in length of operation, the Title VI Graduate Fellowships are by far the most significant group. It became impossible, because of the limitations of time, and illness among the staff, to devote much attention to the provisions of the Fulbright-Hays Act, which has actually been in operation only two years, or to the Title VI NDEA Post-Doctoral Fellowships.

The hope was expressed in the original Proposal that this survey would be continued and expanded for a more complete and thorough investigation of the results of both Acts. This present Report is presented in all honesty as the result of a partial and incomplete investigation which needs to be supplemented by further research. Its conclusions and recommendations must be understood as tentative and subject to verification. A careful evaluation of the Post-Doctoral Fellowships and of the Fulbright-Hays Grants for study abroad is greatly needed; and will require much time.

D. STATISTICS

It is essential to have a clear and well-organized concept of the facts about this program, its growth and evolution, before attempting to evaluate its success, or even to comment upon it. Several Tables of statistics and factual information will therefore be included in the body of this Report, as an indispensable part of its progression, rather than relegating them to the Appendices. It is suggested that the reader study them with care, as frequent reference will be made to them. Some of them are copied here in large part as they were supplied by the Office of Education; others have been developed by the Project Staff out of the Terminal Reports, or from other information furnished by the Office of Education, and sometimes from the Questionnaires.

Table I, entitled Statistical Summary, is introductory, giving a sampling of the most important statistics which will be analyzed later. The magnitude of the operation for graduate students is shown by the total number of applications: 16,766; and by the total number of awards 5,505. This covers the seven years of the Graduate Fellowships. During the three years of the Undergraduate Fellowships beginning in 1963-1964, 692 undergraduates have held awards.

Table II, largely prepared by the Office of Education, gives figures of major importance for the five categories of Fellows involved in this study. During the seven years of the program of Graduate Fellowships, the funds obligated rose from roughly $500,000. the first year 1959, to $5,500,000. for the current year 1965-1966. The total spent during the seven years is over $21,500,000. From a slow start of 361 applications in the first year, the number rose rapidly, but since 1962 the number has remained reasonably stable at a little over 3000. The number of Fellowships awarded depended of course upon the amount of money available, and the average cost per Fellow, which increased gradually. The largest number of Fellowships awarded is in this current year, totalling 1320. We shall comment later upon the relationship between new Fellowships and renewals; and also upon the percentage of Fellows attending Centers. The rest of this two-page Table gives figures on the Post-Doctoral Fellowships and Undergraduate Awards under NDEA Title VI. Page 2 gives summarized information on the two-year operation of the Fulbright-Hays Fellowships for graduate students and NDEA Center Faculty Members. About 82 different languages have been studied by 3767 graduate students during the seven years of the program.

Table III presents a highly interesting three-page breakdown of the fellowship awards by language during the seven years, together with totals by languages. These are grouped, first, for the languages of highest priority, which have received a total of 4179 awards; and then the 75 other languages in alphabetical order, showing the fellowships held in each of the seven years. A total of 1326 fellowship awards were given to this group. Some of these languages like Bengali, Finnish, Hebrew, Hungarian, Javanese, Korean, Persian, Polish, Swahili, and Turkish, represent very considerable portions of the total.

Other tabulations will be inserted in the text of this report as they become pertinent.

TABLE I

NATIONAL DEFENSE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FELLOWSHIPS

Statistical Summary

GRADUATE

For the period 1959-60 through 1965-66:

1. Total number of applications: 16,766
2. Total number of awards: 5,505
3. Number of awards by language:

Arabic	Chinese	Hindi-Urdu	Japanese	Portuguese	Russian	Spanish	Other
603	773	388	538	402	1028	447	1326

4. Total number of Fellows: 3,767
5. Total number of declinations of awards: 606
6. Percentage, in each year, of new Fellows:

59-60	60-61	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66	Overall
100%	76%	66%	59%	44%	49%	60%	58.8%

For the period 1959-60 through 1964-65:

7. Total number of Fellows who held a single award: 1,572
8. Total number of Fellows who held two awards: 691
9. Total number of Fellows who held three awards: 302
10. Total number of Fellows who held four awards: 106
11. Total number of Fellows who held five awards: 9
12. Total number of Fellows who held six awards: 1
13. Percentage, in each year, of total number of Fellows enrolled in Centers:

59-60	60-61	61-62	62-63	63-64	64-65	65-66
32%	77%	72%	68%	65%	53%	77%

14. Total number of M.A. degrees received under awards: 614 (approximate)
15. Total number of Ph.D. degrees received under awards: 81 (approximate)
16. Number of Fellows preparing dissertations in 65-66 program: 175 (approximate)

UNDERGRADUATE

In the period 63-64 (beginning of program) through 65-66:

1. Total number of awards: 692
2. Total number of awards by language:

Arabic	Chinese	Hindi-Urdu	Japanese	Portuguese	Russian	Other
69	241	25	111	60	123	63

TABLE II

NDEA TITLE VI MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE FELLOWSHIPS

	FY1959	FY1960	FY1961	FY1962	FY1963	FY1964	FY1965	Totals
FUNDS OBLIGATED	$500,342	$1,674,513	$2,803,199	$3,918,297	$3,516,600	$3,600,000	$5,506,000	$21,518,951
GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS								
Applications Rec'd	361	1,264	2,041	3,100	3,263	3,310	3,427	16,766
Fellowships Awarded	171	472	769	1,006	902	865	1,320	5,505
Academic Year	135	211	330	481	457	431	724	
Summer and Acad. Year	25	190	332	408	369	333	468	
Summer only	11	69	97	114	66	83	109	
Other	-	2	10	3	10	18	19	
New	171	360	508	592	396	420	793	3,240
Renewals	-	112	261	414	506	445	527	2,265
Percentage New	100%	76%	66%	59%	44%	49%	60%	58.8%
Percentage Attending NDEA Centers	32%	77%	72%	68%	65%	53%	77%	
Average Cost per Fellow	$2,924	$3,453	$3,629	$3,811	$3,750	$3,872	$3,743	
Academic Year	2,960	3,595	3,647	3,662	3,485	3,663	3,665	
Summer and Acad. Year	3,606	4,340	4,584	4,563	4,555	4,641	4,585	
Summer only	557	875	865	904	988	965	933	
Languages Studied	6	31	43	55	59	58	63	82
Institutions Attended	25	34	47	59	56	52	63	65
POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS								
Number Awarded	-	-	-	33	37	13	19	102
Average Cost per Fellow	-	-	-	$1,696	$1,603	$11,120	$10,166	
Languages Studied	-	-	-	6	4	4	4	
Institutions Attended	-	-	-	3	2	5	8	

	FY1959	FY1960	FY1961	FY1962	FY1963	FY1964	FY1965
UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS							
Number Awarded	-	-	-	-	96	196	389
Average Cost	-	-	-	-	$772	$792	$925
Languages Studied	-	-	-	-	13	15	19
Institutions Attended	-	-	-	-	13	15	16

INDIVIDUALS ASSISTED FY1959-1965: 3,767 graduate students; 102 postdoctoral fellows; 681 undergraduates

FULBRIGHT-HAYS FELLOWSHIPS

In FY1965, funds provided under Section 102 (b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 were made available to the NDFL Fellowship Program for awards to graduate students and NDEA Center Faculty members to finance study and research abroad in non-Western languages and area studies.

	FY1964	FY1965	Totals
Fellowships Awarded	118	126	244
Faculty	48	36	84
Graduate Students	70	90	160
Average Cost per Fellow			
Faculty	$8,245	$12,087	
Graduate Students	6,516	6,127	
Languages Studied	28	33	
Institutions Represented	33	30	
Total obligation			
Faculty	$424,738	$435,116	
Graduate Students	489,662	472,187	
Total	914,400	907,303	

TABLE III

NATIONAL DEFENSE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FELLOWSHIPS
GRADUATE AWARDS, BY LANGUAGE

	FY1959	FY1960	FY1961	FY1962	FY1963	FY1964	FY1965	Totals by Lang.
Priority Languages:								
Arabic:	22	61	100	108	100	85	127	603
Chinese:	32	64	101	133	120	125	198	773
Hindi-Urdu:	10	41	73	73	64	59	68	388
Japanese	24	64	100	103	80	61	106	538
Portuguese	14	36	55	77	60	60	100	402
Russian	69	132	190	175	135	125	202	1028
Spanish	-	-	-	100	96	93	158	447
Sub-total:	171	398	619	769	655	608	959	4179
Other Languages:								
Afrikaans	-	1	1	1	1	4	1	9
Albanian	-	-	1	1	4	4	3	13
Amharic	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	5
Armenian	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Bambara	-	-	-	4	2	1	-	7
Batak	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Bemba	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
Bengali	-	7	8	12	12	2	8	49
Berber languages	-	-	1	1	2	3	6	13
Bulgarian	-	-	2	2	1	-	-	5
Bulom	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Burmese	-	2	1	2	8	1	-	14
Chinantec	-	-	-	2	2	2	-	6
Chinyanja	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Chontal	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Czech	-	-	3	5	9	9	11	37
Danish	-	-	1	2	2	1	3	9
Dutch	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
Edo	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Estonian	-	1	2	-	4	3	2	12
Finnish	-	6	11	14	8	4	7	50
Georgian	-	2	2	-	-	1	1	6
Greek	-	-	2	2	2	2	-	8

	FY1959	FY1960	FY1961	FY1962	FY1963	FY1964	FY1965	Totals by Lang.
Other Languages:								
Guarani	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Haitian Creole	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
Hausa	-	-	-	1	9	13	18	41
Hebrew	-	8	13	12	8	9	16	66
Hungarian	-	3	6	8	8	8	16	49
Ibibio	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Igbo (Ibo)	-	-	-	2	1	1	2	6
Icelandic	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	4
Indonesian	-	9	7	13	9	10	20	68
Javanese	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	3
Kachin	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Kannada	-	-	-	2	2	3	2	9
Kazak	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Kazan-Turkic	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Khalka-Mongolian	-	3	4	3	3	6	4	23
KiKongo	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2
Kirghiz	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Korean	-	1	5	10	11	10	12	49
Lithuanian	-	-	-	1	1	2	2	6
Luganda	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Lusatian	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Malayalam	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	3
Marathi	-	1	1	1	1	2	1	7
Mayan	-	-	-	-	1	3	4	8
Mazatec	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Mixtec	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	3
Mundari	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Nahuati	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	3
Nepali	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	6
Norwegian	-	1	2	2	2	3	6	16
Pashto	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
Persian	-	8	8	14	14	14	21	79
Polish	-	2	7	9	10	6	20	54
Quechua	-	-	2	5	5	4	6	22
Rumanian	-	-	1	6	2	2	1	12
Serbo-Croatian	-	-	8	9	9	9	11	46

	FY1959	FY1960	FY1961	FY1962	FY1963	FY1964	FY1965	Totals by Lang.
Other Languages:								
Shona	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Singhalese	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	2
Swahili	-	4	8	26	25	35	45	143
Swedish	-	1	3	3	3	7	11	28
Tagalog	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	4
Tamil	-	-	2	3	6	9	11	31
Telugu	-	1	4	8	5	5	4	27
Thai	-	-	4	10	6	5	12	37
Tibetan	-	1	2	2	4	4	5	18
Turkish	-	6	16	14	17	22	30	105
Twi	-	1	-	1	2	-	1	5
Uzbek	-	2	1	2	2	2	1	10
Vietnamese	-	-	3	5	7	5	3	23
Visayan	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
Xhosa	-	-	-	-	-	2	5	7
Yoruba	-	1	5	8	5	8	3	30
						Sub-total other lang.		1,326
Total Fellowships	171	472	769	1,006	902	865	1,320	5,505

E. MAJOR ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM: PROBLEMS AND QUESTIONS.

I. The Quality of the Fellows: Selection, Competition, Trends.

a. Personal Testimony. On the first major question regarding the success of the NDFL Fellowship Program, the answer is clear and categorical: the quality of the Fellows is excellent. The all but unanimous testimony of all persons interviewed by the staff, and from all evidence that could be secured, is that the Fellows are superior to the general run of graduate students, and the equal of the holders of other major fellowships. In some of the smaller institutions, professors sometimes said that they did not have sufficient basis for comparison with other fellowship holders; but they almost always added that the NDFL Fellows were among their best students. The comment was frequently voiced that the NDFL Program is very selective, and that the selectivity is increasing. A typical comment is "I know some people who deserved them and didn't get them; but I know of no one who got them that didn't deserve them."

In the larger institutions, the testimony of graduate deans and Directors of Centers (See Interview Form, Appendix C) indicates that the quality of the NDFL Fellows is not only uniformly high, but compares very favorably with the best national or local fellowships. One director said that he puts the NDFL Fellowships in the same "league" as the Ford and the National Institute of Health Fellowships. Most professors who were interviewed indicated that they considered their NDFL Fellows as "the cream of the crop." Some directors pointed out that in individual institutions and special cases, some national or local fellowships are more highly regarded and their holders take the lead; but in general the NDFL Fellowships are among the most desirable on a national basis. Their holders are generally considered to be the equal of the Title IV Fellows, even though the institution derives an additional financial benefit from the Title IV Fellowships.

1. The very small amount of adverse comment which has been encountered stems usually from an important fact which is often forgotten in regard to the NDFL Fellowships, namely that the required study program combines language study, usually at an elementary or intermediate level, with area studies, commonly in the social sciences. The aptitudes required by these two subjects are not at all the same. A student may have a distinct aptitude for language but have difficulty working with geography or history. The reverse was encountered even more commonly. Fellows with a major in the social sciences sometimes make poor language students, even though they are of top quality in their own disciplines.

There may be several reasons for this. Aptitudes vary, and some people have high or low aptitude for handling a language, just as some people have high or low aptitude for handling abstract ideas. Another reason may be that a Fellow is naturally inclined to give the greatest proportion of his time and effort to his major subject. If this happens to be history or economics, his course in Japanese may have to take whatever time is left in his schedule. Especially the language professors interviewed have complained that students of recognized high intellectual ability were often not the best students in their language classes. Since the continuation of his fellowship depends more upon his professors and advisors in his major field, the Fellow is inclined to be more afraid of a low grade in his major than in a language course which may not be his major. It is quite true that there are many students in this program who might not be studying a language if it were not required.

2. One of the best features of this NDFL Program is precisely that it leads and even forces the Fellow to a realization of the value of a knowledge of the language of the area which he is studying. In spite of the wide range of language aptitude, it is an exaggeration to speak of "linguistic cripples." No one who has learned to speak English is incapable of learning to speak any other world language, if it is properly taught over a sufficient period of time. Almost all of the NDFL

Fellows succeed in acquiring a sufficient command of the language which they need, and of the particular skill which they need.

It is tempting to consider the possibility of examining the language background of candidates for NDFL Fellowships, and of giving preference to applicants who have already demonstrated a certain amount of linguistic aptitude, perhaps by success in a commonly taught language. If the sole aim of the legislation were to prepare college teachers of the language, this would be wise. But in the broader interpretation of the Fellowship Program, under which a future teacher of Chinese History for example is equally as eligible and desirable, the essential point is to select the candidate who will make the very best possible teacher of Chinese History, everything considered, and then give him the opportunity to secure an adequate working knowledge of Chinese.

b. Selection. Questions are frequently raised in regard to the selection of candidates, the percentage relation of awards to applications, and the comparative percentages in the various languages. In order to give full information on this matter, we are now including three Tables which we feel are worthy of careful attention. Table IV gives an over-all view of the awards of Graduate Fellowships in the seven high priority languages and in the other critical languages taken together, over the five year period from 1961 to 1966. It provides a comparison of actual figures of applications versus awards in each of the five years, together with totals and percentages. It will be seen that there is a wide variation between the chances of an applicant for Latin-American Spanish (21%) or for Russian (23%), compared with his chances if he applies for Hindi-Urdu (46%) or one of the more neglected languages (averaging 46%).

Table V gives the specific example of the year 1963-1964, showing the applications, both new and renewals, with the portion of them not recommended; and compares these figures with the awards for new or renewed Fellowships. It shows also the percentages of new awards to new applications.

Table VI compares, for this current year 1965-1966, the total applications with the awards for renewals and new Fellowships in all 65 languages in which awards were made.

TABLE IV

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Comparison of Applications and Awards by Language

	Applic 61-62	Awards 61-62	Applic 62-63	Awards 62-63	Applic 63-64	Awards 63-64	Applic 64-65	Awards 64-65	Applic 65-66	Awards 65-66	Total Applic 61-66	Total Awards 61-66	% of Applic 61-66	Total Awards 59-66
Arabic	235	100	301	108	258	100	270	85	241	127	1305	520	40%	603
Chinese	384	101	454	133	531	120	479	125	592	198	2440	677	27%	773
Hindi-Urdu	125	73	155	73	156	64	156	59	137	68	729	337	46%	388
Japanese	207	100	279	103	285	80	285	61	284	106	1340	450	34%	538
Portuguese	121	55	178	77	142	60	158	60	270	100	869	352	41%	402
Russian	679	190	711	175	740	135	761	125	673	202	3564	827	23%	1028
Spanish	0	0	488	100	623	96	534	93	504	158	2149	447	21%	447
Other Languages	290	150	534	237	528	247	667	257	726	361	2745	1252	46%	1326
Totals	2041	769	3100	1006	3263	902	3310	865	3427	1320	15141	4862		5505
% of Awards to Applic		37%		32%		28%		26%		38%		32%		

1959-60 Figures for applications by languages not available. Total applic 361, Awards 171, 47%

1960-61 Figures for applications by languages not available. Total applic 1264, Awards 472, 37%

1959-66 Total applications 16766; Total awards 5505; 32.8% overall

TABLE V

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS, YEAR 1963-1964

Examples of New and Renewal Applications and Awards

	APPLICATIONS					AWARDS		
	New	Non-Recommended	Renewals	Non-Recommended	Total Recommended	New	Renewals	% New Awards of new Applic.
Arabic	173	28	85	2	258	35	65	20.2%
Chinese	394	91	137	6	531	41	84	10.4
Hindi	99	15	57	-	156	28	36	28.1
Japanese	199	33	86	5	285	30	50	15.1
Portuguese	87	15	55	-	142	24	36	27.6
Russian	601	136	139	8	740	72	63	12.0
Spanish	558	106	65	1	623	52	44	9.4
Berber	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	0
Bulgarian	4	-	2	-	6	-	1	0
Czech	9	2	5	1	14	3	4	33.3
Estonian	1	-	4	-	5	1	3	100.0
Finnish	8	2	8	1	16	2	6	25.0
Greek	8	1	1	-	9	1	1	12.5
Hausa	9	-	2	1	11	2	-	22.2
Ibo	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	0
Kannada	-	-	2	-	2	-	1	0
Khal-Mongolian	3	-	1	-	4	2	1	66.6
KiKongo	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	0
Korean	4	-	8	-	12	4	7	100.0
Mayan	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	100.0
Quechua	5	1	4	-	9	1	3	20.0
Serbo-Croatian	9	1	12	2	11	1	7	11.1
Tamil	8	-	3	1	11	5	1	62.5
Telugu	3	1	7	-	10	-	7	0
Thai	5	-	6	-	11	3	3	60.0
Tibetan	5	-	2	-	7	2	2	40.0
Uzbek	2	-	1	1	3	-	1	0
Yoruba	6	-	3	-	9	2	3	33.3
Polish	28	3	10	-	38	6	5	21.4
Indonesian	20	2	8	-	28	7	6	35.0

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM 1965-66

Awards

LANGUAGE	RENEWALS	NEW	TOTAL	TOTAL APPLICATIONS
Afrikaans	1		1	5
Albanian	2	1	3	4
Amharic	1	2	3	3
Arabic	49	78	127	241
Armenian			0	5
Bambara			0	2
Bemba		2	2	2
Bengali	2	6	8	16
Berber	4	2	6	12
Bulom		1	1	1
Chinese	83	115	198	592
Chontal		1	1	1
Czech	7	4	11	17
Danish		3	3	6
Dutch		2	2	5
Edo		1	1	1
Estonian	2		2	2
Finnish	4	3	7	16
Georgian	1		1	3
Guarani		1	1	1
Haitian Creole	1		1	1
Hausa	5	13	18	40
Hebrew	6	10	16	37
Hindi-Urdu	35	33	68	137
Hungarian	6	10	16	20
Ibibio		1	1	1
Ibo		2	2	4
Icelandic		1	1	1
Indonesian	6	14	20	49
Japanese	45	61	106	284
Javanese	1		1	2
Kannada	1	1	2	3
Khalka-Mongolian	3	1	4	10
Kirghiz		1	1	2

Awards

LANGUAGE	RENEWALS	NEW	TOTAL	TOTAL APPLICATIONS
Korean	7	2	9	12
Lithuanian	2		2	2
Malayalam	1	0	1	2
Marathi	1		1	3
Mayan	2	2	4	5
Mazatec		1	1	1
Nahuatl		1	1	1
Nepali	1	2	3	4
Norwegian	1	5	6	12
Persian	10	11	21	39
Polish	4	9	20	53
Portuguese	40	60	100	270
Quechua	2	4	6	14
Rumanian	1		1	7
Russian	78	124	202	673
Serbo-Croatian	7	4	11	26
Sinhalese	1		1	2
Spanish	46	112	158	504
Swahili	9	36	45	87
Swedish	3	8	11	18
Tagalog		3	3	10
Tamil	5	6	11	22
Telugu	2	2	4	9
Thai	4	8	12	26
Tibetan	4	1	5	6
Turkish	15	15	30	52
Twi		1	1	1
Uzbek	1		1	2
Vietnamese	2	1	3	9
Xhosa	2	3	5	6
Yoruba	1	2	3	9
Other, no awards				15
Totals, 65 languages	527	793	1320	3427

1. From these tables it is immediately evident that the percentage of awards to applications is higher in the more neglected critical languages than in the more widely studied critical languages. For example, in 1963-1964 the ratio of new awards to new applications was 9.4% in Spanish, 10.4% in Chinese, but 28.1% in Hindi. In the same year the corresponding ratio was 60% in Thai; 62.5% in Tamil; 66.6% in Khalka; while every new applicant in Korean, Mayan and Estonian was accepted. These disparities clearly mean that it is easier to win a fellowship in a language which is clamoring for students. (This same situation is evident in the more detailed report given in Table VI for the awards in the current year 1965-1966).

It should not be assumed from this statement that students of the very neglected languages are either more or less able and deserving than the other Fellows in the program. Some of them are highly able majors in linguistics whose aim is to become familiar with several languages of a certain family. A few may be unusually able students who have become interested in a "rare" language through success in one of the less neglected critical languages. On the other hand, some of them may be students who have tried Chinese or Japanese without success, and decide to apply for Korean because it is easier to secure a Fellowship there. The opinion of the Program Directors is that the students in the most neglected languages are no more able on the average than those who survive the competition in the seven high-priority languages.

2. Returning for a moment to the basic aim of the legislation, the promoting of the national interest, it is a matter of deep regret and serious disappointment that there have been so very few applicants in these most neglected languages. If, from the figures for the current academic year 1965-1966, (see Table VI) we eliminate the seven high-priority languages, and seven others, each of which have enrolled 37 awards or more, we shall have left only 369 awards scattered among 51 languages. Many of these, of potential serious importance in the national interest, have only one or two students. This is particularly true in regard to the Southeast Asian languages. We have <u>only three</u> students studying Vietnamese! It is true

that Thai has twelve, but we have none in Cambodian or Lao, and have almost never had any. The mountain dialects of Southeast Asia are completely neglected.

In other words, these languages which are in the present and foreseeable future of paramount interest to our country, are attracting practically no applicants. The Office of Education can do but little in this situation; the impulse and the encouragement to the student must come from the universities, especially those which because of their strength are able to offer instruction in these languages which are being ignored in spite of their strategic importance to the nation.

c. Trends In discussing the selection of candidates for awards, the question is often raised whether there are any noticeable trends either in the applications or in the awards. Tables IV, V, and VI will also shed much light on this question. The number of awards depends of course largely upon the amount of money available. This was indicated in Table II, and explains for instance why there were 1320 awards for this current year compared to only 865 for the year 1964-1965. On the other hand, it will be noted that since 1962 the number of applicants has increased only slightly: 3100 in 1962, 3263 in 1963, 3310 in 1964, and 3427 in 1965, an increase of only about 100 each year in spite of the greater publicity which the program has acquired. Since the applications did not increase significantly for the current year, while the money available and therefore the number of awards increased markedly, the percentage of awards to applications jumped this year to 38% as compared with 26% last year.

1. This relative stability of the number of applications since 1962 is due largely to the policy of the Office of Education to entrust a considerable amount of preliminary screening to the institutions themselves. In the early years of the program, the Office of Education requested the institutions to send in every application, for fear of losing some acceptable candidates. After 1965, the institutions were requested not to send in the papers of their non-recommended candidates, believing that by this time the institutions knew well enough the standards of the program. This was done in order to cut down the paperwork in the office in Washington.

The applications listed in the last three years have been largely the result of institutional preselection and guidance, an operation which was welcomed by the Office of Education. If the figures for 1965 had been calculated on the same basis as those in 1961, there would probably have been about 4000 or 4500 applications. When this situation is understood, it is clear that the increased percentage of awards to applications does not at all mean a diminution of quality, in fact it means quite the reverse. For the last three years, there has been a definite increase in the number of highly qualified applicants, to some extent self-screened, and to an important degree, pre-selected by the institution, whose Deans and Directors of Centers see nothing to be gained in encouraging the applications and in writing recommendations for mediocre candidates.

2. Another interesting trend lies in a comparison of the new awards and the renewals over the past seven years. During the early years, the new awards constituted a high percentage. Please refer to line 8 of Table II. After 1961, with the amount of money available stabilized or even decreasing until 1964, and with excellent Fellows applying for renewals, the percentage of new Fellows declined to a low of 44% in 1963. At that time, it was indeed a difficult decision to make, whether to refuse to continue a candidate who was doing well in his program, or to refuse to allow an equally good or superior candidate to begin a program. Then in 1965 the amount of money available was increased by 2 million dollars and immediately the percentage of awards to new candidates rose to 60%--793 awards out of a total of 1320. Again, this may be viewed as an increase in quality as well as in quantity.

d. Creation of Interest. An important aspect of this matter of application and selection for NDFL Fellowships, which needs more conscious attention than it has received in the past, is the early creation of interest among students. The use of the term "recruitment" would imply a mechanical program and even the use of propaganda. This is not intended. It is essential, however, that all those who are interested in the aims of this legislation recognize more clearly, and therefore

encourage, the ways through which undergraduate students or even high school students find their attention captivated and their imagination stimulated by the studies which we are discussing.

1. An examination of the responses in the form (Appendix D) used in interviewing graduate students, to the question as to what aroused their interest in these studies, is very revealing. Some of the reasons were of course personal and some accidental, but the great majority replied that their interest originally stemmed from having taken part in some undergraduate course concerned with the civilization and culture of a certain country or area, whether Western or non-Western. They "caught fire" on this topic, followed it further, and soon came to realize the need for a knowledge of the language, and the opportunities for a career.

We might cite some specific examples. One student selects, for distribution requirements, a course in Far Eastern Art; another a course in International Relations, or a course in Chinese History, or Russian Literature, a course in Indian philosophy (even in Junior College), a series of lectures on the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Another read the Eddas and Sagas in a course in Germanic Literature. Another attended an intercollegiate seminar on the Middle East. A course in the history of education discussing the Folk High School system in Scandinavia; a course in comparative government touching upon Brazil and the Portuguese-speaking world, a course in South Asian religion and philosophy, a course on current events touching on the Mau Mau in East Africa, a course on the Old Testament -- these and many other avenues lead students by gradual steps to major in one of the various areas involved, and to apply for an NDFL Fellowship in Russian or Hindi or Portuguese or Hebrew or Norwegian.

2. Some colleges, we understand that Columbia is one, requires every undergraduate to take a course in a non-Western civilization. This movement is growing, and if wisely guided, can encourage undergraduates to choose majors and careers for themselves out of a far wider number of choices than they have imagined in the past.

There are now about 75 courses in Soviet economics being offered in the colleges of the country. They have been very naturally an important recruiting ground for students in the Russian language and other Russian studies. Similar developments can be foreseen in regard to Japan, China, the Middle East and Africa.

We shall discuss later in this report the question of undergraduate study in the critical areas. We refer at this time only to the matter of the creation of interest. It is not sufficiently recognized by academic administrators that a student's major in graduate school is usually selected not later than his sophomore year in college, sometimes even in high school; and that therefore the recruiting, in the best sense of the word, of students for advanced study in areas critical to the national interest must be undertaken early and encouraged by many means now ignored. This would include the introduction into the curricula, even of small colleges, of courses in various aspects of the history, culture, ideas, politics, and other humanistic and social science areas of both Western and non-Western countries.

II. The Results in the Fellows. The second major question which must be answered in evaluating the success of the NDFL Program concerns the results of these Fellowships and the opportunities for study and research which they make possible, on and in the Fellows themselves. Are these Fellowships turning out persons who have completed their training in accordance with the terms of the legislation, and are available for teaching a modern foreign language in college or for other services deemed to be in the national interest? Where are now the Fellows of the past seven years; what are they doing; have they completed their training; are they teaching a language or some approvable related subject, or how else are they serving the national interest?

a. Subjective Judgments. In the many interviews which the Staff held with the graduate and undergraduate Fellows (Appendices D and E), the almost unanimous testimony was strongly favorable, even enthusiastic, that the Fellowships had enabled them or were enabling them to achieve their professional ambition and that

they could not have done so without this financial aid. Even though they sometimes had criticisms about certain aspects of the program or of their instruction, they expressed a deep and sincere gratitude for this financial subsidy and for the advanced study opportunities which it made possible.

Perhaps this was only to be expected, but in many cases the reasons which they gave were interesting. They appreciated the freedom to study full-time and to plan a curriculum to their liking. They appreciated the opportunity to combine the study of a foreign language with their major. They recognized the importance of a total grasp of their material, using the foreign language as an aid to understanding the foreign area and culture. Some were enthusiastic on discovering documents in foreign archives which were useful in their research. One testified that it was the only program he had found which permitted a total interdisciplinary look at the foreign country. They liked the flexible arrangement combining instruction with tutorial assistance. Practically all of them felt that they had derived a great deal of stimulus from it, and a strong encouragement toward the completion of the Ph.D. degree.

The few dissenters were usually students who were not succeeding well with the foreign language and wished to be relieved of this requirement. Some of the students, but a small minority, have indicated in the Project Questionnaire that the fellowship modified their career goal. Only 22 out of 274 replied in the Questionnaire that the fellowship had <u>not</u> helped them to achieve their career goal, this sometimes for technical reasons.

In the same way, nearly all the professors who were interviewed and the graduate deans or Directors of Centers felt that the Fellows were justifying the awards by their efforts and by the results achieved.

b. <u>Statistical Evidence</u>. The practical results of the NDFL Graduate Fellowships are demonstrated not only by subjective judgment, but also by significant statistical data. <u>Table VII</u> gives a breakdown of the career goals as stated by the awardees of Graduate Fellowships during the years from 1960 to 1965. It will

be noted that about one-third or somewhat better of the Fellows planned primarily to teach the language of the award; about one-third expected to teach the language of the award as secondary to their major; about one quarter or less expected to teach area subjects in which reference would frequently be made to the language of the award; and about one-tenth expected to go into governmental or other service in which they expected to use the language. These were of course statements made by the candidates in applying for the fellowships.

TABLE VII

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Career Goals as stated by Awardees

	1960-1961	1961-1962	1962-1963	1963-1964	1964-1965
Teaching primarily the language of award	232	323	372	271	273
	50%	42%	37%	30%	32%
Teaching secondarily the language of award	172	246	322	316	288
	37%	32%	32%	35%	33%
Other Teaching, Area subjects		115	201	199	215
	68	15%	20%	23%	25%
Government or other service	13%	85	111	116	89
		11%	11%	12%	10%
Total	472	769	1006	902	865

TABLE VIII

1964-65 NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Summary of 580 Terminal Reports

88 NDFL Fellows Now Engaged in Teaching or Other Professional Activity

I. Teaching

Teaching Fellow: 15

In language of award: 10		In other fields: 5	
Chinese	2	Anthropology(Japanese)	1
Hebrew	1	Asian Civilization(Hindi-Urdu)	1
Portuguese	1	European History(Russian)	1
Russian	2	International Affairs(Spanish)	1
Spanish	4	Linguistics(Chinantec)	1

Instructor: and Lecturer 30

In language of award: 19		In other fields: 11	
Arabic	1	Comparative Slavic languages (Lusatian)	1
Japanese	2	Economics(Spanish)	1
Persian	1	English(Arabic)	1
Portuguese	3	Fine Arts(Chinese)	1
Russian	8	History(Russian)	1
Spanish	2	International Relations(Chinese)	2
Other	2	Linguistics(Chinese;Mundari)	2
		Western Civilization(Afrikaans)	1
		Other	1

Assistant Professor: 27

In language of award: 15		In other fields: 12	
Chinese	2	English(Arabic)	1
Hebrew	1	French(Hausa)	1
Japanese	1	History(Chinese;Portuguese)	2
Portuguese	2	Linguistics(Hindi-Urdu)	1
Russian	3	Political Science(Afrikaans; Portuguese; Russian; Spanish)	5
Serbo-Croatian	1	Rural Sociology(Quechua)	1
Spanish	5	Speech and Drama(Russian)	1

I. Teaching (Continued)

Associate Professorships: 4

In language of award: 2

Russian 2

In other fields: 2

Anthropology and Linguistics (Russian) 1
Economics (Hindi-Urdu) 1

Professorships: 1

Modern foreign languages (Greek)

II. Other Professional Activity Total 10

Library work (Hindi-Urdu; Spanish) 3
Intelligence Research Analysis 2
USIA: Guide to exhibit in USSR (Russian) 1
Peace Corps: Language Coordinator (Hindi-Urdu; Swahili) 2

Other: Assistant to Brazilian Minister of Education (Spanish) 1
Member of Rockefeller Field Staff, Uganda (Swahili) 1

III. Summary

Teaching:		Other activity:	
Language:	51	Librarianship:	3
Anthropology	2	Government	5
Area Studies	2	Other	2
Economics	2		
Fine Arts	1		
History	4		
International Relations	2		
Linguistics	4		
Political Science	5		
Sociology	1		
Speech	1		
Other	3		
	78 total		10 total

It has been difficult to ascertain exactly how many of the fellows actually go into teaching on the termination of their fellowship, chiefly because a great majority of them are still studying or doing research, often on other fellowships, and completing their degrees. For this reason an analysis of the Terminal Reports received from Fellows in the 1964-1965 program, reports received up to the end of September 1965, is disappointing, although it should be interpreted as purely temporary. Of 580 Terminal Reports received at that time, only 47 students reported that they were actually engaged then in teaching the language of the award, 4 were teaching a related language, 4 were teaching linguistics, and 23 others were teaching in some related field, usually in the social sciences. Ten others reported that they were engaged in some type of government work in this country or abroad, or were in library work.

2. More completely informative and more encouraging are the results secured from the Questionnaire (see Appendix B) which this Project distributed in the Fall of 1965, and which was referred to under Section C, IV, earlier in this report. Four hundred questionnaires were sent to former Fellows according to a complex sampling procedure, worked out by Adams with the close cooperation of Cookson. The list included representatives of Fellows from each year since the beginning of the Program, both men and women, all the languages proportionately, the various sections of the U.S., types of institutions, Fellows with single or multiple awards, and to some extent proportionately to their career purpose and their origin in language-literature departments or the social sciences. Every effort was made not to "load" the selection in any direction. (The Questionnaire did not include 1964-1965, since we have the Terminal Reports for that year, and since there had been no lapse of time since the Report). Since there had been a lapse of time of from one to five years since the Fellowship had been completed by the Fellows on the selected list, we had an opportunity to discover where they had gone in the meantime, and what they are now doing.

This Questionnaire met several difficulties. Even though it was an exact repetition of the questionnaire sent out by the Office of Education in 1963, approval of the Bureau of the Budget was delayed overlong, so that we found ourselves setting a return deadline of September 1 for a questionnaire which was not mailed until mid-August, and often not forwarded to the Fellows at a new address until mid-September. A great proportion of the Fellows had changed their addresses, sometimes four or five times during the period elapsed since the end of their Fellowship. Intensive follow-ups were made, but the institution of the award had also frequently lost track of the Fellow.

In spite of all, we have received 274 replies out of the 400, or 68.5%. This is somewhat low for standard questionnaire procedure, and it may have caused some distortion in the statistical conclusions to be drawn, since it is likely that those who did reply are those whose later careers have been more successful and more stable. Nevertheless, the results are highly significant, and provide up to this moment the best basis for a statistical evaluation of the results of the Program, until a thorough questionnaire survey can be undertaken of the entire list of some four thousand recipients.

The following Table IX presents the language usage reported in the 274 replies. Seventy-five of the Fellows replying are now teaching the language of their award in college or university and six more in high school. Thirty-eight more are teaching, usually in the social sciences, and frequently using the language as a tool for their own and their students' work. Others are using the language more or less in other fields as indicated. It is a striking fact that only seven out of the 274 replies reported that they are not now using the language at all.

TABLE IX

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Language Usage Reported in 274 Replies to Survey Questionnaire

September 1965

Teaching the language of award in College	75
Teaching the language in High School	6
Teaching, and using the language as a tool	38
Not teaching, but using or expecting to use the language professionally	30
Still students	96
University administration	5
Armed Services	11
Government service	6
Not using the language in other employment	7
Total	274
Total teaching the language now or have taught it in the past	98

c. Degrees Earned. The terms of NDEA Title VI Section 601 (b) reads that the Commissioner will pay stipends "but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients of such stipends will on completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for such other services of a public nature...." No mention is made in the legislation of degrees to be earned, or any definition given as to what constitutes completion of training. Since however, the training must be "advanced," the graduate students selected are generally considered to be at least candidates for the Master of Arts degree and eventually candidates for the Ph.D. degree. Since a permanent career in a university now usually requires the Ph.D., the administration of this program tends to regard the completion of the Ph.D. degree as the final proof of the "completion of training." It may well be argued that Fellows who have as their career goal some "other service of a public nature permitted by the Commissioner" may consider their training completed at the Master of Arts level or somewhere above it, but not necessarily pursued to the completion of a doctorate.

The number of Master of Arts degrees and Ph.D. degrees earned by the Fellows, either during their tenure of the Fellowship or later, is one legitimate test of the success of the program. Tables X, XI, and XII give significant statistics regarding the completion of degrees by NDFL Graduate Fellows. Table X shows the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees received, by fields, since the beginning of the program through 1964, according to figures received from the Office of Education, and based upon Terminal Reports. It was at that time discouraging to read that out of aid given to approximately 2600 Fellows, only 50 had actually received the Ph.D. degree according to these figures. Some expressed the fear that the program was not attracting high-class doctorate material.

These conclusions were erroneous, and the fears were premature, for two reasons. The program was at that time still too young to have given the time necessary to produce many doctorates. Secondly, it will always be very difficult to secure accurate information on the total number of doctorates actually completed

by all Fellows who at one time or another have received aid under Title VI. It is common practice for a doctorate candidate to study for a year or two under a Fellowship; then, for various reasons, to accept a teaching position, or a research fellowship in the foreign field, or to change to a different type of fellowship, completing the doctorate several years later, when we have lost track of him.

TABLE X

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Degrees Received, by Field

	1959-1960	1960-1961	1961-1962	1962-1963 ****	1963-1964
M.A. Total	21*	86	112	158	115
Anthropology		1	2	4	
Area Studies		14	16	15	42
Art History				3	1
Economics		3	3	4	3
Education		1			
Geography		1	1		
History		24	26	36	18
History of Religion				1	
History of Science				1	
International Relations		1	3	4	2
Language and Literature		31	42	35	35
Law			1		
Library				1	
Linguistics		8	10	17	7
Mathematics					1
Political Science		2	7	23	5
Sociology					1
Zoology and Botany			1		
Ph.D. Total	1**	9 ***	8	15	17
Anthropology					1
Area Studies			1	3	2
Economics		1		1	
History			2	3	4
Language and Literature	1	2	5	3	4
Linguistics		5		2	4
Political Science					1
Sociology					1
Geography		1			

* Arabic 5, Chinese 4, Hindi 1, Japanese 3, Portuguese 2, Russian 6.

** Japanese.

*** Languages—Linguistics 5, Chinese 1, Russian 1, Geography 1, Economics 1.

**** Total based on 724 Terminal Reports received to April 30, 1964; breakdown by by field gives total 144, on 640 Terminal Reports received in December 1963. Likewise, total Ph.D. 15 in April 1964; breakdown total 12.

Table XI shows a considerable improvement in the number of doctorates earned, even on the incomplete returns of Terminal Reports from 533 Fellows out of 865, before September 29, 1965. Table XI shows the languages in which the Fellowships were held and the doctorates received by Fellows in those languages. It is noteworthy also that 81 of the Fellows reported that they were teaching.

TABLE XI

1964-1965 NDFL GRADUATE PROGRAM

Degrees Received, by Language

Summarization of Terminal Reports Received up to September 29, 1965

Language	Fellowships	Reports Received	M.A.	Ph. D.	Fellows Now Teaching
Arabic	85	50	14	3	4
Chinese	125	79	12	3	10
Hindi-Urdu	59	32	10	2	4
Japanese	61	37	10	2	4
Portuguese	60	37	11	5	10
Russian	125	82	18	5	19
Spanish	93	51	9	8	15
Other	257	165	38	3	15
Total	865	533	122	31	81

Table XII is more encouraging still, reporting the results of the Project Questionnaire in September 1965. Out of 274 responses to 400 questionnaires sent out, we learn that 51 of them had completed the Ph.D. degree. This does not mean that they completed the degree while holding an NDFL Fellowship, nor that the Fellowship was of central importance in its completion. Indeed, many of them completed the doctorate two or three years after the end of their Fellowship. The essential fact is that out of 274 names in a sampling list by no means weighted in this direction, 51 students had completed the Ph.D. degree, having been more or less aided by an NDFL Fellowship.

The distribution in fields among the languages is also very interesting. Linguistics ranks high, but it is a broad spectrum in which history, political science, literature, history of science, international affairs, anthropology, and many others all have a share. It is significant that eleven of the 51 doctorates concerned other languages than the seven high priority languages; and these eleven are scattered widely through nine of the more neglected languages. Also, by comparison with Table XI in which thirteen of the thirty-one Ph.D. degrees were concerned with Spanish and Portuguese, only four out of fifty-one in this questionnaire survey were concerned with Spanish and Portuguese. The proportion of Russian still remains high (12 out of 51), but the non-Western languages show a much higher proportion.

TABLE XII

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Analysis of 274 Project Questionnaires, Ph.D.s Earned

Language		Field
13	Arabic	
		History of Math
		Linguistics
		History of Science
		Political Science
		International Relations
		Arabic Studies
		4 Mediterranean Studies
		Jewish History
		Middle East Studies
		Spanish
3	Chinese	
		Chinese History
		Asian Studies
		Political Science
4	Hindi-Urdu	
		General Linguistics
		Philology
		Hindi Literature
		International Affairs, Law
4	Japanese	
		2 Japanese History
		Chemistry
		Japanese Language-Literature
3	Portuguese	
		Linguistics
		Latin American History
		Spanish
12	Russian	
		4 Slavic Linguistics
		4 Slavic Language and Literature
		General Linguistics
		Slavic and Baltic Studies
		Slavic and Baltic Philology
		German Literature
1	Spanish	
		Linguistics

Other Languages		Field
1	Bengali	Indian History
2	Chinantec	Anthropology General Linguistics
1	Danish	History
2	Hebrew	Jewish Philosophy Near East Studies
1	Icelandic	Linguistics
1	Kannada	Anthropology
1	Lithuanian	Linguistics
1	Serbo-Croatian	Slavic Language and Literature
1	Swahili	Political Science
Total 51		(40 High Priority Languages; 11 other)

Fields of Concentration

Language-Literature	10
Linguistics and Philology	14
"Studies"	9
History	7
Political Science and International Relations	5
Anthropology	2
Philosophy	1
Mathematics	1
History of Science	1
Chemistry	1
Total	51

Table XIII provides a still different analysis of the responses to the Project Questionnaire. Part A shows not only the number of completed Ph.D.'s in the various languages, but also the number of Ph.D.'s definitely expected to be completed in 1966. This adds twenty-seven to the total figure. Most of these were former Fellows, not now holding an NDFL Fellowship. Ninety-two others reported that they are still studying, with an M.A. and an eventual Ph.D. in progress.

Part B summarizes the responses in regard to the teaching situation. Forty-seven who have completed the doctorate are now teaching at various ranks in college or university. Forty-one more are now teaching in the various ranks, including high school, without the Ph.D. It may be assumed that some of these are still working on their dissertation. Forty-five others indicated that they are now employed in various ways and are working on their doctorate in their spare time. This brings to 137 the total of Ph.D.'s now in progress and expected later than 1966. As far as we can tell, all but four of the fifty-one who have completed their doctorate in this questionnaire are now teaching in college or university.

Part C answers the question frequently raised whether the Fellows have had any significant study abroad, in the country of their major language, not merely tourism, but an opportunity to study or do research in the foreign area. The figures shown in this table are disappointingly small, and the matter will be referred to later.

TABLE XIII

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Analysis of 274 Questionnaires

PART A.	Arabic	Chinese	Hindi	Japanese	Portuguese	Russian	Spanish	Other	Total
Number of Ph.D.s	13	3	4	4	3	12	1	11	51
Ph.D.s Expected in 1966	2	2	1	3	5	5	2	7	27
Students (Ph.D. Candidates, Ph.D. or M.A. in Progress)									92*

PART B.	Prof.	Assoc.Pr.	Asst.Pr.	Inst./Lect.	Research & Teach	High Sch.	Other	Total
Teaching with Ph.D.	3	2	32	4	0	0	6	47
Teaching without Ph.D.	1	1	14	14	2	9	0	41
Employed and Working on Ph.D.		8	1	23	5		8	45*

PART C.		Arabic	Chinese	Hindi	Japanese	Portuguese	Russian	Spanish	Other	Total
Significant Study Abroad (Language or Ph.D. Research)	Now have Ph.D. and those expected in 1966	5	1	3	3	7	3	2	14	38
	As yet without Ph.D. and not expected in 1966	7	11	11	12	6	2	4	16	69

* Total Ph.D.s in progress - 137

Two other tables will provide interesting information drawn from the applications of candidates for graduate Fellowships. Table XIV shows the number of Graduate Fellows in the 1964-1965 program who indicated that they were preparing dissertations for the Ph.D. The figures are given by languages, and show the highest number to be interested in Chinese; although forty-three out of 131 or practically one-third of those interested in the high-priority languages are in Portuguese and Spanish. The "other" languages in total show up somewhat better, with forty-eight out of the grand total of 179, or 27%, distributed among these more neglected languages.

Table XV analyzes the fields of 175 Fellows of the current academic year 1965-1966 who are in the process of preparing their dissertations. With approximately the same number as in 1964-1965, (179), the field of language, literature and linguistics groups about half of the total. Among the other fields, history is far in the lead with 37, followed at a distance by political science with 14, and area studies with 13.

TABLE XIV

1964-1965 NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Number of Fellows who are Preparing Dissertations

Highest Priority Languages

Arabic	20
Chinese	33
Hindi-Urdu	9
Japanese	6
Portuguese	18
Russian	20
Spanish	25
Sub-total	131

Other Languages

Afrikaans	1	Marathi	2
Albanian	2	Mayan	1
Bambara	1	Mundari	1
Bengali	1	Nepali	1
Chinantec	1	Norwegian	1
Czech	1	Persian	2
Estonian	1	Quechua	1
Finnish	2	Rumanian	2
Greek	2	Serbo-Croatian	2
Hebrew	1	Swahili	3
Hungarian	1	Tamil	2
Igbo	1	Tibetan	3
Indonesian	1	Turkish	3
Khalka-Mongolian	1	Uzbek	2
Korean	1	Vietnamese	2
Lusatian	1	Yoruba	1
		Sub-total	48
		Grand Total	179

TABLE XV

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS 1965-1966

Fields in which Fellows are Preparing Dissertations

Field	Number of Fellows
Anthropology	8
Area Studies	13
Art	1
Economics	3
Geography	3
Government	3
History	37
International Relations	2
Language, Literature, and Linguistics	86
Math	1
Philosophy	2
Political Science	14
Sociology	2
TOTAL	175

d. The Problem of the Ph.D. Since one of the purposes, in fact the most important purpose of the legislation, is to produce more and better college and university teachers in these needed languages and areas, and since such teachers must usually have a Ph.D. degree, it is essential that a principal achievement of this program be an increase in the number of doctorates earned. We have already pointed out that it is early, and difficult, to judge the program on this basis. The first effective year of the program was 1960, and many of the candidates who were helped by Fellowships in the early years are only now completing their dissertations. It has been and will continue to be extremely difficult to secure reliable information on the total number of doctorates actually completed by all persons who have received aid, especially recent aid, under Title VI.

The statistics quoted in Tables XI and XIII are encouraging because they show much progress. Since the Project Questionnaire was addressed only to students whose Fellowships were terminated before July 1964, the figures of 51 Ph.D.'s completed and 27 expected in 1966 can be added, with practically no overlapping, to the thirty-one Ph.D. degrees reported in the Terminal Reports for the year 1964-1965. This gives us well over 100 as a proven achievement, with an undetermined number of others about whom we have no information. Nevertheless, this is still a very small figure compared with the total number of 3767 different individuals who have been holders of NDFL graduate fellowships for a longer or shorter period. Aside from the fact that the program is still young, we have a serious problem.

1. Our interviews with graduate students, heads of departments, and directors of Centers, have convinced us that there are two major reasons for the comparatively small and slow production of doctorates by the NDFL Fellows. The first, most basic reason is that the Ph.D. requirements in these fields which concern us have become too demanding. The usual American Ph.D. in the humanities or the social sciences--philosophy, French literature, history--can generally be completed by a competent student in four years of full-time work, sometimes even in three years, after the A.B. degree.

In the fields we are concerned with, however, there is ample evidence that five or six years are now being considered an absolute minimum for an acceptable program, and some institutions seem to be considering a ten-year program as an accepted fact. To the usual four years in one of the social sciences are added a minimum of two or three years necessary to become well acquainted with one of the neglected languages, and with the geography, history and culture of the area. A year of field study and research in the foreign area is usually desirable. It also frequently happens that a second, related neglected language may have to be added for research purposes.

The same thing is happening in the humanities, when a student decides to work in Indian philosophy or in the music of the Middle East. The result is that the doctorate programs which the NDFL Fellowships wish to support are in danger of "pricing themselves out of the market." Even the very demanding professions in physics, medicine, and law do not require so much, and promise far more, earlier. Young men and women of today are unwilling to wait until they are 30 years of age to marry and begin a family. The result is that after three or four years, they are tempted by high salaried offers from industry, government, or the armed services and give up their studies, promising themselves that they will finish their dissertation "in their spare time."

2. The second reason for our difficulty, as explained in the complaints of many graduate students in a number of institutions, is that the Ph.D. program in these fields is as yet ill-defined, nebulous even in the minds of the chairman of the department, and changing from year to year. This may be inevitable under the circumstances, since most of these programs are very new, and often still in the stage of experimentation. The offerings and therefore the requirements change with the coming and going of professors in the field. Improvements are being constantly made in the program. Even in some cases the situation overseas changes and requires modifications.

It is also true that these programs are highly flexible and are usually tailored to the needs of the individual student. A graduate student who has had no Chinese in college as an undergraduate will have to be told that his program will take him longer than another graduate student who has had that advantage. A worthwhile doctoral program must be tailored according to the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and those are not always known at the very start.

Nevertheless, when all is said, a graduate student has a right to be frustrated and worried if no one can tell him at the beginning of his program approximately how long it will take to complete it or just what requirements he will have to meet. He has a right to be discouraged and even angry if half way through the program, new requirements of other courses, new languages, or additional field work are superimposed. Some students have testified that they have the feeling of being "led on and on," without knowing how long it will last. This problem of the length of time it takes to get the Ph.D. degree in some of these fields is giving increasing concern to some of the program administrators we interviewed, but we feel that comparatively few graduate faculty members, country-wide, are willing to face the issue in realistic terms.

3. We recommend strongly therefore that a concerted effort be made by deans of graduate schools and directors of Centers, nationally, in order to set realistic limits on the requirements for the Ph.D. in these areas with which Title VI is concerned; and that in so far as is possible, consistent with the necessary flexibility, the required program of studies be clearly defined, well in advance. Speed-up is not the most important problem, but a consensus on what requirements constitute competence in a given field.

e. Changing Languages. An interesting side light on the programs of the Fellows was discovered in an analysis of the Project Questionnaires. There has been quite a little switching from one language to another in the programs of Fellows who held multiple awards. Proportionately it is not large, and much of it is perfectly logical, as when a student works one year in Portuguese and the next

year in Spanish, or one year in Dutch and the next year in Indonesian. Often a student will become interested through a major language like Hindi to undertake studies in one of the more neglected languages like Nepali. Sometimes a student will spend two years on Portuguese, then add a year of Spanish and a year of Arabic; do his thesis in applied linguistics, and go into the teaching of English to Brazilian military officers.

Sometimes a good student will be quite patently trying his hand at two or three quite different languages and then abandon them or use them more or less in connection with a major in comparative literature or anthropology. We do not feel that this is necessarily bad; indeed it may be very good if it aids a good man to decide where he can be most useful. Occasionally, the switching may be the result of ill-defined requirements for the Ph.D. but such cases have not been common. At any rate, we would recommend that an applicant for the renewal of his fellowship, but in a different language, be expected to justify quite clearly the reasons for the change. The program cannot afford to subsidize students who are merely "browsing around."

f. Multiple Awards. Many questions have been asked in regard to multiple awards in the graduate fellowship program. We are therefore inserting Table XVI which gives a detailed analysis of the single and multiple awards over the six-year period from 1959-1960 through 1964-1965, by languages. It will be noted that out of the total of 4335 awards which were made during this period, 1572 Fellows held a single award, 691 held two awards, only 302 held three awards, 106 held four awards, only 9 held five awards and to the best of our knowledge only one held six awards. During this period, no Fellow in the "more neglected" languages held more than four awards. The detailed breakdown of the 66 languages in which from one to four awards were made, is appended.

If, on the one hand, it is evident that there was no monopoly of the fellowships by a few favored persons, it is regrettable on the other hand that out of the 2681 fellows who profitted from this program during those years, only 691 or about 26% renewed their fellowship for a second year. Some shifted to a different

language, some received a different fellowship, either from a local university or perhaps a fellowship to study abroad. Some were tempted by a lucrative job offer. A few abandoned their program. We feel that the blame cannot be laid on the NDFL Fellowships as such, since they are reasonably generous and provide amply for a student unless he has a family.

1. According to our statistical analysis, the Foreign Area Fellowship Program, the Ford Foundation Fellowships, Fulbright Fellowships, government jobs and full-time teaching appointments account for most of the declinations over those six years. During the current year, 15 Title VI appointees declined, in order to accept an NDEA Title IV Fellowship. In this connection, we refer back to Table II, lines 8 and 9, for the comparative figures of new and renewal fellowships. To a very considerable degree and more especially now under the new system of administration of awards, we feel that the matter of renewals and multiple awards places a very considerable responsibility on the academic advisor of the Fellow, to guide him carefully and to encourage him or to discourage him in his plan of studies. We urge that in spite of many other heavy duties, this function be given conscientious personal attention.

TABLE XVI

NDFL PROGRAM

Single and Multiple Awards over the Six-year Period:
From 1959-1960 through 1964-1965 (By Language)

	No. of Fellows who held Single Award	No. of Fellows with 2 Awards	No. of Fellows with 3 Awards	No. of Fellows with 4 Awards	No. of Fellows with 5 Awards	No. of Fellows with 6 Awards	Total Awards	Total Fellows
Arabic	133	67	41	17	5	0	483	263
Chinese	188	84	49	24	3	0	614	348
Hindi-Urdu	104	55	23	11	0	0	327	193
Japanese	146	66	40	17	0	1	472	270
Portuguese	110	46	20	12	0	0	310	188
Russian	325	142	52	13	1	0	822	533
Spanish	155	54	14	0	0	0	305	223
Other (see below)	411	177	63	12	0	0	1002	663
Total	1572	691	302	106	9	1	4335	2681

Note: Through 1964-1965, no Fellow in the "other" languages had held more than four awards.

	Single Award	2 Awards	3 Awards	4 Awards	Total Awards	Total Fellows
Afrikaans	3	0	0	1	7	4
Albanian	0	5	0	0	10	5
Amharic	2	0	0	0	2	2
Armenian	1	0	0	0	1	1
Bambara	1	1	1	0	6	3
Batak	1	0	0	0	1	1
Bengali	10	5	3	3	41	21
Berber	4	1	0	0	6	5
Bulgarian	2	2	0	0	6	4
Burmese	5	1	1	0	10	7
Chinantec	1	1	1	0	6	3
Chinyania	1	0	0	0	1	1
Czech	6	6	2	0	24	14
Danish	4	1	0	0	6	5
Dutch	1	0	0	0	1	1
Estonian	3	4	0	0	11	7
Finnish	14	8	4	0	42	26
Georgian	1	2	0	0	5	3
Greek	3	1	1	0	8	5
Haitian-Creole	1	0	0	0	1	1

	Single Award	2 Awards	3 Awards	4 Awards	Total Awards	Total Fellows
Hausa	23	4	0	0	31	27
Hebrew	21	4	5	1	48	31
Hungarian	8	5	2	2	32	17
Ibo	4	0	0	0	4	4
Icelandic	1	1	0	0	3	2
Indonesian	29	5	5	0	54	39
Javanese	0	1	0	0	2	1
Kachin	1	0	0	0	1	1
Kannada	4	1	0	0	6	5
Kazak	1	1	0	0	3	2
Khalka-Mongolian	4	6	1	0	19	11
Kikongo	0	1	0	0	2	1
Korean	10	6	4	1	38	21
Lithuanian	1	1	0	0	3	2
Luganda	1	0	0	0	1	1
Lusahan	1	0	0	0	1	1
Malayalam	0	1	0	0	2	1
Marathi	2	2	0	0	6	4
Mayan	3	0	0	0	3	3
Mixtec	1	1	0	0	3	2
Mundari	1	0	0	0	1	1
Nahuatl	0	1	0	0	2	1
Nepali	0	0	1	0	3	1
Norwegian	4	3	0	0	10	7
Pashto	0	1	0	0	2	1
Persian	26	11	5	0	63	42
Polish	19	7	1	0	36	27
Quechua	3	6	6	0	33	15
Rumanian	5	3	0	0	11	8
Serbo-Croatian	13	7	2	0	33	22
Shona	1	0	0	0	1	1
Swahili	62	16	1	1	101	80
Swedish	7	3	1	0	16	11
Tagalog	0	1	0	0	2	1
Temazight	1	0	0	0	1	1
Tamil	11	3	1	0	20	15
Telugu	7	3	3	1	26	14
Thai	14	6	1	0	29	21
Tibetan	2	3	2	0	14	7
Turkish	29	11	5	2	74	47
Twi	1	1	0	0	3	2
Uzbek	0	1	2	0	8	3
Vietnamese	4	7	1	0	21	12
Visayan	0	1	0	0	2	1
Xhosa	2	0	0	0	2	2
Yoruba	19	4	1	0	30	24

g. Placement.

1. Although there is no doubt about the national need of the competencies which these Fellows acquire under this program, the mechanisms by which they are placed in positions where their abilities and skills can be used, appear to be highly inefficient. The demand in some areas is high, and shortages of personnel trained in a specific skill may at times cripple an instructional program in a school or college. At the same time, a Fellow possessing the needed skill may be unemployed, without knowing where the need exists or how to find out. Graduate students have complained to our interviewers that they receive little or no guidance in seeking a position where they can use their newly acquired competence.

Likewise, a Center Director states that he gets calls from a number of institutions around the country for people competent in his field. He recommends those whom he knows, graduates of his own Center and of other Centers who may have come to his attention, but he cannot possibly know of all the available people in that field throughout the country. On the other hand, an over-supply of manpower in some of these critical fields may seem to appear, because of the lack of communication. It is a well known fact that most of the placement of candidates for university positions takes place through personal contact, and consequently is at times almost accidental.

We recommend strongly that in order to serve the national need more efficiently, some type of National Roster should be created to maintain a listing of all persons who have reached a stated level of competence in the languages and areas with which we are concerned. Similar undertakings have already shown the way. The Modern Language Association published in 1963 the Harmon Report on Manpower In The Neglected Languages. There is a Commission on Human Resources in Advanced Education. Such an undertaking might appeal to the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

A National Roster or listing of this kind could be useful in many other ways in our search for personnel trained in the critical languages and areas. Discharged servicemen or ex-Peace Corpsmen are returning to this country in large numbers, many of them having acquired in various ways a fairly fluent knowledge of one of the critical languages and a first hand acquaintance with a foreign culture. Most of these would not be suitable for teaching positions, as their knowledge would not be formal or organized for academic purposes. Nevertheless, many of them could be highly useful in some aspect of the national need, if the men knew how or where to apply for a position, or if the national agencies knew where to find these men and exactly what type and level of competence they possessed.

Our brief survey of the national scene, our interviews with faculty members and students, and our own experience with the difficulty of locating ex-Fellows for the Questionnaire survey--all of these have made us keenly aware of the crucial problem of communication. It is not sufficient for this program to train several thousand young men and women in an adequate knowledge of a neglected language, its area, social situation, and culture; we must also be able to find them when they are needed, perhaps for something far more important than what they are doing currently. They too must be given every facility of an efficient and well-organized agency so that they may place themselves in positions of maximum importance for the national interest. This is clearly <u>not</u> the situation at present; and with the increase both in the need and in the number of trainees, the confusion will become worse. A centralized National Roster, presumably operated not by the government but by one of the learned societies is almost as urgently needed as the program itself.

h. <u>Language Competence</u>. The foreign language competence of graduate students in related disciplines has increased markedly, even enormously, over the past six years, according to most persons interviewed. In the social sciences--history, political science, economics; and in the humanities--philosophy and the fine arts, it is now not only expected in most universities, but indeed mandatory, that

graduate students working on foreign area problems be able to carry on research using documents in the foreign language. Emphatic comments have been received on this point from many parts of the country. This is worth emphasizing, for if there is any one objective of Title VI which stands out clearly, it is this: that adequate instruction should be provided in these neglected languages as the starting point for a full understanding of the country and area. This is, therefore, one of the best possible indications that the program has accomplished what the Congress intended.

Much more needs to be done, however, and the total goal is still far from being achieved. 1. In the first place, better teaching materials still need to be devised. Really only a good beginning has been made in preparing instructional materials in the high priority languages. Even in them, there are as yet no good standard achievement tests by which students can be screened and classified according to their proficiency in the language. The important Chinese Dictionary Project has had to be postponed, for example. In the neglected languages of lesser priority, teaching materials are even more inadequate and haphazard. Only by a great expenditure of time and money can even the more important of these lesser languages be provided with the instruments for satisfactory teaching.

2. Greater care should be given to distinguishing the purposes for which Fellows are studying the critical languages, and to adapt the type of instruction to their needs. A Fellow doing research in Chinese classical literature does not have the same need to acquire fluency in the vernacular as does a student preparing for field work in contemporary sociology. One Fellow's need may be primarily for a rapid reading skill; another's may be primarily for understanding and speaking the current vernacular. Unfortunately, testimony comes to us from many sources that in the intermediate classes in the critical languages, the emphasis is primarily literary, i.e. reading and translation, rather than developing oral fluency. Students whose objective is a command of the critical language for communication complain frequently that they do not have an opportunity to acquire it. This fault

is indeed more prevalent in the high priority languages which have an important body of literature, than in the more neglected languages which may have little or no literature. We shall return to this matter in a later section. (III C 6).

3. A very important and pertinent improvement could be made in the foreign language competence of graduate students, if the materials used in class to develop language skills were drawn from the disciplines which constitute the students' major interest. Economics students in a Chinese class should read materials on the economy of Taiwan; political science students in a Russian class should read and discuss, in Russian, materials dealing with current economic problems in the U.S.S.R., and listen to tape-recorded speeches and lectures in Russian on the subject. Each discipline has its own vocabulary and technical terms. It is urgent for the Fellow to become familiar as rapidly as possible with the technical vocabulary of his field in the language which he will use for research, field work, and all types of written or oral communication. This is not being done appreciably at present as a class technique, partly perhaps because language classes combine students with a wide variety of interests; and partly because there are still very few economists in this country who can lecture and lead discussion in Japanese, very few historians who can conduct a seminar in Arabic. One possible solution would be to allow intermediate and advanced students in classes in the critical languages to select and work on materials drawn from their discipline, receiving as much guidance as possible in the technical terminology, as well as in the ideas, from the language teacher in charge.

4. It should perhaps be pointed out, almost parenthetically, that in some areas of the world the researcher or field worker may best <u>begin</u> with a fluent speaking knowledge of one of the common non-critical languages. In Africa, for example, a fluent mastery of French is in some areas a practical necessity, in order to deal with the official and educated circles. Fellows should therefore be advised to secure such a complete command, <u>in addition to</u> becoming as proficient as possible in one of the local native languages where oral communication with people of the rural areas is important.

Because of the prevalence of English in some areas of the globe, particularly in South Asia, some professors have maintained that in certain disciplines like anthropology or geography, a knowledge of a South Asian language is not necessary for library research, and even a certain amount of field work can be begun in English. This point of view is not general, however. For the most part, we received enthusiastic testimony that graduate students are now far more able to use effectively in their major discipline the hitherto neglected language of the area involved. Furthermore, graduate students who cannot do so feel themselves under pressure to acquire the necessary competence.

III. The Impact on the Educational Community.

a. General Impact.

1. Graduate Studies. There can be no doubt that the program of NDFL Fellowships has had a very strong and beneficial effect on the many aspects of the graduate curricula in most of our universities. Nearly all the professors and administrators that were interviewed agreed that these Fellowships have had a significant impact, both directly and indirectly. This influence has been felt both on the departments or the Centers offering instruction in the critical languages, and also in the divisions of the humanities and the social sciences which are concerned, if only at times, or in special cases, with the corresponding countries or areas. The fact of bringing such graduate students to the campus has had the important mechanical influence of increasing enrollments, and therefore of aiding the local programs of instruction to develop. Referring back to Table II, it will be seen that the number of institutions attended by the Fellows has increased from 25 the first year to 63 during the current year, with as many as 59 as early as 1962-1963. The total number of institutions affected at one time or another may be close to 100. We now insert Table XVII showing the distribution of the 1320 Graduate Fellows during the current academic year 1965-1966 among the 63 institutions represented. Page 2 of the Table shows the post-doctoral awards for the current academic year 1965-1966; and the undergraduate

awards for the summer of 1965. The institutions represented by these latter categories are the same as those attended by graduate students. Even in the institutions which have only a few such Fellows, their presence and the courses which are developed partly for their benefit cannot fail to have a significant influence.

TABLE XVII

1965-1966 NATIONAL DEFENSE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FELLOWSHIPS

Graduate Awards, by Institution

American University	4	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	2
University of Arizona	6	University of Michigan	69
Brandeis University	5	Michigan State University	16
Brown University	5	University of Minnesota	1
Bryn Mawr College	1	University of Missouri	1
University of California, Berkeley	81	University of Nebraska	1
University of California, Davis	1	University of New Mexico	6
University of California, Los Angeles	74	New York University	23
University of California, Riverside	1	Ohio State University	7
University of Chicago	58	University of Oregon	1
Claremont Graduate School	2	University of Pennsylvania	21
University of Colorado	3	Pennsylvania State University	1
Columbia University	161	University of Pittsburgh	3
Cornell University	28	Princeton University	27
Dropsie College	3	Rutgers University	2
Duke University	6	St. Johns University	3
Duquesne University	3	St. Louis University	1
University of Florida	29	Seton Hall University	1
Fordham University	3	University of Southern California	8
Georgetown University	12	Stanford University	67
George Washington University	1	Syracuse University	9
Harvard University	143	University of Texas	41
University of Hawaii	8	Texas Christian University	5
Hebrew Union College	1	Texas Technological Institute	1
Howard University	4	Tufts University, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy	4
University of Illinois	17	Tulane University	8
Indiana University	99	University of Utah	2
Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies	11	Vanderbilt University	2
		Washington University	2
University of Kansas	3	University of Washington	47
Kent State University	1	West Virginia University	2
		University of Wisconsin	101
		Yale University	61
		Total:	1,320
		Total number of institutions	63

POSTDOCTORAL AWARDS, 1965-1966

Institution	Language	Number
Columbia University	Chinese	4
	Japanese	3
Harvard University	Arabic	1
	Chinese	2
University of Hawaii	Chinese	1
University of Michigan	Hindi-Urdu	1
University of Pennsylvania	Hindi-Urdu	1
University of Southern California	Chinese	2
Stanford University	Japanese	2
University of Utah	Arabic	2
		19

UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS, SUMMER 1965

Institution		Language	
U. of California - Los Angeles	1	Arabic	31
U. of Colorado	13	Bengali	1
Columbia University	84	Chinese	115
Fordham University	20	Hausa	1
Harvard University	11	Hindi-Urdu	9
Indiana University	50	Indonesian	1
Michigan State University	5	Japanese	44
U. of Michigan	70	Korean	2
New York University	11	Pashto	1
Ohio State University	13	Persian	4
U. of Pennsylvania	2	Portuguese	42
Stanford University	33	Russian	124
U. of Texas	19	Serbo-Croatian	1
Washington University	28	Swahili	5
U. of Wisconsin	23	Tamil	1
Yale University	6	Telugu	2
Total	389	Thai	1
		Turkish	3
		Vietnamese	1
		Total	389

2. Relation to the Centers. The relationship between the NDFL Fellowships and the Language and Area Centers is complex, and it would be almost impossible to distinguish between the influence of the Centers and the influence of the Fellowships, upon the total educational community. Table II, line 11, gives the percentage of NDFL Fellows attending the NDEA Centers during the seven years of the program. In the years 1960-1961, and 1961-1962, a large majority of the Fellows were enrolled in the Centers. In the early years some persons expected that the Fellowships would be used to support the NDEA Title VI (a). This was not adopted as policy and the Fellowships were not definitely assigned to the Centers for a very good reason. Title VI (a) was a matching fund title, and looked toward the expansion of the Centers. There were already a number of good non-NDEA centers in the country, offering good programs but not yet ready to expand. Thus, in an effort to avoid helping the "have-nots" at the expense of the "haves," recipients of fellowships were not required to attend NDEA centers created under the new Title VI (a). Grantees were permitted to enroll in a good program already established and operating.

The curve of enrollments is therefore interesting. In 1960-1961, 77% of the Fellows enrolled in NDEA Centers. This proportion decreased through the years, presumably because the size of the Centers was kept constant and the number of Fellows was increasing. The decreasing percentage of new Fellows in the program may also have had some effect, as Fellows moved out of the centers to do research for their thesis, or field work. Now however in the current academic year of 1965-1966, the percentage of the Fellows in the NDEA Centers is back at 77%, the same as in 1960-1961, perhaps because there are 20 new Centers this year.

Although the Fellowships are important to the Centers, they are in most institutions only a small part of the enrollment. Good language and area centers existed before the NDEA, and would probably continue to exist without it. Nevertheless, the general comment in all the institutions we visited has been that without the Fellowship program and the other aspects of NDEA Title IV and VI, together

with the added financial support from some private foundations, the enormous development in language and area studies, combining the social sciences and the critical languages, would never have occurred on most of these campuses. As one Center Director expressed it, "We had a weak program before NDEA. The NDEA stimulated the university to develop programs in this language and area. There was no question about it. In this respect, Title VI has been tremendously beneficial on our campus."

3. Undergraduate Programs. It may perhaps be said that the most important single effect of the NDEA Program has been the indirect influence which it has exerted toward the inclusion of the international dimension, and particularly the non-Western dimension in the curricula of higher education, particularly of undergraduate education. The number of undergraduates actually holding NDFL Fellowships (681 over the last three years) is relatively very small. The impact has largely been indirect. The Fellowship Program, together with the Center Programs, has had the indirect effect of increasing and enriching the offerings in the critical languages and in the corresponding social science and area studies, by bringing to each institution an increasing number of specialists, highly qualified teachers and graduate students.

Undergraduate interest has responded immediately and enthusiastically. It has shown itself in many ways. Some of the new courses offered by an institution have been opened to qualified undergraduates. Sometimes the professor who was brought to teach graduate students in the Center has consented to give a course in the same field or in some aspect of non-Western studies at the undergraduate level. Young faculty members in liberal arts colleges, ex-NDFL Fellows, are engaged to teach general courses, e.g. in history; then secure permission to offer one course in their specialty, e.g. Middle East history. This "proliferates" the college curriculum, but also rouses undergraduate interest in non-Western areas. In several cases a course which was originally offered for graduate students and then opened to undergraduates became so large that the professor in charge decided to divide it,

separating the two groups so that the material could be differentiated for the greater profit of both.

Very frequently the undergraduate interest has expressed itself in less formal academic ways. A graduate student will gather three or four undergraduates for regular private lessons in one of the neglected languages, either with or without remuneration. Undergraduate students organize special conferences, discussion groups, seminars, inviting visiting specialists for a weekend to discuss non-Western topics with them. Several cases have come to our attention of an undergraduate, not finding the opportunity to study at his own college a neglected language in which he is interested, driving considerable distances once or twice a week to another college where he can secure the necessary instruction, thus preparing himself for his intended work in graduate school. Even on campuses which open no special opportunities to undergraduates in these fields, the existence of such instruction on campus is nevertheless a very important factor in the recruiting of undergraduate interest.

4. Another result of the Fellowship Program has been the significant increase in interest in the classical languages. This influence can be shown to be fairly direct. A graduate student working in Hindi-Urdu or Persian or Marathi, especially if his field is literature, or philosophy and religion, or linguistics, inevitably finds it necessary to include in his program some study of Sanskrit or Pali. The interest in classical Greek and classical Hebrew has increased noticeably, because of the insistence, generated by these programs, that research must return to the original sources in the original language, rather than depending on translations. The gain for these classical languages might have been much greater, had their professors seen the opportunities created by the new NDFL programs. Regrettably, however, communication between the teachers of the classics and the new campaign for the neglected languages has not been very good; and until recently they felt that they had very little in common with it. A real beginning is now being made, however.

b. Interdepartmental Cooperation.

The combined program of NDEA Title VI Fellowships and Centers is now beginning to create a highly interesting movement in the area of interdepartmental cooperation. Faculty members in the humanistic disciplines and faculty members in the disciplines of the social sciences soon discovered that certain common problems created by the Centers and the Fellowships made it necessary for them to get together. They not only discovered a kind of "community interest" in the NDFL Fellow; they also discovered that he posed certain problems the answers to which they would have to work out together.

It would be too much to say that these sometimes forced contacts brought about prompt mutual understanding and cooperation. Our interviews have disclosed a great deal of jealousy and provincialism, particularly in the old established departments. The departments of the West European languages have come in for a great deal of criticism for their unwillingness to cooperate in joint programs with the humanities and social sciences. In several universities, the Spanish department was described as totally unwilling to concern itself with Latin America or with any other topic than the literature of Spain. Some Russian departments have also been criticized as not recognizing the full possibilities of joint endeavor with the departments of history or political science, the arts, or much of anything outside of literature.

1. The most constructive and forward-looking movement to deal with this problem has been the creation of new committees, rather than departments, variously called East Asian Studies Committee, Middle East Studies Program, South Asian Language and Area Program, etc. They are appearing in scores of universities, country-wide, and constitute significant steps toward real interdepartmental cooperation. Members from a variety of standard departments serve on the Committee, which may include political science, history, economics, language and literature, and perhaps a representative from the Registrar's office and the Library; sometimes a Graduate Dean, or a Director of Overseas Studies, or some faculty member from outside the area entirely. These Committees are usually exempt from the traditional

rules for a major or a field of concentration, and can develop programs for individual students in accordance with their objectives and needs. For example, if a graduate student is primarily interested in becoming an expert on Middle East economics, he will study Arabic, without having to take advanced courses in Arabic literature or philosophy. On the other hand, if a student wishes to become a teacher of Arabic, he will devote considerable time to linguistics, to literature, and perhaps to philosophy and history, but will probably be allowed to omit courses in economics and political science.

Committees of this sort are able to create new courses, with the cooperation of several faculty members, which could not exist as such in any one department. In one institution, in the program of Latin-American Studies, one of the required courses is an interdisciplinary seminar in which the departments of history, political science, economics and anthropology all participate.

It is perhaps in the departments concerned with the Far East that the most complete cooperation has been achieved. It has been our observation, and we hope that it is true generally, that the teachers of Chinese and Japanese language and literature are generally on cordial terms of close cooperation with the teachers of Far Eastern history, sociology, philosophy, religion, and the fine arts. It is to be noted also that they give much credit to the help which they have received from NDEA Title VI.

2. In some situations where interdepartmental cooperation is not of the best, some teachers of an area discipline have suggested that it might be worthwhile to concentrate the language instruction in intensive summer courses, leaving the academic year free for the area studies which constitute the student's specialization. They propose that this would make for more undivided attention, both on the area studies in the winter and on the intensive language practice during the summer. The overwhelming majority of persons we interviewed consider such a proposal unwise and even dangerous. It would tend to divorce the language from its area, and to reduce seriously, not only the cooperation between departments, but

also the desirable procedure of using area materials in the language classes, and of requiring the use in the area classes of source material written in the foreign language. The legislation itself has therefore been wisely interpreted to mean that any program eligible for support either as a Center or with Fellowships must include both the language and the area studies.

c. The Results in Teaching Staff and Techniques.

1. Shortages. One of the chief obstacles which stand in the way of complete success in the programs which we are discussing is the continuing acute shortage of adequately trained teachers of the neglected languages. It was the primary purpose of the legislation to overcome this shortage. After seven years of the program, the relative shortage is just as serious. In Tables VII through XIII we have shown that a reasonable proportion of former Fellows have gone into teaching, some of them have been in service for some time. Perhaps half of those who have gone into teaching are teaching the foreign language. We can only say therefore that on the one hand the program is too recent to have produced many teachers of the neglected languages; and on the other hand, because of the awakened national interest, the demand for such teachers has increased even more rapidly than the number of teachers turned out by the program. It is essential in the national interest that through skillful administration of the Fellowships and also through prompt and efficient communication for their best placement, this serious shortage of teachers be reduced as rapidly as possible. We must not fail to insist that the shortage is still critical for the national interest.

2. The shortage is not uniform in all fields, however. There is need of a careful study of the situation in all the neglected languages, concerning the extent and the nature of the shortage. We were told at one institution that in the case of Scandinavian languages and literatures, there is still a recruitment problem for faculty, but that there is not a very great demand for the products of the department. The chairman of the department felt it would be unwise to recruit students too actively for the study of these languages, as it might bring about a

serious placement problem. A similar comment was made in another institution in the case of the Uralic-Altaic languages and literatures. Logically, if there is a shortage of teachers at the university level, a plentiful supply of graduates should be able to remedy the situation after they have acquired a few years of teaching experience. Similarly, we frequently asked a chairman of department or graduate dean in the course of an interview whether the quality of the Fellows was good enough to warrant his considering them as candidates for a regular instructorship in his institution. The reply was usually, "Yes, perhaps, but not right away; that will depend on circumstances, and they will need more study and some teaching experience." Very rarely, however, did we meet the comment of any danger of an oversupply of future teachers; in almost every field, the situation was reported to be quite the contrary.

3. A Basic Problem. A fundamental problem does exist in the preparation of teachers of the neglected languages. It is true that the great majority of the fellowship holders of recent years and the current year plan to go into teaching as a career at the college or university level. In accordance with the approved programs and the terms of the legislation, they will complete their doctorate studies with a good knowledge of one or more of the neglected languages and a full understanding of the country or area in which the language is commonly used. They will be "available" for teaching these neglected languages in an institution of higher education. So far, so good. In actual fact, however, a minority of them actually become teachers of the language in a classroom. The statistics we have referred to above, especially Tables XII and XV are quite revealing. In Table XII, of the 51 doctorates completed, only 24 or less than half have reported their special field as language, literature and linguistics or philology. The same is true in Table XV. Then, of this half, a large share teach literature or linguistics, and less often teach the language, especially at the beginning or intermediate levels.

(a) A Traditional Attitude. The basic difficulty, and one important cause of the shortage of well-trained classroom teachers of the neglected languages, lies not in the Fellowship program, nor in the instruction they receive, nor in the quality of the Fellows themselves, but rather in the American academic tradition and the attitude of the university graduate schools. It is expressed in the often repeated phrase that "a language is not a discipline." This is qualifiedly true. The study of a language, properly taught, can be a very enriching experience, and require much intellectual effort. A language is not, however, a body of knowledge; it is a vehicle of thought.

(b) Status of the "Language Teacher." Two conclusions that have been drawn from this fact have had highly unfortunate results in university policy. One is the attitude that no good scholar should consider himself a "language teacher," but rather a teacher of literature or one of the other disciplines; and that the teacher who is willing to teach chiefly in language classes and enjoys it, is somehow a little "second rate." The average young man, fresh out of graduate school with his Ph.D. in French or German literature, is not very happy, nor very competent either, when given an assignment of beginning French or German classes. The same attitude has tended to perpetuate itself with the neglected languages.

(c) The Ph.D. Program. The other conclusion drawn from this basic attitude is that the language itself is not a sufficient or proper subject for a Ph.D. program. An NDFL Fellow who wishes to prepare himself for a career teaching Japanese or Arabic cannot choose the Japanese or Arabic language as his major doctorate field. He must choose Japanese language and literature (with major emphasis on the literature) or Japanese history or Far Eastern Studies, or Asian history or linguistics. In many cases, his doctorate requirements force him to spend more time than he wishes, or than is even necessary for his preferred career, on the traditional components of the Ph.D.

The problem becomes extremely difficult for a young man who is interested in becoming a teacher of one of the rarer, or second-priority languages, which has no significant body of literature. We have interviewed young men whose specific career objective was to become the best possible teachers of some group of lesser African or South Asian languages. But a student who wishes to become a teacher of Bemba, or Ibo, or Yoruba is told that this is not an acceptable doctorate program; there is nothing which would make an acceptable dissertation. He is therefore forced to specialize in linguistics or anthropology or geography; and the likelihood is that he will eventually become a university teacher of one of those "disciplines." He will be "available," but will never actually contribute to the national interest by teaching those languages.

One possible solution of the problem has appeared in a few universities, in the creation of special programs, administered by cooperating departments, in Asian Studies, Mediterranean Studies, Slavic and Baltic Studies, etc. When administered with flexibility and discretion, this arrangement can permit a conscientious student to tailor his program, under guidance, for his specific career needs. (See above, Section III b 1).

One institution offers an interesting example. If a student wishes to become a teacher of Bengali, and enrolls in the South Asian Program, he will be required to study economics, sociology and a number of other things. If, however, that student wishes specifically to take a Ph.D. in Bengali, the student may transfer to the Division of Oriental Studies. There he will study Bengali and write his thesis on Bengali, amplifying his program with Sanskrit, linguistics, and related courses, and comes out with a degree in Bengali. Unfortunately, not many institutions in the country have as yet accepted or seen fit to approve such a flexible innovation.

It is evident that we are not arguing against the intent of the legislation, to give the candidate a full understanding of his area, including the necessary knowledge of the history, economics, sociology and anthropology of the region.

The fundamental danger in the traditional graduate school attitude is that when a Ph.D. candidate has been required to do a major portion of his work in other fields that the language itself, he will be gradually led or even required to teach those subjects, rather than the languages for which he had intended to prepare himself.

Permit us to make it clear also that we are not advocating a lowering of the standards of Ph.D. requirements, or any fundamental change in the regulations by which most institutions govern their Ph.D. programs. There should be sufficient flexibility in the requirements to allow the candidate to concentrate on the disciplines which will best serve his goal. Usually, but not always, the instruction which he receives in the neglected language is adequate, particularly if supplemented by field work or study in the country. We are not especially advocating the creation of a Ph.D. in a language as such, certainly not in the rarer languages which have very little literature. It is indeed wise that the doctorate program should be based on one of the disciplines, and should include all useful contact with related disciplines.

(d) Our Recommendation is perhaps basically a plea for a change in attitude in the traditional American graduate school, so that it will recognize the urgent national need for teachers of several scores of neglected but critical languages, and also recognize that the expert teaching of these languages is as important academically, and as dignified professionally as the teaching of literature or history or philosophy.

(Please refer back to Table VII (page 33) on career goals, and note that the percentage of Fellows who have indicated that their career goal is teaching primarily the language of the award has dropped over a five-year period steadily and ominously from 50% to 32%, that those who are planning on teaching secondarily the language of the award remain approximately the same, at a 33% average; while the curve of those who are planning to teach other subjects, particularly the area subjects, has increased from 15% steadily to now 25%.)

4. The Linguistic-Informant Technique. Some of the rarely taught languages suffer from the handicap of having very few qualified teachers available in the entire country. In such cases, lacking the ideal combination of a native speaker who is well versed in the best linguistic techniques, the best solution is to employ a trained linguist to present the analysis of the language plus a native informant who will limit himself to the drills prescribed by the linguist. Some institutions prefer this technique, even for languages in which skilled and experienced native speakers can be secured. The report on the Intensive Language Programs in the summer of 1964, written by Professor Ray Andrew Miller of Yale University, makes a very strong recommendation for this procedure of the strict separation of the function of linguist and informant.

He criticized the many programs which his survey found in which untrained native informants, instead of modelling the language under close supervision of the linguist, were spending their time talking about the language, expounding their usually incorrect notions of the grammar of the target language and attempting to find English translation equivalents. Miller rightly criticizes severely the programs where the substance of the teaching is merely discussion of grammar and translation into English. Some directors of programs have reservations, however, about the strict application of what Miller defines as the audio-lingual technique, and object to the necessity of engaging a theoretical linguist who cannot speak the language, to be assisted by a native speaker who knows nothing of its structure. It is pointed out that this strict audio-lingual technique is not very applicable to Arabic, in the judgment of some experts.

5. Techniques and Materials. Our interviews on many campuses seemed to show that the effectiveness of the teaching methods employed for the neglected languages is not necessarily better or worse than for the commonly taught languages. The techniques and materials used by the instructors tend to go to one extreme or the other, using either the very traditional grammar-translation methods, or on the other hand the very new and emphatically audio-lingual techniques. The fellowship

program and the techniques employed in the NDEA Centers seem to have had little effect on the techniques of instruction used in the classrooms of the major languages of Western Europe, nor vice versa. Communications between the teachers of the "big languages" and the "little languages" are not very good. It appears that progress in the quality of the teaching staff and in the techniques which they use occurs, when it does, by different means and from different sources than intercommunication.

6. The Preparation of Language Teachers. We were frequently reminded that the NDFL Fellows seldom teach in a classroom. Since the Fellowships usually go to the best students, as far as can be judged, the institutions which use graduate assistants to teach the beginning and intermediate language classes have been forced to award their teaching assistantships to graduate students who are not good enough to win a fellowship. The result has been a deterioration in the quality of undergraduate instruction in the foreign languages, both the major languages of Western Europe and especially the neglected languages. We question seriously how well qualified a graduate student is to teach a rare language even after three or four years of study, without a great deal of practice, and some experience in the foreign country. It is evident that there are not enough really competent teachers to staff as many programs in the rarer languages as the colleges might wish to create. A warning must therefore be expressed in terms of quality. If an institution cannot offer a course or program taught by a completely competent teacher or group of teachers, it should decline to offer the course or the program, and should advise its students to go where it is well taught. Expansion in this area is not necessarily for the best.

(a) Little Opportunity to use the Language. The preparation of the NDFL Fellows specifically to be good classroom teachers of the language appears to be the weakest spot in the whole program in most institutions. Over and over again, in talking with our interviewers, in their Terminal Reports, and in the replies to our Project Questionnaire, the Fellows complained, often bitterly, that they were

not acquiring a mastery of the language, and were not given sufficient opportunity to use it orally in their studies or in realistic situations. Outside of the one "intensive" course in the language, they maintain that they get no opportunity to hear or use the language orally in the rest of their program.

Even in the language course itself, the orientation of the instruction is often excessively literary. In several large institutions with many NDFL Fellows, our interviewers found that even the professors who were handling the language courses usually had no hesitation in saying that their interests were primarily literary. The advanced courses in the language-literature departments are often given in English. Some of the professors justify this practice by insisting that the intellectual level of the work in literature makes the use of English an absolute necessity. The situation varies greatly from university to university, and even from department to department within the same university; but practically none of the language-literature men whom we interviewed claimed that their university had taken it as a basic principle that the language of instruction in advanced courses was primarily or typically the foreign language.

Our interviewers were confronted with repeated illustrations of this criticism. One NDFL Fellow who had much interest and much experience in linguistic studies and in the use of audio-lingual materials, and who had been a teaching assistant before he received his first NDFL Fellowship, stated that the work in his language at that institution was poorly done because the teaching staff had little knowledge of and no interest in the audio-lingual approach. He added that audio-lingual materials in that group of languages are not readily available, but that the faculty there is not at all interested in developing them. In spite of his own capabilities and experience in this field, he has been urged to pursue literary rather than linguistic studies.

Another NDFL Fellow who had been a teaching assistant was so little interested in the principles of teaching the language course that he did not take the trouble to listen to the tapes which his students were required to use in the laboratory.

He expressed a definite distaste for teaching the language and for the problems involved, maintaining that he is interested solely in literary studies. Another NDFL Fellow who had begun the study of Chinese in the Air Force Program and had spent fifteen months in Taiwan, criticized the Chinese program in the institution where he now is, because there was little emphasis on the modern language and on the speaking-listening experience. He said that he did not get much chance to use the spoken language, and that his fluency in Chinese was in fact beginning to deteriorate.

(b) Complaints from the Fellows. Observations and complaints noted in our Project Questionnaires form almost a continuing pattern. It is worth while to quote some of them. "Over-emphasis on the historical detracts from a speaking and reading knowledge." "The program is not as satisfactory as it might have been, particularly for one learning the language as a tool rather than as a subject for teaching. The introductory years were excellent but the intermediate stages poorly developed and uncoordinated though some efforts are being made to correct this." "Unrealistic instruction for one genuinely interested in field research. Not enough conversation and related drills. Must stress the necessity (underlining by the Fellow) of constant conversation and oral reading drills." "My command of spoken Russian was better when I began the NDEA program than when I ended or now."

"Most of the language teaching at X -- University is of very poor quality. Modern materials and facilities are available but not utilized." "X University's program in these languages was so mediocre as to be of little help in learning them." "The organization of the X Institute left something to be desired--poor usage of the language laboratory." "I feel that the first year of instruction in the language was excellent, the second poor, the third poorer." "The summer of 1963 when I was required to study X (language) at X University would have been much better spent studying the language in India, as there was no course prepared to teach me and the instructor (a good man who had not been alerted in advance) had to improvise from day to day." "One learns almost no Russian as a Russian language

graduate student here. I was an all A student, received one NDFL after another, but today can hardly address some one with a "how do you do" in Russian. All classes are in English, readings are in English. One is expected to pick up the language on the side, something which is virtually impossible with a full load of courses. Teachers are ill-prepared and bored, mainly I feel, due to the deeply ingrained habit of hiring teachers who write scholarly papers but have neither the taste or the skill to be good language teachers."

Even when all due allowances are made for some fault or lack of initiative on the part of the student, and for the mediocre student and the disgruntled student, these repeated comments, voluntarily made, and culled from the reports of our interviewers and from the Project Questionnaires are very revealing, and we may say damning, for one aspect of the NDFL program. It is the clearly stated objective of the legislation to increase the number and improve the quality of the teachers of the neglected languages in the language classroom. There is no doubt that this is being done well in some programs and in some institutions; it is also patent that it is done poorly and that it is being neglected in principle in other programs and in other institutions.

7. Placement Tests. Another important criticism in this area of language preparation, which we may echo from the Miller Report, and substantiate from our own investigation, concerns the availability and use of placement tests. Professor Miller pointed out that the lack of adequate standardized placement tests means that students coming together from many sources for an intensive language course either in the summer or in the winter, are grouped together in intermediate classes where the level of instruction tends to sink to the level of competence of the weakest students. In the most comprehensive programs, the intermediate work tends to verge on the elementary, and the advanced work becomes intermediate. This situation, and the tendency to insist upon literature, is the main cause of the statements cited above that the intermediate and advanced courses in the language are less successful than the beginning course.

(a) Tests needed for Coordination. The Modern Language Association has set the example for the preparation and standardization of achievement tests in the four skills for the common European languages. This must now be done and as soon as possible for the languages on the NDEA high-priority list. At the present time no generally accepted tests exist in these languages, as far as we could determine. The urgent need is for the creation of tests which will assist the programs in determining the achievement of students who come from widely differing instruction; and the standardization of instruction, not in the pejorative sense of the term, but in the sense of coordination between different levels, between different institutions, and between summer and academic year programs. The first step will be to survey just what tests already exist, where they are being used, and with what success.

We have learned of an Indian scholar who is now visiting the United States to develop tests to give to Americans to assess their language achievement and ability before they go out to India. This man is investigating the teaching of Indian languages in the United States, to see the different standards and techniques in the different places where these languages are being taught. It is highly desirable that tests be devised which would be adequate both for their purposes in India and in the Centers which teach the Indian languages in this country. Along the same lines, Japanese and Chinese tests are being used in Tokyo. Stanford University is endeavoring to develop tests on the basis of those used in the Asian countries involved. Stanford has had two years of experience with these tests, and the second year appears to be better than the first. It must be remembered however, that for the Asian languages, testing students at the intermediate level is meaningless unless they have all used the same textbook. Such tests are not really proficiency tests but progress tests on the material used. The type of test to be developed also varies considerably according to the type of language.

We recommend therefore that for the improvement of intermediate and advanced instruction in the neglected languages, the development of standardized achievement

or proficiency tests, covering all four skills, is a peremptory need. When properly developed and tested, and national norms established, their use should be required in all programs which concern NDFL Fellows. We recognize that this will be a difficult, time consuming, and expensive operation. Yet on the basis of our present observation, we fear that the language achievement of NDFL Fellows, specifically in the audio-lingual skills, i.e. understanding and speaking, will continue to suffer as it does at present from wide variations in quality at different institutions, from neglect in advanced language classes because of overemphasis on literary reading, and from disuse in other parts of the Fellow's program.

IV. Regulations and Administration of the NDFL Fellowships.

a. Praise. It is fitting that this section should begin with an expression of unstinted praise for the efficiency and courtesy of the persons who direct and administer this program in the Washington offices of the Division of Foreign Studies, Bureau of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education. In all our investigation, in all our interviews with graduate students, undergraduates, faculty members, Graduate Deans and Directors of Centers, when any criticisms would certainly have come out, and also in the comments on our Project Questionnaire, the almost unanimous testimony was to the high regard in which everyone concerned held the personnel of these offices, their promptness in replying to questions, their competence in their assignment, their courtesy even when enforcing an unpopular regulation, and their ability to avoid the role of the impersonal bureaucrat. The Staff of this Evaluation Project also wishes to pay its own high tribute to the unfailing cooperation and efficient assistance which it has received from the persons in charge of these same offices. In spite of many handicaps, we feel that they have a thorough understanding of the job to be done, and are doing their devoted and loyal best in the performance of it. They should be congratulated and heartily thanked.

b. The New System of Administration of the Fellowships. Between the date of the contract authorizing this Evaluation and the writing of this present report,

two major changes have occurred which affect the administration of these Fellowships. One was the reorganization or realignment of certain divisions and branches of the Office of Education. Changes in the Table of Organization resulted in some changes in the offices with which we dealt. Their relocation in a different building, with resultant moving of files and other material, occasioned some delays in our operation. Relatively however these changes were minor.

A fundamental and highly significant change in the administration of the Fellowships was put into effect by order of the United States Commissioner of Education, beginning with the awards available for tenure in 1966-1967. Under this new system, briefly stated, instead of forwarding graduate applications for Fellowships to Washington for screening by a panel which selected the awardees, as in the past, graduate institutions offering programs of eligible language and area studies now submit applications for allotments of Fellowships in graduate language and area programs. An institution may apply for allotments in one program or in several. The quotas of graduate Fellowships allocated to specific language and area programs were announced by the Commissioner of Education, based on the recommendations of a Panel which was convened in Washington, The institutions receiving allocations are now responsible for publicizing their programs, for screening the applicants, and submitting to the Commissioner final recommendations for the awards. These recommendations are expected to be approved, normally, if the candidate is eligible. The institution will also administer the payments of stipends and allowances.

1. Implications. This change in administration of the NDEL Fellowships involves two highly significant changes in actual operation. First, it is now the institution which chooses its Fellowship holders, and not a panel in Washington. Second, the panel in Washington examines, not the individual Fellowship applicant, but the program proposed by an institution for an allotment of Fellowships.

The changed procedure means that the panel in Washington concentrates its entire attention on the institution's proposal and its request for the allocation

of fellowships to its program. It is evident therefore that by this procedure, through a panel of invited consultants, the Office of Education is coming very close to something which might be called a qualitative evaluation of the institution, or at least of the programs which it proposes. The director of a program which is refused an allocation of fellowships, or which receives an allocation of a few fellowships instead of the much larger number requested, will naturally conclude that the panel, and the Washington office, decided that his program is substandard. Inevitably, he will compare the program he has created and the faculty he has assembled with other programs and other staffs in other institutions; and very naturally, will not find in his own judgment that the comparison justifies the decision.

The result has already been evident in the many complaints and protestations, both written and verbal, some of them bitter and violent, which have gone to the Washington office and have also come to the interviewers on our staff. Some proposals were made by directors of programs who had worked extremely hard, with skill and devotion, to prepare a proposal which they honestly considered the equal of any in the country, only to be refused an allocation; or, what seemed to them even more insulting, an allocation of one fellowship. We have listened to the disappointed and even angry protests from highly competent Directors of Studies. In some cases we have failed to understand the reasons for the judgment of the panel in Washington. We are keenly aware of the many complexities involved, some of which we shall discuss later.

2. Quality. One thing is clear. The only consideration which should concern the authorities in Washington, and the panels which they bring together, is the quality of instruction offered by a proposed program. This quality will have to be judged in its many and varied aspects, and it must be interpreted as wisely as possible in terms of the national interest. But quality alone, the total quality of the proposed program from all points of view and in all the various functions and attributes which go to make up the best program, must be the only thing

considered. If any other factors are allowed to enter the consideration of the panel, the whole scale of judgment is in danger of being reversed. At the other end of the scale, we might think of dividing the total number of fellowships by the number of programs proposed; or we could distribute the fellowships geographically among the 50 states in proportion to the population; we could adopt any of many other equally foolish and unworkable bases for distribution. The quality of the proposed program alone should be the basis of decision.

Quality is not a simple thing, however. It is on the contrary highly complex, and its evaluation depends upon many and varied criteria. It is not the automatic result of size, either large or small. It is not guaranteed by reputation, nor is popularity among students or faculty members a proof of it. The financial resources of an institution may assist in achieving it, <u>if</u> they are properly used.

We should like therefore to take a little time to discuss a few of the more important aspects of the problem which any panel or group of men charged with allocating NDFL Fellowships and therefore inevitably of evaluating programs, must have clearly in mind. The institutions also must understand them, whether in forming a program, or in making a complaint.

3. <u>Distribution</u>. We are inserting here <u>Table XVIII</u>, which will add to the picture already given on page 1 of <u>Table VII</u>, and will permit a comparison of the distribution of awards of the Graduate Fellowships during the last three years. For the current year, the number of awards in each area is indicated together with the number of languages offered in each area. It can thus be seen that some of the institutions which have a very large number of awards are also offering a large number of languages in six or seven different areas, the number of awards for each language is not therefore as disproportionate as it would appear from the total.

TABLE XVIII

NDFL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP AWARDS

Institution	Awards 1964-65	Awards 1965-66	Awards 1966-67	Number of Langs. offered in 1966-67	Areas	Awards in Areas
American Univ.	2	4	5	3	Africa	1
				2	East Asia	1
				1	Mid. East	1
				1	So. Asia	2
Univ. of Arizona	3	6	6	2	E. Asia	1
				2	Lat. Amer.	4
				1	So. Asia	1
Brandeis Univ.	2	5	5	1	Mid. East	5
Brigham Young Univ.	1	0	0			
Brown Univ.	2	5	2	2	East. Eur.	2
Bryn Mawr Coll.	1	1	0			
Univ. Calif. Berk.	60	81	102	5	East Asia	28
				5	East Eur.	18
				2	Lat. Amer.	7
				4	Mid. East	17
				4	So. Asia	20
				3	So. East Asia	5
				3	West Eur.	7
Univ. Calif. L.A.	59	74	72	6	Africa	25
				2	E. Asia	2
				7	E. Eur.	6
				4	Lat. Amer.	12
				2	Mid. East	24
				6	W. Eur.	3
Univ. of Chicago	37	58	72	3	East Asia	16
				3	East Eur.	16
				1	Lat. Amer.	2
				3	Mid. East	9
				4	So. Asia	24
				2	West Eur.	5
Claremont Grad. School	1	2	1	2	East Asia	1
Univ. Colorado	1	3	2	5	East Eur.	2
Columbia Univ.	105	161	171	2	Africa	14
				3	E. Asia	62
				4	East Eur.	32
				4	Lat. Amer.	32
				3	Mid. East	25
				2	So. Asia	2
				3	Uralic	4
Cornell Univ.	27	28	41	2	East Asia	6
				4	E. Europe	3
				3	Lat. Amer.	10
				2	So. Asia	6
				7	So. E. Asia	16
Dropsie Coll.	0	3	3	2	Mid. East	3
Duke Univ.	4	6	9	1	East Eur.	2
				1	So. Asia	7
Duquesne Univ.	10	3	7	3	Africa	7
Univ. Florida	19	29	32	2	Lat. Amer.	32

Institution	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	No. Langs.	Areas	Awards
Fordham Univ.	4	3	2	3	East Eur.	2
George Wash. Univ.	0	1	3	2	East Asia	3
Georgetown Univ.	9	12	9	2	East Asia	1
				2	Lat. Amer.	5
				1	Mid. East	3
Harvard Univ.	88	143	136	4	East Asia	66
				6	East Eur.	24
				2	Lat. Amer.	9
				4	Mid. East	37
Univ. Hawaii	4	8	6	3	East Asia	3
				2	So. E. Asia	3
Hebrew Union Coll.	0	1	3	1	Mid. East	3
Howard Univ.	3	4	5	3	Africa	5
Univ. Illinois	8	17	18	2	East Asia	1
				4	East Eur.	4
				2	Lat. Amer.	13
Indiana Univ.	68	99	101	5	Africa	6
				4	East Asia	6
				7	East Eur.	35
				3	Lat. Amer.	13
				3	Mid. East	7
				2	West Europe	2
				3	Uralic	32
State Univ. Iowa	0	0	1	2	East Asia	1
Johns Hopkins, Adv. Int'l. Studies	5	11	5	3	Mid. East	5
Univ. Kansas	3	3	8	2	Mid. East	2
				3	East Eur.	2
				2	Lat. Amer.	4
Kent State Univ.	0	1	0			
Mass. Inst. Tech.	1	2	0			
Univ. Michigan	55	69	82	2	East Asia	28
				3	East Eur.	12
				4	Mid. East	28
				3	S. E. Asia	14
Michigan State Univ.	2	16	18	4	Africa	12
				1	East Eur.	1
				2	So. Asia	5
Univ. Minnesota	1	1	8	2	East Asia	2
				2	So. Asia	3
				4	West Eur.	3
Univ. Missouri	0	1	0			
Univ. Nebraska	0	1	0			
Univ. New Mexico	5	6	8	1	Lat. Amer.	8
City Univ. of N.Y.	0	0	2	1	West Eur.	2
New York Univ.	12	23	17	3	East Eur.	1
				2	Lat. Amer.	11
				1	Mid. East	5
Northwestern Univ.	0	0	14	5	Africa	14
Ohio State Univ.	2	7	3	3	East Eur.	3
Univ. Oregon	0	1	0			
Univ. Pennsylvania	22	21	34	2	East Asia	2
				3	East Eur.	4
				4	Mid. East	5
				9	So. Asia	23

Institution	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	No. Langs.	Areas	Awards
Penn. State Univ.	0	1	2	4	East Eur.	2
Univ. Pittsburgh	2	3	5	2	East Asia	1
				2	Lat. Amer.	4
Princeton Univ.	21	27	38	2	East Asia	7
				1	East Eur.	13
				2	Lat. Amer.	2
				3	Mid. East	16
Rutgers Univ.	0	2	0			
St. Johns Univ.	3	3	1	1	East Asia	1
St. Louis Univ.	1	1	0			
Seton Hall Univ.	4	1	1	2	East Asia	1
Univ. of So. Calif.	6	8	4	2	East Asia	2
				2	Lat. Amer.	2
Stanford Univ.	35	67	43	2	East Asia	25
				1	East Eur.	6
				2	Lat. Amer.	12
Syracuse Univ.	2	9	7	2	Africa	2
				3	East Eur.	3
				1	So. Asia	2
Univ. Texas	17	41	43	1	Africa	3
				3	Lat. Amer.	22
				3	Mid. East	9
				2	So. Asia	8
				1	West Eur.	1
Texas Christian Univ.	1	5	0			
Texas Tech. Inst.	1	1	0			
Tufts, Fletcher Sch.	4	4	0			
Tulane Univ.	11	8	20	2	Lat. Amer.	20
Univ. Utah	1	2	3	3	Mid. East	3
Vanderbilt Univ.	3	2	2	1	East Eur.	2
Washington Univ.	0	2	6	2	East Asia	2
				2	Lat. Amer.	4
Univ. of Washington	26	47	46	5	East Asia	37
				2	East Eur.	9
West Virginia Univ.	1	2	0			
Univ. Wisconsin	60	101	97	2	Africa	11
				2	East Asia	5
				3	East Eur.	13
				2	Lat. Amer.	36
				1	Mid. East	10
				4	So. Asia	20
				3	West Eur.	2
Yale Univ.	40	61	69	3	East Asia	24
				5	East Eur.	22
				2	Lat. Amer.	11
				4	S. E. Asia	12
Totals: 65 Institutions	865	1320	1400			

The complaint has frequently been voiced in our interviews with small institutions that in this distribution of fellowships, "the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer." Table XVIII, when carefully examined, does not support this complaint in its entirety. It is quite true that several of the large institutions: the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Chicago, Columbia University, Indiana University, the University of Michigan--have seen their allocations increase year by year, sometimes rapidly, so that they hold a considerable proportion of the Fellowships. At the other end of the scale, it is true that some small institutions have either disappeared from the list or have been maintained at the almost negligible figure of one or two Fellowships.

Nevertheless, the great majority of the institutions in this table have remained roughly the same in comparison with the total number of Fellowships awarded (865 in 1964-1965; 1320 in 1965-1966; 1400 tentatively allocated for the coming year); for example: Cornell University, University of Florida, University of Illinois, Indiana University, New York University, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, University of Texas, University of Washington. Even the University of Wisconsin, offering seventeen different languages, had its quota cut back slightly for the coming year. It is evident that on the basis of these figures, it cannot be claimed that the half-dozen "big ones" are pushing all the other programs out of existence. As for geographical distribution, 27 states are represented, many of them with several institutions.

Since it is true that a high percentage of the fellowship awards are allocated to the large and powerful institutions, it is important for the reviewing panels in Washington to keep constantly in mind that size is not a determinant of quality. Better teaching is possible, and is often done, in a small institution where a competent young teacher with his reputation yet to make is giving every ounce of his energy and personal attention to a small class of students undistracted by a large campus, and stimulated by a warm human contact. This is especially true of the teaching of the foreign language, where the stimulus of question-response is basic to the technique.

Large institutions can do the same thing if they will. They have the means to offer a broader, more varied curriculum; to keep classes smaller; to provide better materials and more library resources. But sometimes we know that they do not teach as well. Some of the complaints received by our interviewers and on the Project Questionnaire stem from the impersonality of a large class in a powerful institution, taught by a famous professor who thinks only of returning as rapidly as possible to his own research. It is highly desirable that these Fellows have close personal contact with the best minds in their field. The large institutions are most able to secure these leaders and specialists. The quality of the program depends on the extent to which these teachers are willing to give themselves personally to their teaching and to the individual student. The evaluating panel must always be on the alert to distinguish between "window dressing" and the actual effectiveness of instruction, in any institution, whether large or small.

4. Relation to the Centers. Another complaint which has come frequently to us, as to Washington, concerns the relationship between the Language and Area Centers supported under Section 601 (a) and the Fellowships under 601 (b). Some Directors of Centers have protested that it is quite illogical for the government to be putting money into the Centers, in order to assist the institution to develop a good program in the neglected languages; and then with the other hand withdraw the Fellowships on which the Center Director had counted. Some Directors have maintained strongly that they cannot possibly operate a Center unless they have a goodly number of Fellowships. It seems indeed to some Directors that the Division of Foreign Studies is contradicting itself when it supports the Centers with funds through Section (a) and then allocates only one or two fellowships, really no assistance at all, through Section (b).

We must keep in mind the difference in function between the Centers and the Fellowships. A Center is usually created to do a variety of things in an institution; to provide certain combinations of instruction, to interest both graduate and undergraduate students in certain aspects of the curriculum. Many of the

existing strong Centers were created before the advent of NDEA, and would continue to exist without it. They have been strengthened by it, but have and can and probably would continue to exist without it. In some institutions, the NDEA grant contributes only about one-tenth of the total cost of the operation of the Center. In such cases the NDFL Fellows may represent a small percentage of the total number of graduate students studying in the Center. A few of the others may provide their own funds, but a much larger number are carried on university fellowships, tuition rebates and loans. Other institutions may not have the financial resources to support a Center to that extent, and must count on both the Center Grant and also a considerable number of NDFL Fellowships. In such cases, since the Center Grants and the Fellowships are both administered from the same office, it is reasonable to assume that a Center which maintains high quality and is meeting a national need will continue to receive all possible support through the allocation of Fellowships.

Another angle of this matter is sometimes forgotten, namely that it is possible under Section (a) for the government to assist a program to grow and improve in quality, when it seems to have possibilities, but has not yet reached its full potential of quality. It still may not be of sufficiently high quality to merit the allocation of a large number of Fellowships; but if under able administration and with generous support from the local institution it grows and improves, it may look forward to an increase in the number of allocated Fellowships later. This has quite evidently taken place in the cases of several programs which are reflecting a small but steady growth in Table XVIII.

5. Title IV. The question of the relationship to government support available for institutional programs through NDEA Title IV is also an interesting one. Fellowships under Title IV which go to a certain university program carry with them also a government grant for institutional costs. This is not true for Title VI. It is a matter of record that some institutions have been able to develop a good program with the aid of Title IV Fellowships, so that they ultimately became

worthy of Title VI Fellowships. The historical relationship between the effects of Title IV and Title VI Fellowships on certain institutional programs is worthy of detailed study. Future possibilities are also significant, since Title IV funds were increased 100% for the coming year.

6. Student Choice. It cannot be forgotten that a large part of the decision in these matters still rests with the choice of the students. Under the old system it was they who decided through what institution they would apply; under the new system it is they who decide to what institution they will apply. If for any reason a sufficient number of graduate students does not apply to any program to fill its quota, the unused Fellowships may be reallocated to another institution which has had more demand. Such choices may or may not be uninformed, but they still are an element in the situation.

7. Review of Quality. Quality once achieved does not remain permanent. Sometimes indeed it changes very rapidly. Teachers of the critical languages are in such short supply that there is a great mobility among them. They move from institution to institution in response to offers of more pay for less work, professional advancement; because of geographical preference, or personal taste. Some small Centers have seen almost their entire staff change within a two or three year period. There is always considerable lag in the changing reputation of any organization, and the Center Programs form no exception. In the past, the number of applications from students through a certain institution might depend on what had been told them about its quality two or three years before, as well as upon the comfort of its dormitory rooms, or its eating facilities. Now, under the new system, some smaller institutions which feel that they are improving their staff and their program, complain against the "frozen" reputation of the large, prestige institutions.

On second thought, it would seem evident that the new system of administration of awards provides a better guarantee for a frequent review of the quality of the programs to which Fellowships are allocated, than did the old system. Now for the

first time, instead of examining the merits of an individual student, the panel in Washington, composed presumably of 25 or 30 of the best informed representatives of all the fields concerned, meet to examine the programs proposed by the various institutions. This is not an official evaluation of the quality of the institution nor of the quality of the Center, but since the quality of the program proposed may be expected to reflect both to a certain degree, it comes very close to it.

Annually the panel will be called upon to decide how many Fellowships should be allocated to a given program in a given language and area, on the basis of the people who will staff it, the level and type and content of the courses offered, the ratio of faculty to students, how many are full-time and how many part-time, the equipment, and all aspects of the program. The panel will endeavor to penetrate the fog of college catalogs, and through their own pertinent experience, decide how many Fellows the program can handle well. In theory at least, there seems to be no machinery which would guarantee a more enlightened and equable relationship between the quality of the program proposed and the number of students that it ought to have on government subsidy.

The adjustments will of course be difficult. Some small institutions complain that they have been improving more rapidly than their allocation would express. Other institutions whose allocations have been cut back find themselves forced to bid some of their students transfer to another program. In cases like this, Title IV may be of some assistance. The institution itself may be able to find local university fellowships to tide over a good graduate student.

One other danger seems to have appeared in some institutions. A number of fellowships is now allocated to the institution, and consequently in theory at least the university administration may consider them to be in the same category as all other fellowships which are at the bestowal of the institution itself. This might lead to an insistence that candidates for the NDFL Fellowships be ranked along with other candidates for university fellowships in the same fields; or it might lead to a reduction of the amount of money which the university allocates to

fellowships in that field. This would clearly be a negation of the purposes of the NDEA legislation. We express the hope that the nomination to and the administration of these NDFL Fellowships will remain separate, administered under the same authority as that which directs the Program, in much the same way as the National Science Foundation Fellowships are administered.

8. Selection of the Fellows. The second basic aspect of this new administrative system is that the Fellows will be selected by the institution and not by the panel in Washington. This places squarely upon the institution the responsibility for selecting graduate students who will be able to profit most from the instruction offered by the Program. In the past, if a Fellow turned out badly, the institution could always blame the panel in Washington, and there were cases where the panel in Washington selected a student who had either not been recommended or recommended less highly than others by the institution. The new system now puts the entire choice in the hands of the institution and the Program Director.

A number of implications come immediately to mind. There will be a natural tendency for the institution to favor a local candidate of known quality over a new applicant who comes perhaps from a distance, who has never studied at the institution, and presents recommendations from unknown teachers and transcripts of study whose quality cannot be evaluated. Since a personal interview is a persuasive addition to a candidate's academic record, there will be a tendency to favor applicants who come from nearby institutions, or who have the personal funds to come for an interview from a more distant place. It will be important for each program to guard against "ingrowing" tendencies, narrow mechanisms, and a natural but dangerous preference for some certain type or background of student body.

A second danger which we may foresee in the selection of studentslies in the fixed allocation of a number of Fellowships. Each program will naturally wish to fill its quota, and will be highly reluctant to report to Washington that it can yield one or two Fellowships to another program. There will be a strong tendency therefore to fill the quota, even if the last candidate or two in the list approaches

the marginal limit of quality. It is of course true that the teachers in the program will have to live with the results of such a choice, and may be unhappy about it. They will not recommend the mediocre Fellow for a renewal the following year. Still, each new year with its new quota will present new candidates; and unless the panel in Washington discovers indirectly that the quality of the program is deteriorating so that it is not attracting as many high-quality candidates, the situation may go on for several years. We feel that there is a danger that there may develop in some cases an undesirable variation of standards of selection between institutions.

c. Application, Reapplication and Notification. The new system of administration should be able to solve a number of problems which have caused complaints from the Fellows. Both in personal interviews and from the Questionnaires, Fellows and former Fellows have commented upon the problem created for a Fellow by the necessity of having to reapply annually, and the uncertainty of how to plan for the future. They complain that April is too late for the applicantsto make other successful plans for the following year, and that they find themselves in annual insecurity each spring, not knowing whether to spend time looking for employment of some kind, or simply to assume the risk of not getting an award. Those with families to support are practically forced to make a tentative commitment for some employment in case they do not win a fellowship. They maintain that job hunting and the uncertainty of the situation detract from the effectiveness of their study. As a side-light on this, we note that the most common source of complaint received from former Fellows concerns the withdrawal of fellowship support and the problems which it created, not only for the completion of their degree, but in order to make adequate future plans at the proper time. On the other hand, the month of December was too soon for the Program Director to know a new student well, in order to recommend him under the old system, unless perhaps he had been studying in a preceding summer session at the same institution.

It is of course impossible to give security to these Fellows. No graduate students in our universities have security; all have to apply from year to year; and it is probably well that they do have to. Some professors have the opinion even now that the renewals have tended to become too automatic and that Fellows sometimes relax their efforts if they can count too much on a good thing.

The new system of administration will bring about some improvement, because the student will be judged and his Fellowship renewed by the persons who know him best rather than by a distant panel. Since the Program Director will know in December his quota for the following year, there will be no harm in his telling his best students that they have no cause for worry if they continue to do superior work. The institution can now set its own deadline for applications, allowing itself only enough time to screen the number of applications which it expects. This may be much less time than Washington used to require. We assume that all institutions will follow the recommendations of the Council of Graduate Deans, that official notifications go to the nominees on March 21 (as we understand the date to be) and that the students will have until April 15 to indicate their acceptance of the nomination. The institution then is not required to notify the Office of Education of its list until May 8. It would appear that eligible graduate students have no real cause for complaint if they are informed on March 21 whether or not they will have a fellowship for the following year.

1. New and Renewals. Some discussion has occurred on the matter of the desirable percentage of new Fellows and renewals in a Program. It is evident that this must be left to the judgment of each Program Director. The over-all figures which were given in Table I are interesting as a matter of general policy, but cannot form a basis for decision in a single Program, especially when only a half-dozen students are involved. It is clearly desirable that a Fellow of superior ability be given every facility to complete his training. This is indeed the intent of the legislation. On the other hand, it would be a mistake for a Program to award all its allotment to renewals; there should be a certain reasonable

proportion of new Fellows entering the program each year. What that proportion is must be left to the judgment of the institution, depending upon the current circumstances.

d. Length of Support. Quite a number of students have voiced complaints that their fellowship support was withdrawn too early, and that it prevented them from finishing their training or their dissertation. In the individual cases, our interviewers had no way of knowing whether the student was dropped because he failed to continue to deserve support, whether he was or was not recommended for continuation by the institution, or for what other reason. It is natural to expect that Fellows will wish to continue to be supported as long as possible, either by NDFL's or by other fellowships; and that those who apply and are dropped will be disappointed.

It is our opinion that the present rule is sufficiently generous from the point of view of federal funds. A deserving student is eligible for renewals for a total of 48 months on NDFL Fellowships, provided he continues his studies in his announced program. These 48 months are not necessarily consecutive. A Fellow may accept another fellowship such as the FAFP, and spend the year abroad; or he may accept a teaching fellowship from his institution for a year while working on his research. Referring back to Table XVI it will be seen that many Fellows have held four NDFL awards, a few have held five and one has held six, in addition to fellowships from other sources. Our Project Questionnaires have revealed that some students have been supported by fellowships for as long as six years. If an NDFL Fellow reapplies after an interval, he must prove that he has continued his ongoing program of studies, and that he has not dropped out or changed his program. One reason for the limit of four years is the feeling that if an NDFL Fellow is carried for four years on federal funds and is really meritorious, his institution should also come to his aid with an institutional fellowship or a teaching assistantship. From our observation, we do not recommend any extension of the NDFL limit at the present time.

A slightly different problem concerns the completion of the dissertation. A few cases have come to our attention where the Fellow has completed all his course work and research and then because of family obligations has had to accept a position before completing the writing of his dissertation. It is common knowledge that there are many young instructors in our colleges whose dissertation drags along for several years, at the risk of some of their material going out of date, because they cannot find the time to complete the writing. It would be very desirable if some source of funds could be made available to assist deserving students to complete their thesis. We are convinced that a candidate who has completed his research and gathered all his material should be able to write his dissertation in one year (if he ever will), and should be assisted to have that year. If this is not feasible under NDFL, either the sponsoring university or one of the foundations should consider the problem.

e. The Amount of Support. Another topic which received much attention in our interviews concerned the size of the fellowship grant. A whole gamut of reactions was noted. The majority of the Fellows admitted that the support was adequate, even generous, and that they were very grateful to be freed from financial worries. Several even said that they never had so much money before in their lives; and a few said that they had been able to save something from the allowance. Other Fellows, especially those with families, or living in expensive city situations, maintained that they had difficulty breaking even, and sometimes went into debt. Some complained against the rule that they are not allowed to accept gainful employment. A few stated that it was more honorable to "moonlight" than to borrow, and claimed that if a Fellow is doing excellent work in a full program of studies, what he does with his spare time is his own business.

We recommend that the amount of the stipend, both the basic grant and the allowance for dependents, be reviewed periodically, and related to the cost of living in an average city situation, as well as necessarily related to the stipends of university fellowships and to other federal agency grants. All these should be

kept on approximately the same level, or the whole situation will be thrown out of adjustment. It would be unwise to increase greatly the allowances for dependents. At the present time they seem reasonably adequate; and it would be a mistake to increase them so much that a Fellow with several dependents would be earning more money tax-free than he would be likely to receive in his first academic appointment. On balance, it is our judgment that the stipends are sufficiently generous at present, and we have no recommendation beyond a periodic and careful review.

f. Practice Teaching. Somewhat related is the problem of practice teaching. The question has been debated since the very beginning of the Program, even occupying much time at the Ann Arbor Conference in 1960. At the present time the rule reads that if the institution requires practice teaching as a part of the doctorate program of the Fellow, he may include one course for one semester of such official practice teaching and be remunerated for it. Otherwise, the Fellow must devote himself to full-time study, engaging in no outside employment, research, or part-time teaching for which payment is received.

The dilemma lies in the aims of the Program itself. On the one hand it wishes to prepare the Fellows as rapidly as possible for their teaching career and therefore wishes them to concentrate on full-time studying. But if they are to be given a complete preparation for teaching, surely they should have some orientation toward and initiation into actual teaching. Many of the Fellows made this point quite strongly in our interviews, but their arguments have to be distinguished from the argument in favor of earning some money on part-time. Logically interpreted, it does not seem wise for an institution to certify that a teacher's preparation is complete and that he is ready to teach, if he has never taught a class under supervision. This is the reason why the rules do permit the inclusion of one semester of teaching one course.

In practice, the difficulty lies in the fact that arrangements either are not possible or are simply not made for the Fellow to teach, or to receive the indispensable supervision of a trained critic teacher. In some instances there are not

enough students in the particular neglected language to provide a class for such practice teaching. Often the professor in charge, although agreeing that the Fellow is doing good work, expresses doubt about his being a good classroom teacher. This would seem to be all the more reason to try him out under guidance in a classroom situation. Very few of the doctorate programs in our larger institutions include a requirement in practice teaching. In one institution which does have such a requirement in one particular department, it was learned that the students are required only to prepare two or three lectures which they give under supervision. This does not amount to a great deal of teaching experience, but it is obviously better than none at all. The primary obstacle in the whole matter is clearly the unwillingness of the heads of departments to spend the time necessary for adequate supervision of actual classroom work by their doctorate candidates.

In spite of the difficulties, we recommend strongly that wherever a realistic teaching situation can be created, the NDFL Fellows be given a reasonable amount of practice teaching experience, supervised and criticised, together with some orientation in the teaching problems which they will meet in their particular field. This should be done systematically, but not necessarily as a course for credit, and entirely apart from any question of remuneration.

g. Administration by the Institution. Three matters which received some comment in our interviews and in the Questionnaires will now be handled differently under the new system. It appears to us that they can now be taken care of with little trouble by the institution itself, if proper attention is given to them.

1. Publicity. A considerable number of Fellows commented that the publicity given to the NDFL Fellowship opportunities had been inadequately done. They frequently said that they had heard about the fellowship "only by accident" or "happened to see a notice on a bulletin board" and often narrowly missed the deadlines in applying for them. It is evident that this was not the fault of the Washington office, since it could do no more than send printed material to the various institutions. Now, under the new system, publicity is clearly placed in

the responsibility of the local institution, to inform possible candidates about its program, and the manner in which it will receive applications. There should be no difficulty about publicizing the opportunities in the various classes of the institution itself, by direct announcement, either in graduate or undergraduate courses. The difficulty will come in acquainting students nationally, and at a distance, about the programs of the many different institutions. Publicity in the undergraduate liberal arts colleges is the weakest spot. Now, an institution which has a good program and wishes to fill its allocated quota of fellowships with good candidates must see to it that the opportunity is widely publicized.

2. Application Blanks. A number of comments have been made by Fellows that the application blanks distributed by Washington were too long, complicated, and too difficult or time-consuming to fill out. There will still be forms which the Washington office will have to have, in order to comply with the regulations of the Act. Now however, the institution can abbreviate its own application forms as much as it wishes, and ask only for the information which it feels it needs in order to make a wise selection among the candidates. These may indeed vary from program to program. We expect that to some extent the application forms may become less mechanical and more personal, as befits the more personal method of selection.

3. Payments. Some comments were made by Fellows on detailed matters concerning the payment of the stipend from Washington, as related to the bills which they received from the institution, or other expenses. Since payments will now be made by the institution, these matters should be easily regulated. It is evident that the student should not be required to pay a tuition bill before he receives the credit for his stipend. It is also highly desirable that the student should know the exact date when his stipend checks are ready, so that he can arrange his other financial obligations.

h. Summary. Since this report is written before the new system of administration has had a year of trial, we have only been able to report some of the complaints and some of the observations, the former based chiefly upon disappointments

in the allocations of Fellowships, and the latter based upon surmises as to what may happen. Some modifications or adaptations may have to be made; and it is hoped that the new system will receive cooperation and a fair trial. We have found that, except for disappointments in the size of the allocations, most of the Program Directors and others concerned were either noncommittal, waiting to be shown, or were generally of the opinion that the new system would bring improvements. A possible by-product is that students and the general public will identify the NDFL Fellowships more with the academic institution which awards and administers them, and less with the federal agency. The Office of Education will heartily approve this change in the image.

V. Undergraduate Study. The discussion of organized study by undergraduates of the neglected languages and areas divides itself quite clearly into two points of view: its place in the curriculum of general or liberal arts education for undergraduates; and secondly its role in shortening the time necessary for such study in the graduate school and for completing the Ph.D. degree. We shall therefore take them up separately.

a. Liberal Education. Many organizations are now rightly insisting that American education must recognize that its heritage and its interests are no longer limited to Western Europe. Agencies like Education and World Affairs, assisted by foundation funds, are presenting cogent arguments for the inclusion of new courses, or material added to existing courses, on the cultures of the non-Western world. Current events and rapid communication in a shrinking world have encouraged undergraduate interest. Even the preparatory schools are now beginning to feel the effect of this broadening horizon in American education. Russian is now generally accepted as a regular part of an undergraduate curriculum in the colleges which can offer it; and many hundreds of undergraduates, country-wide, are studying Chinese and Japanese. Undergraduate courses in political science or economics which include important reference to Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East, are common.

As we have indicated above in Section E I d2 (page 30), the availability of these elements in undergraduate instruction is of the highest importance in the creation of interest among undergraduates in the neglected languages and areas, and to induce them to consider specializing in these fields for graduate work. It has not been the specific aim of the NDFL Fellowship Program to give a large share of attention to undergraduate study, but it may well claim to have had a major though indirect impact on the inclusion of non-Western areas and languages in the accepted curricula for undergraduates. This movement is surely to be encouraged.

We recommend strongly that every liberal arts college in the country examine carefully the possibilities of increasing, in its basic curriculum open to election by all students and even to a certain extent required, instruction which will enlarge the world horizons of the students and lead them to become more interested in the non-Western cultures and areas. In the small liberal arts colleges, this is usually best done not by adding specialized courses in the non-Western languages and areas, but rather by including in present courses of a general nature greater attention to those areas.

b. Early Preparation for Graduate Work. Referring back to Section II d, in which we discussed the problem of the Ph.D., we raise again the question whether something can be done to shorten the time spent in graduate school. Current doctorate programs in the critical languages are requiring from six to eight years. A Ph.D. program in one of the social sciences of a critical area, which may also require a concentrated study of one or two neglected languages, plus a year or two of field work and research, extends the necessary time often to ten years. Many graduate students who answered our Project Questionnaire got married, assumed family responsibilities and abandoned the program, or postponed to the indefinite future the writing of their dissertation. We were frequently asked therefore why it would not be wiser to begin the study of a critical language as an undergraduate. Many professors stated that they would prefer to have their graduate students come to them possessing reasonable competence based upon two or three years of

undergraduate study of the needed critical language. Especially now that, with the development of language teaching in the elementary schools, students come to college having already studied French or German or Spanish for five or six years, they are ready to begin the study of Russian or Japanese in their sophomore year of college. This would be so much gained in the effort to shorten the excessively long time needed to reach the doctorate.

c. Advanced Training. The delicate question of the interpretation of the words "advanced training" in Section 601 (b) returns to our mind here. A beginning class in Chinese or Hindi or Turkish is considered advanced training for a graduate student, because students usually begin those languages in graduate school. Some universities make a distinction, and count such beginning courses as graduate credits, but do not allow them to count in satisfaction of the course requirements of a department. On the other hand, in order to be eligible for an NDFL Summer Fellowship, an undergraduate must have had one year of college work in these critical languages, or two years of study for an award in Russian. This is clearly illogical, but it is in this way that "advanced training" is interpreted. These rules are undoubtedly necessary and realistic under the present circumstances. As long as most colleges do not offer one of the critical languages for their undergraduates, it will be necessary for the graduate schools to provide elementary instruction in the language, and accept it for graduate credit. Nevertheless, it is also evident that the NDFL program puts a premium on undergraduates who have seized the opportunity somewhere to acquire a year's intensive study of one of the neglected languages.

d. Overspecialization? Some professors whom we interviewed took the opposite view. In the name of liberal arts education, some teachers maintained that "undergraduates are too young to overspecialize." They argued that the undergraduate curriculum should be held to a broad liberal arts basis, and that involvement in a critical language and area would constitute unwise specialization. This should be postponed until the graduate school. Other professors voiced the view

that undergraduate instruction in the critical languages should not be encouraged on any campus which does not already have a good graduate program in which to continue it. These teachers were quite unsympathetic with the problem of a small liberal arts college which wishes to introduce work in one non-Western language and area. Two years of Japanese in the middle of four undergraduate years would be unwise. Yet many good liberal arts colleges are now able to offer to selected honor students a limited specialization in one critical area and its language, which will then be continued immediately into graduate school elsewhere.

Another Center Director gave his opinion that it is highly unwise to talk about undergraduate programs in these fields, when there is not enough faculty manpower to cover the needs of the graduate programs. On the whole, however, the great majority of professors interviewed, especially in the social science departments, were in favor of some plan by which superior undergraduates could secure at least two years of study, either in college or in intensive summer programs, of the critical language which they would need in graduate school, as a means of shortening and enriching their graduate studies.

e. The Scholarship Problem. If this early beginning is desirable, would it not be wise for NDEA to provide more special fellowships for undergraduate study of the neglected languages? This question was frequently raised in our interviews with undergraduate and graduate students; and occasionally by the professors. We asked the question generally in our interviews with Graduate Deans and Center Directors. The consensus of opinion is that such a step would be unwise at present.

There is at present an NDFL Undergraduate Summer Session Program for the study of the critical languages. Figures were given in Table II, (page 15) that in the last three years 681 undergraduates had studied 19 different languages in summer sessions held in 16 different institutions. This is very small compared to the Graduate Fellowships, but it has been a successful operation. Our interviews with the undergraduates this summer proved their practically unanimous enthusiasm for the program. It is also important to note that these undergraduates were young.

Undergraduates are not eligible if they expect to complete their Bachelor's degree before the close of that summer session. On the other hand, high school graduates expecting to enter college are eligible. In the summer of 1965, about 25% of the NDFL Fellows holding undergraduate summer session awards in the critical languages were pre- or post-freshmen. That is, they had either just completed their freshman year, or were just about to enter their freshman year in college. All had had at least one year of formal college work or its equivalent in the critical language they were studying. In addition, 30% of these Undergraduate Fellows had just completed their sophomore year. In other words, 55%, or over half of the 389 undergraduates in the 1965 summer session program were not yet college juniors. Their records were, with rare exception, completely satisfactory.

The fundamental reason for our recommendation against the creation of special scholarships for undergraduates to begin the study of a neglected language in college, and against any great expansion of the present Undergraduate Summer Session Program, lies in the danger of artificial incentives for the study of any subject in the undergraduate curriculum, whether it be language or history, physics, chemistry or music. We know that this is being done in some places by the scientific profession. We doubt that it is educationally sound in the long run, nor the best educational policy for the country.

We feel that the undergraduate student should have the opportunity, and the freedom, to choose the field where his interests and talents lie, uninfluenced by pressure or by financial subsidy. That stage is too early in the formative period of the student, to subject him to an artificial lure or a conscious recruitment, especially through money. In the near future, there will undoubtedly be a greatly expanded program of scholarship aid to all worthy undergraduates. We trust that this will be on an impartial basis for all disciplines; and that the student will remain free to choose both his college and his areas of interest.

On the other hand, it is highly desirable that the institutions, even the small liberal arts colleges, seek outside funds, possibly even federal funds, to

broaden and enrich their offerings in the cultures and areas of the world which have hitherto been neglected. As we have said above, even a small liberal arts college should be able to select one non-Western area of the world, and offer a reasonable amount of instruction in its language and culture and social science within the limits of an undergraduate curriculum. Through good liaison between that college and certain graduate schools, a student entering graduate work would have a considerable advantage.

VI. Study Abroad and Cultural Immersion.

It is our urgent recommendation that much greater attention be given to the need and the place of study abroad, in programs of graduate work in the critical areas.

a. Present Situation. We consider that complete immersion in the critical language being studied, and first hand contact with and serious study in the critical area are an essential part of any language and area program. At the present time Section 601 (b) of NDEA provides for study outside the United States only if the program is offered abroad by a United States institution, or if the student has completed all his course work for the doctorate and requires access to materials not available in the United States to complete his dissertation. No fellowships were awarded for study overseas during the first two years of the NDFL program. In 1961-1962, 43 Fellows went to six different countries under the supervision of six U. S. graduate schools. In 1962-1963, 78 Fellows went to 18 different countries under the supervision of 17 graduate schools. In 1963-1964, 73 Fellows went to 20 different countries under 19 graduate schools. In 1964-1965, 80 Fellows studied abroad.

Referring to Table XIII, Section c, we find that of the 274 students who returned the Project Questionnaire, only 107 or 40% reported that they had had any significant study abroad in the country of their specialization. This means that many of them have completed their doctorate and are now teaching in a college or university without having had real first-hand contact with the country and language

concerning which they are supposed to be specialists. Most of those who reported that they have had such study abroad indicated that they had obtained it through other means than the NDFL Program, other fellowships, or foundation grants.

The Fulbright-Hays Act provides a small amount of money for travel grants for a few NDFL Fellows. Basically the Fulbright-Hays Graduate Fellows must be those who have completed all pre-dissertation requirements and who plan to do full-time research on their dissertation in the foreign country. It is our judgment that this postpones foreign study until too late for the great majority of graduate students interested in the critical languages and areas.

b. Timing. The question of when a graduate student should go abroad to study the critical language and its country or area, is a difficult and complex one. It is generally agreed that it is unwise to send a beginning student to the language area for the purpose of studying the language. It may be a stimulating experience, and his progress from zero will be rapid, but the necessary dependence on the use of English for a long time, the inability to use the language in the living situation, the lack of proper study facilities, teaching personnel, and equipment in most of the critical areas--all these lead to the conclusion that it is much better to get the first year or two of intensive language training in a good program in this country.

Beyond that, there is much difference of opinion, and much depends upon circumstances. Some language teachers believe that two years of preparatory study of the language are sufficient to enable the student to profit fully from well-organized language study abroad. They believe that thereis an advantage to the student in going abroad early in his graduate work, in order to learn the critical language well, especially orally, and with a good pronunciation. Other teachers, expecially of those languages which have a very different sound system or syntax from that of English, insist that even three years of study are hardly sufficient for full profit in the foreign scene.

In some cases, as when a student may have studied the language for four years during his undergraduate course, he may be ready for a year of study in that country immediately after graduation. There is even some reason to believe that a year of foreign study at that time will confirm the student's tentative commitment to this field for his graduate work, and remove any hesitation that he may have about his interest in it for a career. Other teachers maintain that no student should be sent on a fellowship to a "critical" area until after he has had a substantial period of graduate work in some American university, concentrating upon all aspects of the language and the area concerned.

In some cases it may be necessary for a graduate student to go to the foreign country twice: once early in his program in order to master the language, and then again two or three years later in order to complete his research for his dissertation. In other cases it may not be necessary to go abroad the second time, especially if his dissertation consists of editing a classical manuscript, or some other research in classical literature for which the materials may be in libraries in this country and for which no field work is necessary. It is evident that the amount and the timing of the study abroad must be decided according to each individual case. There should be no doubt however about the absolute necessity of the experience.

c. Criteria. This discussion may perhaps be summarized as follows: every graduate student specializing in one of the "critical" countries or areas of the world and in the language where it is spoken natively, should have one or more periods of significant study and residence in that country for first-hand contact. These periods should be for a full year, not simply for a summer; they should be long enough to have a significant effect upon the Fellow and his subsequent competence as a teacher. He should go abroad for the first time when his preparation in the spoken language and his knowledge of the area, acquired through his studies in the United States, are sufficient to enable him to derive the fullest profit from residence and first-hand contact; when his professional maturity is evident,

and his commitment to this field of study is reasonably clear. If these criteria are satisfied, we recommend that Title VI Fellowship funds be made available in sufficient quantity to support such travel and study for at least a year, together with travel and living allowances for the Fellow's spouse and family.

d. American Programs Abroad. In view of the difficulty that graduate students usually experience in organizing the desired type of study program in the foreign countries with which we are concerned, we recommend that several American universities, or perhaps learned societies concerned with a particular foreign area, consider the possibility of setting up programs of appropriate study, each in a different foreign area. An Agency or Office of this sort in the foreign country could sponsor and supervise study programs for some NDFL Fellows, direct other Fellows to the sources they need for their research, intercede for them with university and governmental authorities abroad, and be the instrument for sanctioning their activity and accomplishments when they return home.

e. Substitutes on the Home Campus. Even when everything has been done to provide the maximum amount of study abroad, much of the mastery of the foreign language and familiarity with the culture of the foreign country will have to be acquired here in the United States. Everything possible must therefore be done to create for the student in our colleges and universities a local counterpart of the foreign culture.

This is not now being done satisfactorily. Many undergraduate and graduate Fellows have complained that few attempts are made in the NDFL Programs to create this atmosphere. Not only the language classes, but the area classes as much as possible, should be taught in the foreign language. The classwork should be supplemented by language houses, language tables, and conversation groups. Interesting taped materials of plays, speeches, and broadcasts can provide laboratory listening. If the group of students studying one of the neglected languages is large enough, a small house or wing in a dormitory can be set aside for their exclusive use, along with a language table in the dining hall. Films in the language and about its culture should be shown regularly.

Native speakers of the language who happen to be studying at the institution are very useful in all such activities and are too frequently forgotten. At comparatively little expense they can assist in the language house, eat at the language table, and direct the conversation group. Their compensation need be no more than room and board in the language house. Every effort should be made to bring together the students of a critical language and the native speakers of that language who are studying on campus. In one university, the Dean of the Graduate School learned that the African Students' Association did not know of the existence of the African Studies Association. A mutual introduction was of great profit to both.

VII. Manpower Needs.

a. An Increasing Need. The clearest, most self-evident conclusion to be drawn from this entire Survey is that the national need for persons possessing a good knowledge of one of the languages which have been defined as critical to the national interest, and a full understanding of the area or country in which such language is commonly used, is now very great, and that the need is increasing faster than these persons are being produced by the NDEA Title VI Program or other related programs. The nation has become far more aware than it was when the National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958, of the crucial role which a knowledge of these areas and languages plays in national policy and in the conduct of our international relations.

Our government has responded and is continuing to respond actively to this increase of awareness, as is evidenced by the increasing sums which the Congress is obligating for an increasing number of Fellowships for such study. A clear indication of future policy was given by President Johnson in his significant remarks at the Smithsonian Institution Bicentennial Celebration on September 16, 1965. Pointing out that "ideas, not armaments will shape our lasting prospects for peace" and that "the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms," the President went on to say that he had directed

a special task force of his administration to recommend a broad and long-range plan of world-wide educational endeavor. The second and third points of this program as he outlined it are as follows: "Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it; third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands." It does not require much imagination to foresee in this announced policy of President Johnson a tremendous increase in the need for a large supply of individuals trained as defined in Section 601, (a) and (b).

b. Accurate estimates unavailable. Following close upon the fact of the great need is the serious observation that there is no reliable guide or basis for an accurate estimate of these manpower needs in the various aspects of the national life. The most that has been done in the past is to identify the languages and areas considered most needed. With a great deal of difficulty, seven languages were designated as having top priority, and about a hundred others as acceptable for NDEA support in the second category of critical languages. Up to now, study has been undertaken by a few students in about 75 of the second group. Awards have been made on the basis of the amounts of money available, the number of applicants of acceptable quality, and programs of high quality instruction offered in the various universities.

At no time has the Office of Education or any other national agency been able to state specifically that a certain number of persons qualified in a certain language and area were needed in the national interest. It is not likely that this can be done in the future. Nevertheless, so vital a thing as national interest should not be left to the unpredictable, often illogical and fickle fluctuations of instruction available and individual student interest. The shaping of national policy should also assist in shaping the guide lines for the creation of the manpower needed. The universities will welcome more information and guidance in the preparation of programs of instruction and in the advising of their students.

c. Three Major Areas. We may divide the manpower needs into three major areas:

1. Academic. Teachers of the critical languages are in very short supply. Directors of Centers in most universities have testified to the great difficulty of securing qualified staff. So rapid has been the growth of interest among undergraduates and even among secondary school students that class enrollments outstrip the increase of the supply of teachers. This has been occurring especially in the classes in Russian and Chinese. The head of one department told us that he had been successful in securing three additional teachers, but that the student enrollment had quadrupled in the same year.

Institutions raid one another, offering ever higher salaries and smaller teaching assignments, the natural result of large demand for small supply. The resulting extreme mobility of teachers of the critical languages has made it very difficult to maintain up-to-date information on the quality of a Center or a Fellowship Program. The reputation of a program lags behind the facts, whether it has been improving or deteriorating because of the gain or loss of highly qualified teachers.

The rapid increase in the number of courses offered in some of these critical languages, particularly in the small colleges, unaccompanied by a corresponding increase in the number of well-qualified teachers, has in some cases watered down the quality of instruction. Instructors or teaching assistants, only partially prepared, and not speaking the foreign language well, have been found in charge of classes that are much larger than the optimum size for effective language learning. This has not happened, to the best of our observation, in the NDEA-sponsored Centers. The danger is recognized; the Division of Foreign Studies and its annual panels are endeavoring to watch quality of instruction as the first essential, and will authorize no unwise expansion.

Emigrés from the communist countries of Eastern Europe are much used now as teachers, but the native-born ones are growing older and soon will no longer be

available. It is already very difficult to secure competent Russian émigré teachers born in Russia. The same is true to a certain extent for the other "iron curtain" countries of Eastern Europe. It must also be remembered that a person to whom a language is native is not by that fact a competent teacher of the language. Much training needs to be added: an analytical and theoretical knowledge of the language, training in linguistics, a knowledge of the techniques of teaching, and a good acquaintance with the psychology of the American student and the American educational system--these and many other things are needed to make of a native speaker an effective language teacher. This is one of the reasons for the development of the "linguist-informant" technique which has proven so effective in many situations.

In situations where the crucial shortage of a teacher for a critical language occurs, it may be necessary to press into service as a language teacher a competent person who has done his doctorate in one of the humanities or social sciences, and whose major language was the specific critical language. Since Ph.D.s are not generally offered in the more neglected languages as such, but in one of the disciplines concerned with that area, these competent graduates are usually teaching the discipline rather than language courses. It may become necessary in the national interest to demand that these former NDFL Fellows do their fair share of language instruction.

This shortage of qualified teachers of the neglected languages suggests the creation of Summer Institutes for the intensive study of the language, linguistics, and teaching techniques, for the upgrading of teachers. This has been done with much success in the NDEA Summer Institutes for the teachers of the common West European languages. For the summer of 1966, a considerable number of these intensive Summer Institutes are located in the country abroad. In the past seven summers, we have seen thousands of teachers of French, German and Spanish, perhaps imperfectly prepared to begin with, or needing retraining and new inspiration, transformed in one or two intensive summers of language practice and professional guidance, into confident and effective teachers. We recommend early adoption of a similar program for the neglected languages.

2. Governmental Agencies. The list of the federal agencies which have requirements for trained linguists covers almost the entire list of government functions, from the various departments of the Armed Forces, the National Security Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency to the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Health Education and Welfare, Labor, State and the Treasury; it includes the Atomic Energy Commission, the Library of Congress, the National Science Foundation, the Veterans Administration, the International Cooperation Administration, and on and on. The civil government agencies and bureaus find it difficult if not impossible to give any workable estimate of their needs for trained manpower in the neglected languages and areas. Circumstances change so greatly, and their needs are so varied from country to country, that it is unrealistic to expect them to set a figure, for example, of the number of persons they will need three years from now well-trained in the language and area of East Pakistan, or of Kenya.

The military services are no more able to estimate their future needs, and even if they could estimate them with some exactness, this information would be classified, and could not be released even to the Office of Education as a basis for the allocation of Fellowships. How could they have known three years ago that we would now have a critical need for thousands of American speakers of Vietnamese? The pity of it is that in the past six years, only twelve Americans have been studying in Vietnamese under NDFL Fellowships. Worse yet, we do not seem to be learning our lessons from the past. The Korean situation is far from settled and may even again give trouble; but only 21 students have held NDFL Fellowships to become experts in the language and area of this continuing potential "trouble spot." Must it always be a question of "too little and too late"?

3. Business, Industry and the Professions. In all the walks of life, our American education has not kept pace with the expansion of this nation's complex international interests. International business and industry have grown far out of proportion to the corresponding instruction in our colleges and universities,

and have frequently been compelled to set up their own training institutions, as Aramco has done for the study of Arabic. The learned professions like medicine, or the sciences like nuclear physics, are truly international, and their representatives manage to understand each other imperfectly, and with much loss. The need here is very great, and as elsewhere, is largely unpredictable.

It is important, therefore, to interest and involve the liberal arts undergraduates of our colleges, first of all in the genuine mastery of a common language, and then in so far as is possible, in some one of the neglected languages and areas, whether Western or non-Western. The beginnings can be made in general undergraduate courses in the humanities and the social sciences, through the inclusion of a broader range of material than is now the case. We must remember that the seed of interest is sown in the undergraduate program, perhaps even earlier. An undergraduate should be shown that he never can know what area of the world or what language his future career will suddenly confront him with. He cannot know, nor can his college, nor the government tell him. The one certainty is that he will be confronted with this need, some time, some where. The definitely foreseeable national needs require that more Americans be trained in a mastery of one of the languages of the globe and in full understanding of the area where it is spoken.

F. CONCLUSION

Here then is the real challenge of a rapidly changing world to American education and to the American people. We must expand our horizon to include a complete understanding, not only by our government, but by our entire people, of the problems, the motives, the fears and the hopes of other peoples all around the globe. Our community is now the world and there is no possibility of excluding any part of it. We must now realize the complete interdependence and the consequent need for intercommunication of all mankind.

The first step is for us to admit that the American public is poorly prepared for effective international communication. Great progress has been made in the

last seven years, but the rapid march of world events stresses a desperate need for still greater progress and more urgent effort. The United States is still linguistically unprepared for world leadership.

It is quite evident that only a few of the three thousand languages and major dialects spoken in the world can be included in the curriculum of our undergraduate colleges, and not many of them, even with government subsidy, in our graduate schools. The task appears insuperable. How shall we go about it; where should the student begin, with which language?

In reality it makes little difference, provided he begins early, and with one of the major languages and cultures of the earth. If the language is well taught and studied to the point of reasonable mastery, and combined with a real understanding of the country and its culture in the broadest sense of the word, the basic educational objectives will have been attained with respect to all languages and all countries. The student will have rid himself of his natural attitude toward "foreign-ness"; he will begin to be at home in another part of the globe; he will have learned much about the structure of language, his own and another, and of the mechanics of learning a language; he will have disproved for himself the old notion that Americans are monolingual.

The United States Government, through the National Defense Education Act, the Fulbright-Hays Act, through new legislation and through all possible agencies, must lead the way by wise planning and greatly increased support to meet the challenge of new and rapidly increasing needs for competence in the languages and areas of a world in upheaval. In these crucial times, America needs not dozens but thousands of citizens who have a fluent mastery of the major languages of the world, and a thorough understanding of the areas where they are spoken. More important still, it needs a whole people who are prepared by their education to try to understand the minds and hearts of other peoples, their needs, their problems and their fears. Our younger generation will early master a second

language and be ready at any time to learn a third and a fourth, or any other language of the earth, if the need arises in their career, or for their country. We shall also learn about another country, its society and its culture, its different ways of speaking, thinking, and doing, so that there will be no "foreign" people. We shall learn to listen too, and other peoples will teach us; we shall learn to communicate, to commune together as friends.

Summary of Recommendations

Note: These recommendations have been gathered here for handy reference. They have been lifted from their context, which is usually necessary for their full understanding and justification. Reference is made to the pertinent section and page.

---

1. Since this Evaluation was limited by many factors, and its conclusions are presented only as incomplete and tentative, it is recommended that a full and complete evaluation be undertaken as soon as possible, to include especially the Title VI Post-Doctoral Fellowships and the Fulbright-Hays Grants which have not been covered in this survey. C VI page 12
2. Every effort should be made to interest more students in the study of the very neglected languages, some of which are in the present and foreseeable future of great importance to the national interest, but which now attract almost no applicants. E I b2 page 27
3. Orientation toward graduate specialization begins very early. Colleges are therefore urged to introduce into their undergraduate liberal arts curricula new courses, or perhaps better, new material into existing courses, concerning aspects of the geography, history, culture, thought, politics, and other humanistic and social science areas of both Western and non-Western countries hitherto neglected in American education. E I d2 page 30, E III a3 page 67, and E V a page 102
4. It is urgent that realistic limits be set on the requirements for a Ph.D. program in the "neglected" areas, based on a national consensus of program administrators as to what requirements constitute reasonable competence in a given field. The present indefiniteness and trend toward an eight-to-ten year program is discouraging candidates. E II d3 page 53
5. Candidates seeking a renewal of their Fellowship should not be allowed to change their major language without clearly justifiable reasons in terms of their specialization. E II e page 54

6. In connection with the renewal of awards and multiple awards, the Academic Advisor of a Fellow has a very heavy responsibility to guide his program carefully, to encourage him, or discourage him from continuing. This function should receive his conscientious personal attention. E II f1 page 55

7. We recommend urgently the creation of a National Roster, preferably sponsored by a learned society, to maintain a listing, with current addresses, of the ex-Fellows of all NDEA and NDEA-related Fellowships, together with the names and type and level of competence in these areas of ex-Peace Corpsmen, selected ex-service men and others. The placement of men possessing urgently needed competencies is now in a state of confusion. We should know where to find such men when they are needed. E II g1 page 58

8. Materials used in a class to develop language skills should be drawn as much as possible from the discipline which constitutes the student's major interest, to increase his motivation and to familiarize him with the technical vocabulary of his field. E II h3 page 61

9. The creation of interdepartmental Committees or Programs is heartily recommended, to organize and supervise flexible programs of study and degree requirements in the language and area fields connected with Title VI. Effective interdepartmental and interdisciplinary cooperation is often best achieved in this way. E III b1 page 69

10. The relative shortage of adequately trained teachers of the neglected languages is as critical as it was seven years ago. Energetic efforts must be continued to relieve it. E III c1 page 71

11. Since a majority of the Title VI ex-Fellows are "available" and prepared to teach the neglected language, but do not, a more intensive effort is recommended to permit and encourage Fellows specifically to become classroom teachers of the language. This will require some greater flexibility in the traditional Ph.D. program. E III c3 (c) page 73

12. It is recommended that the American graduate school recognize that the nation urgently needs trained classroom teachers of many neglected languages, and that expert classroom teaching of a language is as important academically and as dignified professionally as the teaching of literature or history. E III c3 (d) page 75

13. Since many Fellows complain that they are not acquiring a mastery of the critical language, and since the preparation of good classroom teachers of the language appears to be the weakest point in the Fellowship Program in many institutions, it is vital that the Fellows be given more opportunity to hear and speak the language, in the advanced classes which tend to be excessively oriented toward the reading and translation of literature, and to use it actively in the rest of their study program. E III c6 (a) page 77

14. The development of standardized achievement or proficiency tests, with national norms, covering the four skills, is a peremptory need, in order to coordinate variations in quality and materials, in academic year or summer programs, in different institutions. E III c7 page 80

15. We urge that under the new system of administration of the Fellowships, quality of instruction be the only basis on which the allocation of Fellowships to the various institutional programs is made. Quality is highly complex; it must be evaluated with great care. It is not the automatic result of size or financial resources; it is not guaranteed by reputation nor choice by students. E IV b2 page 84

16. The quality of a program and the number of Fellowships allocated to it should be carefully reviewed, annually, for indications of improvement or deterioration in quality, but changes in allocations should be made gradually, to avoid hardship. E IV b7 page 92

17. Now that the selection of the Fellows is the responsibility of each institution, it must guard against provincialism or fixed mechanisms, and differing standards of selection between institutions. E IV b8 page 94

18. We recommend no extension of the present 48-month time limit on the length of Fellowships. We do however recommend consideration of some plan by which a Fellow who has completed all his requirements and the research for his dissertation may be assisted for one year to complete the writing of it.

E IV d page 97

19. It is recommended that the amount of the stipend be reviewed periodically, to keep it and the allowance for dependents in line with the cost of living in an average city situation, and with other federal or university fellowships. E IV e page 98

20. It is strongly recommended that wherever a realistic teaching situation can be created, the NDFL Fellows be <u>required</u> to have the present permissible amount of practice teaching, closely supervised, together with a systematic orientation to teaching problems. E IV f page 99

21. It is urgent that an institution offering a program to which Fellowships are allocated do everything possible to acquaint students country-wide with this opportunity, especially undergraduates in the smaller liberal arts colleges. This tends to be a "blind spot" in present publicity.

E IV g1 Page 100

22. In order to shorten the period of graduate work and give the student an early start, it is generally recommended that a superior undergraduate who is definitely interested in a neglected language and area secure a year or two of study of the language, either in college or in intensive summer sessions, continuing it without interruption in graduate school.

E V b page 103

23. It does not appear wise at present to make any major increase in the present small though successful program of Summer Fellowships for undergraduates. We are opposed to any artificial stimulus or pressure on the student in favor of <u>any</u> segment of a well-balanced undergraduate liberal arts curriculum. Institutions, however, should be urged to broaden and enrich their offerings concerning the neglected areas of the world. E V c page 104

24. It is our urgent recommendation that much greater attention and support be given to study abroad, in programs of graduate work on the neglected areas. Complete immersion in the critical language and first hand contact with and serious study in the area are essential in any language and area program. When the study is done and how many trips are needed will depend on individual circumstances. E VI a and b page 107

25. Every graduate student specializing in a critical area and its language should study in that country for a year, not merely a summer, when his preparation in the language and area have become adequate for full profit, his professional maturity is evident, and his commitment to the specialization is clear. Title VI Fellowship funds, in conjunction with other federal and private funds, should be made available in sufficient quantity to support the Fellow for a year abroad with travel and living allowances for his family. E VI c page 109

26. We recommend the establishment by American agencies of American Programs or Offices in such foreign countries, to sponsor and supervise the study of NDFL Fellows, and to obviate the difficulties which confront a student alone. E VI d page 110

27. The NDFL Programs should do much more than they do at present to create on the American campus a local counterpart of the foreign culture and atmosphere: language houses and tables, conversation groups with native speakers, taped materials, motion pictures; and especially the use of the foreign language in all classes and extra-curricular activities. E VI e page 110

28. We recommend the creation of a program for the training and upgrading of teachers-in-service of the neglected languages, similar to the NDEA Summer Institutes for teachers of the West European languages. E VII c page 114

29. The man-power needs of this nation for persons with a mastery of a critical language and a full understanding of its area are increasing faster than they are being produced. The needs are urgent in government, education,

business, the professions, and in all walks of life. No reliable guide or basis for a scientific estimate of the national needs appears to exist. Yet the production of trained personnel should not depend on the variations of instruction available or the fickleness of student interest. Those who shape national policy should assist, through wise planning and greatly increased support, in shaping the guidelines for the creation of manpower in these areas. E VII page 111

30. Most of all, the entire American people should be taught by its whole education to try to understand the minds and hearts of all other peoples. E VII page 116

APPENDICES

A. Terminal Report Form

B. Project Questionnaire

C. Interview Form for administrators

D. Interview Form for graduate students

E. Interview Form for undergraduates

OE-4009 (REV. 8-63)

BUDGET BUREAU NO. 51-R351.3
APPROVAL EXPIRES 6-30-65

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20202

TERMINAL REPORT FOR HOLDERS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FELLOWSHIPS

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958
TITLE VI, SECTION 601 (B)

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Complete in triplicate and retain ONE copy.
2. Forward the original and one copy to:

LANGUAGE FELLOWSHIP SECTION
DIVISION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ASSISTANCE
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20202

COMPLETE AND RETURN THIS REPORT when you have received grades for the latest portion of your award:

SUMMER FELLOWS: *At end of summer session*
ACADEMIC YEAR FELLOWS:) *At end of final*
SUMMER AND ACADEMIC YR. FELLOWS:) *Semester or quarter*

N.B. - The "Report of Over or Under Payment" may be returned any time after you have paid final tuition and required fees for the entire period of your award.

FELLOW'S NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)

FELLOWSHIP NO. | LANGUAGE

PERIOD OF AWARD (INSTITUTION(S) ATTENDED)

SUMMER

ACADEMIC YEAR

(Check one)

		CAREER GOAL
COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY TEACHING		PRIMARILY OF LANGUAGE ABOVE & SECONDARILY OF
		SECONDARILY OF LANGUAGE ABOVE AND PRIMARILY OF
		IN FOLLOWING FIELD (OTHER THAN LANGUAGE)
OTHER SERVICE		IN FOLLOWING FIELD OR AGENCY

GIVE YOUR COMPLETE MAILING ADDRESS OR ADDRESSES WHERE YOU CAN BEST BE REACHED WITHIN THE NEXT 12 MONTHS

DEGREE STATUS

1	DEGREE ATTAINED UNDER FELLOWSHIP DURING AWARD PERIOD	FIELD
2	DEGREE YOU ARE WORKING TOWARD	FIELD
	EXPECTED DATE OF COMPLETION	

PLANS FOR YEAR FOLLOWING CURRENT AWARD

Have you received a renewal of your NDFL award? ☐ YES ☐ NO *(If NO Please describe your plans below, giving your title and name of organization with which you expect to be affiliated).*

1	CONTINUED STUDY (INSTITUTION)	OTHER FELLOWSHIP AWARD
2	TEACHING POSITION (TITLE AND SUBJECT)	INSTITUTION
3	GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT (TITLE)	AGENCY
	USE TO BE MADE OF LANGUAGE	
4	OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY (TITLE)	EMPLOYER
	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES	
5	OTHER (PLEASE DESCRIBE)	
6	GIVE YOUR LONG-RANGE PLANS, INCLUDING USE TO BE MADE OF LANGUAGE	

The following is a list of Modern Language Association standards for language proficiency. Please rate yourself on your abilities. (Check one rating for each category)

LISTENING COMPREHENSION	☐ **SUPERIOR** Ability to follow closely & with ease all types of standard speech, such as rapid or group conversation, plays, & movies.	☐ **GOOD** Ability to understand conversation of average tempo, lectures, & news broadcasts.	☐ **MINIMAL** Ability to get the sense of what an educated native says when he is enunciating carefully & speaking simply on a general subject.
SPEAKING	☐ **SUPERIOR** Ability to approximate native speech in vocabulory, intonation, & pronunciation (e.g., the ability to exchange ideas & to be at ease in social situations).	☐ **GOOD** Ability to talk with a native without making glaring mistakes, & with a command of vocabulary and syntax sufficient to express one's thoughts in sustained conversation. This implies speech at normal speed with good pronunciation & intonation.	☐ **MINIMAL** Ability to talk on prepared topics (e.g., for classroom situations) without obvious faltering, & to use the common expressions needed for getting around in the foreign country, speaking with a pronunciation readily understandable to a native.
READING	☐ **SUPERIOR** Ability to read, almost as easily as in English, material of considerable difficulty, such as essays & literary criticism.	☐ **GOOD** Ability to read with immediate comprehension prose & verse of average difficulty & mature content.	☐ **MINIMAL** Ability to grasp directly (i.e., without translating) the meaning of simple, nontechnical prose, except for an occasional word.
WRITING	☐ **SUPERIOR** Ability to write on a variety of subjects with idiomatic naturalness, ease of expression, & some feeling for the style of the language.	☐ **GOOD** Ability to write a simple "free compasition" with clarity & correctness in vocabulary, idiom, & syntax.	☐ **MINIMAL** Ability to write correctly sentences or paragraphs such as would be developed orally for classroom situations, & to write a short, simple letter.
LANGUAGE ANALYSIS	☐ **SUPERIOR** Ability to apply knowledge of descriptive, comparative, and historical linguistics to the language-teaching situation.	☐ **GOOD** A basic knowledge of the historical development & present characteristics of the language, an awareness of the difference between the language as spoken & as written.	☐ **MINIMAL** A working command of the sound-patterns & grammar patterns of the foreign language, & a knowledge of its main differences from English.
CULTURE	☐ **SUPERIOR** An enlightened understanding of the foreign people & their culture, achieved through personal contact, travel & residence abroad, through study of systematic descriptions of the foreign culture, & through study of literature & the arts.	☐ **GOOD** First-hand knowledge of some literary masterpieces, and understanding of the principal ways in which the foreign culture resembles & differs from our own, & possession of an organized body of information on the foreign people & their civilization.	☐ **MINIMAL** An awareness of language as an essential element among the learned & shared experiences that combine to form a particular culture, & a rudimentary knowledge of the geography, history, literature, art, social customs, & contemporary civilization of the foreign people.
PROFESSIONAL	☐ **SUPERIOR** A mastery of recognized teaching methods, & the ability to experiment with & evaluate new methods & techniques.	☐ **GOOD** The ability to apply knowledge of methods & techniques to the teaching situation (e.g., audio-visual techniques) & to relate one's teaching of the language to other areas of the curriculum.	☐ **MINIMAL** Some knowledge of effective methods & techniques of language teaching. ☐ **NOT APPLICABLE**

GIVE BELOW INFORMATION ON COURSES FOR WHICH YOU ENROLLED FOR EACH SESSION, SEMESTER, OR QUARTER UNDER YOUR AWARD.

MONTH & YEAR ATTENDED		GRADES	NO. OF CREDITS		COURSE NO.	DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF COURSE
FROM	TO		GRAD.	UNGRAD.		

Give the extent of progress, during award period, in non-class activities (e.g., writing your dissertation, research for thesis, independent language study, preparation for comprehensive examinations, etc.).

Comment on your experience under the NDFL fellowship program (with particular reference to your increasing proficiency in the language of the award).

SIGNATURE	DATE

GPO 883-371

OE 4144-C
BOB 51-6213.1
Expires 12/31/65

American Council of Learned Societies
345 East 46th Street
New York, New York 10017

DATE: _____

The American Council of Learned Societies, under contract with the U.S. Office of Education, is making a survey of the impact of the NDEA and NDEA-related Modern Foreign Language Fellowships programs. You can help us greatly by providing us with information about your activities since the termination of your NDEA Fellowship. This is in addition to any information which you may already have contributed in your terminal or other reports.

Please comment fully and frankly on the effect of your Fellowship on your academic and professional activities since that time. Your comments are essential to us in studying the needs and policies of foreign language and area training under the NDEA and the Fulbright-Hays Act.

IT IS URGENT THAT THIS FORM BE COMPLETED AND RETURNED BY SEPTEMBER FIRST. An envelope is enclosed.
PLEASE NOTE THAT QUESTIONS 3-10 REFER TO THE TIME SINCE YOUR NDEA FELLOWSHIP TERMINATED.

REPORT ON NDEA TITLE VI FOREIGN LANGUAGE FELLOWSHIPS WHICH TERMINATED BEFORE JULY 1964

(Please correct above name and address if incorrect)

1. FELLOWSHIP AWARD			2. PRESENT POSITION	
LANG	PERIOD OF AWD(S) (Month & Year) FROM TO	INST(S)	TITLE OF POS.	NAME AND ADD OF EMPLOYER

3. GRADUATE DEGREES			4. OTHER POSITIONS HELD		
DEGREE	DATE	MAJOR FIELD	DATES FROM TO	TITLE OF POSITION	NAME OF EMPLOYER

5. OTHER FELLOWSHIPS, AWARDS OR HONORS RCV'D

6. PUBLICATIONS AUTHORED AND CO-AUTHORED

7a. Have you used the language of your NDEA Fellowship? Yes/ / No/ /
b. How used? Research/ / Travel/ / Teaching/ /
Indicate extent of utilization.

8a. Have you had experience in foreign areas where the lang. is spoken? Yes/ / No/ /
b. Give dates, purpose and location.

9a. Did the language fellowship modify your career goal?	Yes ☐ No ☐	10. Comment on any aspects of your fellowship which are not included in previous questions.
b. Did it help you achieve your career goal?	Yes ☐ No ☐	
SIGNATURE		
SOCIAL SECURITY NO.	DATE	

INTERVIEW FORM FOR TITLE VI FELLOWSHIP ADMINISTRATORS

1. Name and title

2. Institution

3. Relationship to Program

4. Length of relationship

5. Are contacts with USOE satisfactory?

6. a) What is the quality of Fellowship applicants? b) Do marginal applicants sometimes get Title VI Fellowships? c) Does competition vary from language to language in your field? d) Any recent changes in this variance?

7. How do Title VI Fellows compare a) with graduate students in general?
b) with holders of other fellowships?

8. Is the proportion of Ph.D.s to Fellowship holders satisfactory?

9. How are Title VI Fellows regarded by staff and fellow students?

10. Are they beginning to contribute to the creation of teaching materials?

11. Are their careers justifying the Fellowship awards?

12. Would you hire them?

13. a) To what extent has the FL competence of graduate students in your field increased in the past ten years?

b) What more can be done to produce or accelerate an improvement?

14. Should there be field work or study abroad? With Title VI support?

If so, what qualifications?

15. Placement tests: local or national? What skills tested?

16. Is the Program helping to supply qualified teachers and other users of the FL?

17. What problems, if any, do you have in securing well qualified teachers?

18. Are your departmental offerings all that you would like?

19. Has the Program tended to weaken instruction in your field?

20. What courses are conducted in the FL? Are area courses conducted in the FL? Are area course readings in the FL?

21. Is there any supervision of native informants?

    Any instruction in methodology?

22. a) What about guidance and recruitment of undergraduates?

    b) Suggestions for improvement?

    c) Influence on undergraduate offerings in the FL and in the area?

23. How would you react to the use of Title VI Fellowship money for undergraduates during the academic year?

24. Is the impact of the Program greater in language and literature or in area studies?

25. Has it had any significant impact on interdepartmental cooperation between language and literature and social sciences?

26. Any significant improvement in social science research through firmer control of the FL?

27. What has been the influence of the Program a) on your university?

    b) on your field in general, here and elsewhere?

    c) on your language and area center?

28. General suggestions for improving the Program.

INTERVIEW FORM FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

1. Name _____

2. Home Address _____

3. Institution _____ 4. Language of Award _____ 5. Dates _____

6. B.A.: a. College _____ b. Year _____ c. Field _____

7. Undergraduate Honors: a. Phi Beta Kappa _____ b. Prizes _____

_____ c. Degree with Honors _____ d. Other _____

e. Scholarships, year and field _____

8. M.A.: a. College _____ b. Year _____ c. Field _____

d. Honors _____

9. What is now your major field? _____

10. a. Have you taught? _____ b. What courses? _____

_____

c. When? _____ d. Where? _____

11. a. Have you held NDEA Title VI Fellowships before? _____ b. When _____

c. Where? _____ d. What FL? _____

12. a. Other Fellowships? _____ b. When? _____ c. Where? _____

d. What field? _____

13. When do you plan to complete your course requirements for the Doctorate? _____

_____

14. a. Have you chosen a dissertation subject? _____

b. When do you plan to complete it? _____

15. What got you interested in the language of your present Fellowship? (Personal or professional interests, etc.) _____

_____ _____

16. How many years before this have you studied it? _____

17. How do you plan to use your knowledge of this language? _____

_____ _____ _____

18. What is your ultimate professional objective? _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

19. Is this year's program contributing satisfactorily to it?_____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

20. What features of this program do you especially like? _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____.

21. What features of this program would you like to see improved, and how?

a. Curriculum_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

b. Quality of instruction_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

c. Materials used_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

d. Administration_____ _____ _____ _____ _____.

e. Financial arrangements _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

f. Any other features _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

22. a. What is your opinion of the quality and attitude of the other Title VI Fellows

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

b. Can you compare them with classmates who are not Title VI Fellows? _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____.

23. Any criticism of the application and award procedures? _____ _____

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _

24. Is publicity and information about the Fellowships adequate?_____ _____

25. Do you expect to apply for a renewal next year?_____ _____ _____

26. Any other comments? _____ _____ _____ _____ _____

INTERVIEW FORM FOR NDFL UNDERGRADUATES

1.a. What basic personal interests and professional objectives attracted you to this program?

1.b. What ultimate or medium-term (but not short-term) aims do you hope to accomplish

2.a. How do your studies this summer coordinate, tie in, supplement, or contribute to your general program of studies, your major, etc.?

2.b. What is your academic background, major field?

2.c. What do you bring to the summer program? How many years of the language have you had prior to this? Foreign residence? Etc.?

2.d. What are you getting out of the summer program, in terms of skills, credits?

3.a. How do you expect or <u>hope</u> to use the knowledge you are now acquiring as a graduate student, or later? (Be as specific as possible.)

4.a. Are you satisfied, enthusiastic, disappointed somewhat, or frankly critical of the curriculum?

4.b. Quality of instruction?

4.c. Materials used?

4.d. Organization of the Center?

4.e. The quality and attitude of your fellow students?

4.f. The requirements of the program?

5.a. Do you have any criticisms, constructive or not, of any aspect of the Fellowship program application procedures? (Please feel free to "let down your hair and talk"--complete anonymity promised.)

5.b. Size of award, finances?

5.c. Distribution of Fellowship information?

5.d. Have you applied, or do you plan to apply, for a renewal?

6. General