DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 313 FL 001 177

By-Fishman, Joshua A.; And Others

Language Development: Selected Papers from a Ford Foundation Conference on the State of Art.

Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Spons Agency-Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Oct 68
Note-69p.; Papers presented at a Ford Foundation Conference, New York, April 1967.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.55
Descriptors-*English (Second Language), Federal Aid, Financial Support, Foundation Programs, Instructional Materials, *Language Development, Language Laboratories, Language Research, Linguistics, *Modern Languages, Programed Instruction, *Second Language Learning, *Sociolinguistics, Teaching Methods, Televised Instruction, Uncommonly Taught Languages
Identifiers-Ford Foundation

The five papers collected in this booklet present an overall view of language development from the early 1950's to the present. Joshua A. Fishman discusses language and the problems of social and national development and indicates how sociolinguistic research may illuminate these problems. Albert H. Marckwardt considers the teaching of English as a foreign language, discussing the postwar and present situations, the role of linguistics, teaching materials, and the teacher shortage. Kenneth Mildenberger discusses progress in teaching and research in both the commonly and uncommonly taught languages, considering learning theories, instructional improvement, instructional materials, professionalism, and Federal aid. Implications of the new technology for language teaching are examined by Wilbur Schramm, who discusses the present and possible future uses of accepted technological devices and examines the more controversial technological developments. Melvin F. Fox reports on Ford Foundation activities (1951-66) in support of foreign language teaching and the teaching of English as a second language at home and abroad. (AR)

October, 1968

Language Development

SELECTED PAPERS FROM

A FORD FOUNDATION CONFERENCE

ON THE STATE OF THE ART

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Contents

Introduction

After some fifteen years of activities in the language field, the Ford Foundation organized a Language Development Study, a broad review of the state of the language field generally and of the Foundation's experiences, with a view toward formulating the Foundation's future plans in the field. Each of several leading experts was asked to discuss his specialty and its particular problems, developments over the last decade, the gaps in knowledge or techniques, and the needs for development in the United States or abroad.

The papers prepared for this review were discussed at a conference held in New York in April, 1967. They included contributions by such distinguished specialists as Charles A. Ferguson, Beryl Loftman Bailey, Vera John, Mary Lanigan and James Sledd, Thomas Sebeok, and John B. Carroll. The papers presented in this report are limited to those that have a general interest and have contributed most directly to the assessment of past Foundation programs and to the effort to determine its future course of action. Albert H. Marckwardt's paper, describing the progress that has been made over a decade in the teaching of English as a foreign language, pinpoints continuing deficiencies in materials and shortages in personnel. Kenneth Mildenberger's paper surveys the state of teaching of foreign languages in the United States, including the results of research on the effectiveness of different methods and the impact of Federal financial aid. Wilbur Schramm deals with the present effectiveness and future possibilities of language teaching technology. Joshua Fishman shows how the new hybrid discipline of sociolinguistics provides insights into the conditions of effective language policy and language learning. Finally, Melvin J. Fox, the Foundation staff member who organized the Language Development Study, discusses the history and rationale of Ford Foundation activities and the implications of recent developments in the language field for future Foundation policies. While these papers do not, of course, exhaust the subject matter of the language field, they do represent major concerns of those seeking viable approaches to the language problems that beset the world.

Sociolinguistics and National Development

JOSHUA A. FISHMAN
University Research Professor of Social Sciences, Yeshiva University

The Language Component in the Problems of Developing Nations

The problems of developing nations are not essentially different from those of other nations, for few nations, if any, are completely stabilized, unified, or legitimized; however, the problems and processes of nationhood are surely more acute and more visible in developing nations, and these nations have, therefore, come to be of interest to many social scientists. Among these are sociolinguists, albeit all too few, who are interested both in the transformations of group identity in general and in the impact of other social institutions (political, educational, and so forth) on language-related behavior and on language per se.

1. One of the problems that is particularly acute and visible in new nations is the lack of correspondence between their political boundaries and any pre-existing ethnic-cultural unity. This lack of correspondence occurred frequently when new nations were formed in Eastern Europe after World War I, even though these nations had behind them long periods of nationalist, ethnic-cultural activity before the achievement of nationhood (Rustow, 1966); it is even more common in the formation of the new nations of Africa. The political independence of African nations has generally been achieved far in advance of unification around a set of traditional behaviors and myths; the new political entities, therefore, must seek a nationwide ethnic and cultural identity in symbols that transcend pre-existing ethnic-cultural particularities. The choice of

appropriate symbols is often a difficult one: "If the Africans do not suffer from the civilizational *embarras de richesse* that now typically confronts the Asians, they suffer instead from the dilemma of having either to relate themselves to some foreign great tradition or somehow to convert elements of their many indigenous tribal cultures into a new entity worthy of civilized respect" (Marriott in Geertz, ed., p. 48). As Marriott sees it, "The resulting composite cultures . . . seem generally to bring together foreign secular elements at the top with some elements of generalized indigenous sacred significance below" (ibid., p. 51). Language, of course, may have a prominent place among the new nation's various symbols of ethnic-cultural identity.

At the same time, and as a reaction to this national effort, the local counterparts to national symbols may assume new ideological significance among populations that never attributed such significance to them before. Harrison describes the linguistic fragmentation of India, for example, and makes the following gloomy prediction about the language situation there:

> In each region writers and intellectuals will be caught in an atmosphere of political ferment that will, in most instances, emphasize and honor parochial rather than universal values. The decline of English has already led to a sharp decline in educational standards. . . . Intellectual activity in each region will to a considerable extent be the pulp culture of popular writers who will address themselves to the swelling millions of new literates in the regional languages. This pulp culture will, by its very nature, be predominantly parochial in its horizons. . . . (p. 79)

Thus, language may become both a symbol of supra-local ethnic-cultural identification (i.e., "nationalism") and a symbol of contra-national ethnic-cultural identification on the part of smaller groups who, resisting fusion into the larger nationality, develop their own localized nationality-consciousness.

In this process of conscious integration (national or contra-national), hitherto local languages or languages with limited functions may become unifying symbols, increasingly differentiated from languages or varieties with which they have long been in contact. A

case in point is Macedonian, a language not sharply differentiated from Serbian and even less different from Bulgarian. After World War II, Tito encouraged the use of Macedonian as the official language and a new standard language was established Lunt, 1959). Again, in Norway, the achievement of political independence in the nineteenth century was accompanied by a complicated process of language differentiation which has been described in great detail by Haugen. The preferred national or local language may be linked with a group's heroes and values, with national missions, and, ultimately, with the sacredness of the state and of the moral order. In a brief paper entitled "Myths about Arabic," Ferguson notes that within the Arabic speech community it is firmly believed that Arabic is superior to all other languages: it is more beautiful, its grammar has a more "logical" structure, its lexicon is vaster, and it is more sacred. Ferguson also reports the conviction among Arabic speakers that there will be in the future a single Arabic language—a slightly streamlined version of Classical Arabic—and that, indeed, this language is already being used by some educated Arabs and will increasingly be taught to all. This case seems to show that the ideological significance of a language may contribute not only to processes of symbolic mobilization and unification but also to the conversion of the language into a fitting instrument of government, technology, and high culture.

2. Besides the problem of ethnic-cultural identity, developing nations are beset by problems revolving about efficiency and instrumentality. Political independence eventually creates a sense of ethnic-cultural unity and of common commitment within the geographic limits of a polity, although this may take time (and frequently force), as exemplified by the lack of full ethnic-cultural unity even in such well-established polities as Great Britain, France, or Spain. Long before such unity is fully established, however, a nation-state must function: it must protect itself from external and internal opponents and must provide for its citizenry opportunities for trade, education, and all other legitimate societal pursuits. As Geertz puts it, ". . . the peoples of the new states are simultaneously animated by two powerful, thoroughly independent, yet distinct and often actually opposed motives—the desire to be recognized as responsible agents whose wishes, acts, hopes, and opinions 'matter,' and the desire to build an efficient, dynamic modern state. The one

aim is to be noticed: it is a search for an identity, and a demand that that identity be publicly acknowledged as having import, a social assertion of the self as 'being somebody in the world.' The other aim is practical: it is a demand for progress, for a rising standard of living, more effective political order, greater social justice, and beyond that of 'playing a part in the larger arena of world politics,' or 'exercising influence among the nations.'" (p. 108).

In order to function efficiently, to achieve their practical aim, new nations that lack prior socio-cultural unity must come to grips rather quickly with their language problems. In this connection, the conflict of aims that Geertz mentions may occur: while the need for a broad ethnic-cultural unity may well point to the long-term espousal of a particular language as the national language, the immediate operational needs of government, education, and industry in all regions of the country may well necessitate the short-term recognition of multiple languages. Thus, some nations have accepted, for reasons of expediency, the use of several local languages in early education (e.g., grades one to three or even six), while the preferred national language is retained for intermediate education and a non-indigenous language of international significance is retained (at least temporarily) for governmental activity and higher education. Under the 1957 Constitution of the Federation of Malaya, Malay was declared to be the national language, but for a period of at least ten years English could be used for all official purposes. The aim of the education policy of the Federation has been to make Malay the national language, "whilst preserving and sustaining the growth of the language and culture of peoples other than Malays living in the country. . . . At the primary level, parents have the choice of vernacular schools—teaching either Malay, Chinese (Mandarin), or Tamil—or the English-medium schools. At the secondary level . . . the choice . . . is now between Malay and English" (LePage, pp. 68-69).

If such a pattern enhances social stability, language policies can then be implemented that permit the preferred language gradually to displace the language of wider communication above it in the educational hierarchy (viz. the increasing displacement of English in the Philippines and in India), and, more remotely, the languages of narrower communication below it. Such a progression requires careful educational, political, and social planning, for it contributes

to the simultaneous occurrence of identities which may become resistant to displacement or containment, as well as very careful language planning. Thus, a language policy that contributes to efficient functioning (what is sometimes referred to as "political integration") may ultimately also help foster the new socio-cultural identity, just as surely as a language policy that contributes to socio-cultural integration helps foster and maintain political integration.

3. The above sketch of the language component in the growth of socio-cultural unity, on the one hand, and in attainment of efficient national functioning, on the other, is a highly theoretical reconstruction based more on hunches, extrapolations, and partial observations than on systematic and comparative study. On the whole, sociolinguistics has not yet been closely or directly involved in the vast amount of recent and ongoing sociological, economic, political science, educational, and other scholarly work on the developing nations. In the few instances that interdisciplinary area-studies centers have attracted scholars devoted to socio-linguistics, these scholars have shown little interest in the transformations of society and language in the large, and have confined themselves to studying patterns of narrowly linguistic behavior.

The major recent volumes on developing nations have devoted little attention to language; a welcome exception is Passin's discussion (1963) of the difficulty that journalists in such nations have in finding the right level of nomenclature to use in their writings. At the same time, recent works on the language problems of developing nations have been singularly innocent of social science expertise. (Anon., 1966; LePage, 1964; Spencer, 1963). At the 1960 Congress of the International Sociological Association (at Evian) only two language-focused papers were presented at the several sessions devoted to the new nations. In November 1966, an attempt by the SSRC to bring together linguists and social scientists for three days to discuss and clarify this area of joint interest was only indifferently successful, primarily because leading social scientists in the field did not attend, but also because the attending linguists were ignorant of social scientific work with bearing on the developing nations in particular and nation-characterization in general. In the following month, at an international conference on social-psychological research on developing countries held at Ibadan, there was substantial interest in language but only one investigator

who was planning to study its societal role. As a result, while much is suspected and roughly understood concerning the role of language in socio-cultural and political integration, all too little is known with certainty and very little indeed that can be clearly used as the basis of policy.

All this is most unfortunate, for in the new nations language-related problems are both endemic and highly visible; moreover, the kinds of problems that occur in these early stages are fleeting and especially difficult to reconstruct by means of archival or laboratory analysis. Thus, though the new nations are undergoing rapid and complex social change, there is very little language-related research under way on the effects of this change on the transmutations and elaborations of ethnicity; on the development of identification with the broader nationality and the broader polity; on the simultaneous resurgence of tradition (e.g., in dress, naming practices and religious observances) and growth of modernity (in the occupational, educational and governmental spheres); on the impact of previously available great traditions—the knowledge, doctrines, philosophy, and aesthetic canons of elites; on the acceptance of more modern and broader identifications; on the restructuring of traditional value hierarchies as distinguished from their disintegration; or on the bicultural counterparts to bilingualism.

The Social Component in the Problems of Developing Languages

The developing languages (i.e., language undergoing the greatest and most rapid change—planned and unplanned—in societal functions) and the developing countries do not stand in a completely isomorphic relationship to each other; nor do the developing languages reveal problems or processes that are discontinuous with those of more widely accepted or better established languages. Nevertheless, for sociolinguists the developing nations do tend to present the most strategic sites for the study of developing languages.

Languages undergo development when their functions undergo real or anticipatory expansion. This expansion of functions, in turn, results from the expanded role repertoires (real or anticipatory) of those for whom the particular languages have become so centrally symbolic of group membership and of group goals that any other languages are unacceptable. As the lives of these speakers

change, they find it necessary to talk about new things. They modify their language accordingly, and eventually, the language is modified officially and systematically. In recent years, the expansion of role repertoires has occurred most frequently in the developing nations, and it is there that the expansion and symbolic elaboration of languages has also been most frequent.

1. Language choice (selection) is significant both for socio-cultural integration and for political integration, but it is significant in quite different ways. From the perspective of socio-cultural identity, language represents the continuity of a great tradition with all of its symbolic elaborations. Language "selection" is simply the triumph of one tradition over other and purportedly lesser traditions and goals. Indeed, there is no real language "choice," since a particular commitment presents itself to its adherents as a matter of course, as "natural." The goal of language loyalists is language reinforcement and maintenance rather than selection proper. However, from the point of view of effective functioning or political integration, language selection involves a real decision process: alternative results are calculated, in terms of communicational ease, of operational efficiency. Rival languages are considered in terms of their potential contribution to the functional strength of the nation. Two contradictory conclusions frequently emerge: the fewer the languages the better, *and* the less opposition to any language or languages the better. Thus language choice may well come as the resultant of these two contradictory considerations. Effective political consolidation is compatible with a greater variety of language choices than is socio-cultural integration, yet the choices that are made early may become restrictive, creating inflexible institutional commitments to particular languages.

Whether language selection evolves primarily from identification with a great tradition or from calculations of operational efficiency, or, as is common, from a combination of both, it is necessary to engineer consent or acceptance. Without such acceptance language selection may be resisted or sabotaged. There are many ways of engineering acceptance: among these are language censuses (often rigged); subsidized schools for children and classes for adults; free publications and audio-visual materials; language societies with national, regional, and local branches; examinations and contests yielding honorific or more tangible rewards; and translation insti-

tutes for converting world literature into the selected language.

Many of the above mentioned examples suggest that in the process of influencing people on behalf of a particular language, the language itself may be enriched (or at least altered) in one way or another. This is indeed the case and a case well worth studying, for far too little is known about it.

2. Western languages, even those that have considerable international prominence, are constantly undergoing elaboration, in response to the growing and changing technological, scientific, and cultural pursuits of users of these languages. Similarly, Western languages are constantly undergoing recodification, via dictionaries, grammars, and usage handbooks by means of which the elaborations are evaluated and consolidated (Guxman, 1967b). Such processes of elaboration and codification are even more necessary (and noticeable) in those new nations in which an indigenous language has been selected for some function additional to those with which it has hitherto been associated. Inevitably, official, semi-official, and unofficial agencies, institutes, and societies arise that prepare and distribute orthographies, word lists, and grammars (as well as related teaching and learning materials). These materials frequently reveal serious disagreement (or elicit such) in view of their different postures toward certain basic issues, for example, the desirability of Western borrowings as against new coinages from old roots, or the respective merits of classicism and vernacularization.

Where the language being elaborated or codified lacks a generally accepted standard variety, those engaged in elaboration/codification must select a variety for attention. Selection for elaboration/codification is normally guided by considerations such as the following: a large number of speakers (although, at times, a case is made for a variety spoken by relatively few, on the grounds that it is not involved in the bitter traditional rivalries to which more widespread varieties have become exposed); past association with a great tradition; current association with major social trends (urbanization, Christianization, and so forth); greater purity, i.e., fewer influences from varieties or languages considered undesirable or, conversely, greater similarity to highly regarded varieties or languages; and, lastly, the desirability of a middle-ground position between overly pure and overly indistinguishable varieties. Depending on the initial selection based upon considerations (and

value-laden positions) such as the above, the end-products of subsequent elaboration/codification efforts will obviously differ widely with respect to the establishment of norms of orthography, phonology, lexicon, and grammar. The process of establishing a standard language is clearly fertile ground for disagreement, and Lunt's surprise at the ease with which a standard Macedonian language was agreed on is warranted.

3. In view of the number of instances in which the selection, elaboration, and codification of developing languages has occurred during the past century, we have surprisingly few complete case studies of these processes, with even fewer that relate them to concurrent societal developments (there are a few, e.g. Haugen's study of Norway and Clough's of Belgium); still fewer attempt to do so on a comparative or contrastive basis that permits the formulation of generalizable parameters and the estimation of their relative significance (perhaps only Guxman, 1967a and, to a lesser extent, Haugen, 1966b). While we have many lists of new words (and new forms) in language X, we know almost nothing of how language academies operate, how governments review and implement the recommendations of such academies, how language societies popularize and defend the recommendations and decisions of academies and governments, or of how rival academies and societies confront each other and seek to influence governments and populations in accord with their own preferences. We particularly need systematic explanations, guided by social theory, of the success of certain selective, elaborative, and codificatory attempts (i.e., attempts that are accepted by the desired target populations) and of the failure of others.

Sociolinguistic Research and Other Language Studies

There are a number of implications of sociolinguistic research, and particularly research on the language problems of developing nations, for other language-related topics. Once language-teaching abandons the myth of fully-separated and unvarying languages, it will find the sociolinguistic concern with situationally and functionally defined varieties extremely useful. Native language as well as foreign language teaching should benefit from the concept of a speech community with a repertoire of varieties and the definition of communicative appropriateness not in linguistic terms alone

but also in terms of particular interlocutors, situations, interaction types, and domains. Contact between sociolinguistics and language instruction is just beginning and should become stronger with the passage of time.

Another set of problems that sociolinguistics can illuminate is that of the language problems of disadvantaged speakers of non-standard varieties. Social scientists have already shown that the language of lower class urban Negroes and Puerto Ricans includes several varieties that differ in the extent to which they are effortlessly mastered (Labov, 1966a). The long experience of other countries (e.g., England, Germany, Italy) in coping with home-school dialect differences of a major sort may be illuminating, if only to indicate clearly the differences between those cases and the American Negro case. Certain non-standard varieties have been found to signify intra-group loyalty or strong ideological preferences (Labov, 1965; Fishman, 1965); this means that the learning of more standard varieties is impeded not only by structural factors but also by functional ones. It has generally been assumed that the educator's principal task is to expand the language repertoires of disadvantaged populations, but if the language problems of the disadvantaged were considered against the background of coterritorial language differences and of language shift more generally, it would become evident that the cart has been put before the horse; it is the real or anticipated expansion of role repertoires that is crucial for the success of any attempt to attain verbal repertoire expansion on a large scale. All in all, there are ample signs of the potential value of sociolinguistics for the study of the language problems of developing populations both abroad and in the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anon. *White Paper on the Restoration of the Irish Language: Progress Report for the Period ended 31 March, 1966.* Dublin: Department of Finance, Government of Ireland, 1966.

Bell, Wendell and Oxaal I. *Decisions of Nationhood.* Denver: Social Science Foundation (University of Denver), 1964.

Bidwell, Charles E. "Language, dialect and nationality in Yugoslavia." *Human Relations,* 1962, *15,* 217-225.

Clough, Shepard B. *A History of the Flemish Movement in Belgium.* New York: Smith, 1930.

Deutsch, Karl. *Nationalism and Social Communication.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1953.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. "An analysis of the interaction between language, topic and speaker." *American Anthropologist,* 1964, *66* (6) part 2, 86-102.

Ferguson, Charles A. "Diglossia." *Word,* 1959, *15,* 325-40.

————. Myths About Arabic. *Georgetown University Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics,* #12, 1959, pp. 75-82.

————. "The language factor in national development." *Anthropological Linguistics,* 1962, *4* (1), 23-27.

Fishman, Joshua A. "Who speaks what language to whom and when?" *Linguistique,* 1965a, 2, 67-88.

————. *Language Loyalty in the United States.* The Hague: Mouton, 1966a.

————. "Some contrasts between linguistically homogeneous and linguistically heterogeneous polities." *Sociological Inquiry,* 1966b, *36,* 146-158.

Friedrich, Paul. "Language and politics in India." *Daedalus,* 1962, Summer, 543-559.

Gallagher, Charles F. North African Problems and Prospects. Part III: Language and Identity. *American Universities Field Staff, North Africa Series,* 1964, *10* (5).

Geertz, C. "The integrative revolution." In C. Geertz (Ed.), *Old Societies and New States.* New York: Free Press, 1963. 105-157.

Gumperz, John J. "Linguistic and social interaction in two communities." *American Anthropologist,* 1964, *66* (6), part 2, 137-153.

————. "On the ethnology of linguistic change." In Wm. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics.* The Hague: Mouton, 1966, 27-49.

Guxman, M. "Some general regularities in the formation and development of national languages." In Guxman, *Voprosy formirovanija i razvitija nacional'nyx jazykov.* English translation being prepared by the Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. 1967b, 295-307.

Harrison, Selig S. *India: The Most Dangerous Decades.* Princeton: University Press, 1960.

Haugen, Einar. *Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966a.

Heyd, Uriel. *Language Reform in Modern Turkey*. Jerusalem: The Israel Oriental Society, 1954.

Labov, William. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966a.

———, et al. *A Preliminary Study of the Structure of English Used by Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City*. (Cooperative Research Project 3091) New York: Columbia University, 1965.

LePage, R. B. *The National Language Question*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Lunt, Horace G. "The creation of standard Macedonian: some facts and attitudes." *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1959, *1* (5), 19-26.

Marriott, M. "Cultural policy in the new states." In C. Geertz (Ed.), *Old Societies and New States*. New York: Free Press, 1963, 27-56.

Moscos, Charles C., Jr. and Wendell Bell. "Cultural unity and diversity in new states." *Teachers College Record*, 1965, *66*, 679-694.

Nahirny, Vladimir and Joshua A. Fishman. "American immigrant groups: ethnic identification and the problem of generations." *Sociological Review*, 1965, *13*, 311-326.

Rustow, Dankwart A. Language, modernization and nationhood; an attempt at typology. S.S.R.C. Conference on Language Problems of Developing Nations, November, 1966. (mimeo)

Shuy, Roger W. (Ed.). *Social Dialects and Language Learning*. Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Spencer, J. (Ed.). *Language in Africa*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Stewart, William A. *Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

Weinreich, Uriel. *Languages in Contact*. New York: Linguistic Circle, 1953. Second Printing The Hague: Mouton, 1963.

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT
Professor of English,
Princeton University

Language pedagogy has felt the impact of linguistics in a quite uneven manner. It was first evident, perhaps, in the teaching of English as a foreign language, and almost immediately afterward in the teaching of the so-called unusual languages. It was to be more than a decade before the commonly taught foreign languages were at all affected, and longer still before the movement extended to teaching English as a native language.

The reason for this is not at all difficult to determine. It boils down simply to the presence or absence of vested interest and traditional teaching procedures. In 1941, the date of the first classes at the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan, there were no teaching materials other than those which had been created out of hand the preceding year in preparation for this first group of foreign students to be given an intensive course in English. The very concept of intensive language instruction was new, making it necessary to develop classroom procedures to fit the situation. After we became involved in World War II, the process was destined to be repeated with languages such as Thai, Burmese, Chinese, Japanese, and a host of others, chiefly in connection with the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies.

The teaching of English as a foreign language developed in a somewhat parallel fashion on two fronts: adult education projects in Latin America as part of an emergent cultural-relations program designed to counteract previous efforts on the part of the German

and Italian governments; intensive courses in American colleges and universities to enable visiting scholars and advanced students, also chiefly from Latin America, to pursue advanced studies in this country—not necessarily at the institution where they received their English training.

Our earliest attempts to teach English in Latin America demonstrated clearly that the popular interest in English instruction was potentially so great that demand would soon outrun any conceivable supply of teachers. Within months after their opening, centers in Mexico City, Caracas, and Bogota had enrollments ranging from one to three thousand. In order to meet the situation, teacher-training programs developed both in the United States and within the countries where English-teaching activities had been established. The latter were—as they still are—chiefly in-service, directed toward the native secondary-school teachers. The former were in part pre-service, aimed at building up a corps of qualified personnel for new positions, both at home and abroad.

The Postwar Situation

With the end of the war, Latin America ceased to be the sole focus of our English-teaching efforts. Our activities became literally global in their scope, embracing the Far East, the Near East, and portions of Europe. Japan, where literary studies in English had been highly developed up to 1940, proceeded under American prodding to change its educational system and made English, to all intents and purposes, a required subject in a curriculum which called for universal education through the ninth grade. This alone demanded initial training or retraining of some 50,000 teachers of English. The countries of Southeast Asia, both the old and the emergent, felt a need for English beyond anything that had previously existed, as English became increasingly vital for such fields as national development, science and technology, and international relations.

The story in the Near East was much the same, although the need for English arose more often as a consequence of our technical assistance programs than from a vast expansion of the educational systems. Many European countries were already teaching foreign languages far more effectively than the United States, and consequently there was little need for our assistance except for the de-

velopment of American studies at the university level. Even so, Italy and Greece, and to a somewhat lesser degree Austria, have received both American and British assistance and continue to do so. Recently the eastern European countries have indicated an interest in further development of their English-teaching programs and a willingness to accept at least a degree of American aid.

During the past decade the political changes and the development of new nations in Africa have created a new demand, both for direct teaching and for teacher-training, again on a vast scale. In fact, two kinds of demands have developed: the teaching of English to non-English-speaking natives in countries where English is either officially or unofficially the language of government, business, and education, and the teaching of English in French-speaking Africa. There has been great concern as well over the state of English in India, Pakistan, and Ceylon where, because of changes in government and language rivalries, the command of the language has retrogressed at the same time that it has become more essential as a cementing force and a channel of communication, a situation which has had a paler and less critical reflection in the Philippine Islands.

U.S. English-Teaching Activities

No less than seven U.S. Government agencies are involved in one way or another in English-teaching activities: the Department of State, through the Fulbright program; the U.S. Information Agency (U.S.I.A.), through binational centers; the Agency for International Development; the U.S. Office of Education, through its International Teacher Exchange Program; the Department of Defense; the Peace Corps; and the Department of the Interior, which has the responsibility for English instruction in the Indian schools in this country and the Trust Territories overseas.

In addition to the Federal government, private foundations have played a significant role in English teaching in a number of countries. The Ford Foundation has supported basic communication and linguistics research; the expansion of knowledge and scholars, and the increase of training tools and teacher-trainers in the United States in relation to both modern and the so-called unfamiliar foreign languages and to English as a second language; development in more than a dozen countries of training facilities for

English as a second language; experimentation with new approaches to language-learning in the schools and improvement of links and interchange between scholars and teachers in the United States and in other countries.

The Rockefeller Foundation has given support to projects in the Philippines, the United Arab Republic, and to various countries in Latin America. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund has financed work in Japan, and limited support for work in Southeast Asia has come from the Asia Foundation. In Britain the Nuffield Foundation has been interested in the development of textbook materials for use in Africa and has assisted a research project based at Makerere College in Uganda.

A decade ago, activities in teaching English as a foreign language were already widespread in various countries, wider in fact than the supply of well-trained manpower could possibly satisfy. In this country a fair number of colleges and universities were offering special instruction in English for foreign students, but they were for the most part the larger institutions.

The universities of Texas, Michigan, California at Los Angeles, Indiana, Illinois, and Columbia had well-developed programs, many of them going back to the immediate post-war period. There were, however, probably not more than fifty universities engaged in such programs, if indeed they numbered that many.

U.S. Government support of English-teaching activities in 1957 was chaotic, to say the least. The various agencies involved had not yet formulated clear ideas of their function, and in some instances budgetary appropriations were grossly insufficient for the programs that were being conceived. Early attempts at inter-agency co-operation had foundered, and there was little communication, to say nothing of coordination, among the various governmental departments engaged in English teaching.

Even so, there were one or two bright spots on the horizon. The Fulbright steering committee for linguistics and English language teaching had, in the fall of 1957, passed a resolution calling for the creation of an extra-governmental body which might provide a channel of communication between the government and the universities, as well as among the various agencies of the government, with respect to English teaching and other activities involving the application of linguistics. This was the first in a chain of events

which led to the establishment of the Center for Applied Linguistics (C.A.L.). At the same time, the Advisory Committee for Cultural Information of U.S.I.A. created a small sub-committee to report to it on the activities of the English teaching branch of the agency. This, too, was an initial step, leading ultimately to the establishment of the Advisory Panel on English Teaching, which now reports directly to the director of the agency.

Early Linguistic Tools

Teaching materials, though a great improvement over what had been available previously, were still in a somewhat rudimentary stage. Certain principles and techniques had, however, been established. The use of a contrastive analysis of native and target languages was one of these. The University of Michigan materials in their earliest phase were firmly based upon an English-Spanish contrast. This was still implicit in the four revised volumes that appeared in 1958, and which by that time were serving native speakers of a variety of languages.

The same contrastive principle lay behind the nine volumes produced by the American Council of Learned Societies (A.C.L.S.) between 1952 and 1956, under contract with the State Department. Although the so-called *General Form*, designed as a basic pattern for the entire series, had been produced in advance of the textbooks themselves, each of the specific volumes, designed for native speakers of Burmese, Greek, Indonesian, Iranian, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Serbo-Croatian, Thai, Turkish, and Spanish took the structural differences between English and the native language into account. It must be conceded, however, that the contrastive studies upon which all of these materials were said to have been based were never published, and as far as can be determined, they consisted of somewhat unorganized material reposing in file drawers in Ithaca, Washington, Ann Arbor, and elsewhere.

Both the Michigan and A.C.L.S. materials aimed primarily at a spoken command of English, and, in order to achieve this, they devoted considerable attention to stress and intonation. The emphasis was upon pattern drill, mastered to the point where automatic or instantaneous recall would occur. A statement by Robert Lado in the Introduction to *English Pattern Practice*, 1958 (the fourth volume of the revised Michigan series), is a cogent explanation of

the pedagogical strategy which lay behind the procedure:

> In *Pattern Practice* . . . the student is led to practice a pattern, changing some element of the pattern each time, so that normally he never repeats the same sentence twice. Furthermore, his attention is drawn to the changes, which are stimulated by pictures, oral substitutions, and so forth, and this, THE PATTERN ITSELF, THE SIGNIFICANT FRAMEWORK OF THE SENTENCE, rather than the particular sentence, is driven intensively into his habit reflexes.

A concomitant of the careful attention to grammatical structure exemplified by these textbooks was a management of vocabulary items quite different from that typical of the conventional language textbook. The vocabulary was controlled, but no longer on the basis of frequency counts, since most of these had turned out to be biased in one direction or another. The idea was rather to enable the student to manage a fair number of grammatical patterns with a somewhat limited but nevertheless useful vocabulary, building up the lexicon after control of the basic structures had been achieved. This was justified on the ground that the native language is generally learned in this fashion.

Most of the materials available at this time were modest in their aims; they were not directed beyond an intermediate level of achievement. There was virtually nothing for advanced students, nothing designed to train students initially taught by an audio-lingual method to cope with literary English, nothing designed to teach the student how to write acceptable English themes. The profession was decidedly in a first phase of materials production.

Both the Michigan and the A.C.L.S. materials were designed primarily to serve prospective students and research fellows in American institutions of higher learning. In both instances the content, the lexicon, the exercises, the drill materials were chosen for their utility in a campus setting. To this extent they did try to bridge a cultural as well as a linguistic gap, but they were fairly naive in their attempts to do so. In neither instance had the authors learned how flat the humor in language textbooks usually seems, nor were they able to raise the level of it. Nevertheless, despite these shortcomings, the approach in the textbooks was comparatively new,

there was an air of freshness about it, and teachers properly trained to use the textbooks achieved striking results at times.

The training of teachers, however, presented a serious problem both in this country and abroad. In the United States not every institution which provided English instruction for foreign students had the resources to develop a teacher-training program. Nor was there yet a clear notion of what the content of such a program ought to be, although certain principles of organization were beginning to emerge. For the most part, what training did exist was on the M.A. level, centered about a core of linguistic courses. Whatever was offered in addition to this core varied widely at the dozen or so institutions where training for teaching English as a foreign language was available.

Outside of this country, only Europe could boast of a long tradition of professional language instruction. The western European countries, never under the frantic time pressure that characterized foreign-language instruction in the United States, were generally satisfied with their own more deliberate methods and seemed little inclined to join us in an exploration of the possibilities of applying new linguistic concepts. To many of them, these seemed as objectionably American as the variety of English spoken in the United States. Elsewhere throughout the world, short-term seminars or workshops, conducted by Americans or British, were the principal resource for the upgrading of teachers in service, and somewhat less often for pre-service preparation. There was little continuity from year to year. Seldom did American or British assistance proceed in any one country upon the basis of a careful examination of the foreign-language teaching situation in that nation.

Language instruction by radio had developed in the early 1940s, not long after the initial attempts in this country, and a good many of the American binational centers had attempted to employ the medium. In general, materials were locally produced, often frantically just ahead of broadcast time. There was no communication among the various countries about the principles to be employed in developing materials, about various ways in which programs might be conducted, or about methods of evaluation. Responsibility for such programs often rested with the Information Officers rather than the English Teaching Branch of the U.S. Information Agency, and at that time there was little language-teaching expertise

among the former.

Although a certain degree of sophistication was beginning to develop in various models for language-laboratory teaching and reinforcement of teaching of the foreign languages in the United States, English-teaching materials had not progressed beyond the stage of records accompanying the textbooks. Even these at times failed of their purpose; it turned out, for example, that every available record-player in Burma operated at 78 rpm. whereas the A.C.L.S. *English for Burmese* had been recorded at 33. True enough, this is an extreme illustration, but it is symptomatic of how little thought had been given to the problem of audio-aids.

Similarly, a decade ago, a bare start had been made on developing methods of testing English-language competence of those learning it as a foreign tongue. Huge sums can be wasted in bringing inadequately prepared students to an academic environment which demands of them a working knowledge of English. There can be an equal waste in insisting that students undertake classwork in English which repeats what they already know. The need for measuring instruments was beginning to be met by tests developed at the University of Michigan and at the American Language Center, then at American University in Washington, D.C. One of the major problems was an adequate measure of oral competence. Valiant attempts were under way to measure this through paper-and-pencil techniques, but the results were not of such a nature as to inspire confidence.

The Present Picture

The English-teaching situation today presents an improved picture. Expansion has been great; changes have come rapidly during the past decade.

To begin with, we are teaching more students both at home and abroad. The most recent report (1967) issued by the Center for Applied Linguistics shows that 150 colleges and universities in this country now offer English courses for foreign students. Of these, approximately forty institutions offer what might justifiably be called an intensive course or courses, some of them demanding as much as thirty-five hours weekly, although twenty to twenty-five is closer to the norm.

The clearest idea of the scope of our activities abroad can be

gained from U.S.I.A.'s annual report. During the fiscal year 1966, the agency conducted English-teaching programs in fifty-seven countries, with a total enrollment of 309,857. The fifty-seven countries include nineteen in Latin America, sixteen in Africa, and twelve in the Near East. Some of the individual country operations are fantastic in size, the thirty-eight centers in Brazil enrolling 53,817 students. Four centers in Iran have 12,878 students, and a single one in Thailand has 11,526. Even though activity in Europe has been severely curtailed and that in the Far East may be best described as selective, there are no indications of a diminution in demand. All signs point to continued growth, not only in U.S.I.A. but in the six other government agencies as well.

Happily, the government situation is less chaotic than it was a decade ago. Primary responsibility for the coordination of English-teaching activities has been placed in the Bureau of Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. An inter-agency committee on English teaching is operating with greater effectiveness than it ever has before. Attempts are under way to have field teams evaluate the total English-teaching program in certain countries.

U.S.I.A.'s language-teaching efforts have improved, partly perhaps as a consequence of the recommendations of the Advisory Panel on English Teaching, a group consisting of six linguists drawn from university faculties. The Voice of America has had a highly competent English-teaching specialist in its radio division for the past five years, and has had staff members from the English Teaching Division on loan to assist in the development of televised materials. English teaching now has division instead of branch status within the agency, which has meant an upgrading of the persons in charge of the activity, and the staff is five times as large as it was in 1957. The position of English Teaching Officer has been created, which makes possible a longer period of specialization in English-teaching activities. Similar improvements, though possibly not so extensive or dramatic, have taken place in other government agencies.

Communication between government and the profession has been markedly improved as a result of the organization of the National Advisory Council on Teaching English as a Foreign Language, under the sponsorship of the Center for Applied Linguistics. A semi-annual meeting gives government personnel the opportunity

to report on programs current and projected and to outline their needs. University representatives react to these, report on their activities, and out of the frank and open discussion which ensues. new ideas frequently emerge.

Conferences, both national and international, have been fruitful in providing for exchange of information and opinion. Two national conferences on teaching English as a foreign language, held in the early 1940s, were followed by a long silence, and it was not until July, 1957, that a third was convened at the University of Michigan with funds provided by the Ford Foundation. Its principal purpose was to bring together two main groups: the theoretical linguists on the one hand, and all those whose interests were practical and pedagogical on the other. This was followed two years later by a Conference on English Teaching Abroad, held in Washington, D.C. It included representatives from the British Council as well as from a number of American agencies, and it was one of the first undertakings of the Center for Applied Linguistics. Soon after this the center began its annual series of International Conferences on Second Language Problems, with not merely Americans and British but other nationalities in attendance as well. The French in particular have made notable contributions to these conferences.

There has been a vast improvement in the amount of information readily available on teaching English as a foreign language; ten years ago there was but a single publication available. For example, there are now a number of bibliographies, the principal one being the *Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language,* published by the Center for Applied Linguistics. The center has published a number of other more specialized bibliographies as well, and the British Council has been producing its own *English-Teaching Bibliography.*

Communication within the profession has also been facilitated by the development of a number of new journals. During the past decade, U.S.I.A. has established the *English Teaching Forum,* and the *International Review of Applied Linguistics* has appeared on the scene. In addition, a number of journals devoted to English-teaching problems in particular countries have sprung up: The *ELEC Bulletin* for Japan, *Inter-PRET* for the Puerto-Rican teacher, the *Bulletin of the Central Institute of English,* published in Hyderabad, India, and two from the Philippines. Furthermore, certain

other countries, Czechoslovakia and Chile to name only two, now have publications dealing with the teaching of modern languages in general, and many of their articles deal with English. There are, finally, two periodical publications of research abstracts, one in England and one in this country.

Everything points to the important conclusion that information of all kinds on the teaching of English as a second language is available on a vastly wider scale than it was ten years ago. The difficulty now is keeping up with everything that appears. It is true that quality as well as quantity must be considered. In this connection it may be justly said that the level of sound knowledge and intellectual sophistication represented in these journals is neither higher nor lower than it is in other divisions of the field of language pedagogy.

Improved Teaching Materials

With respect to English-teaching materials the story is much the same. The last ten years have shown a tremendous increase in every direction. First of all, the instructional range has increased. Materials on a fairly advanced level are currently available, and some of them are designed to aid the student in developing the level of writing skill which might be demanded of him in a freshman English course in an American college or university. Many of the collections of readings recently published reveal a recognition on the part of the editors that the student needs an introduction to the principal facets of American culture considerably more profound than the campus dialogues about dating practices, which abounded in the A.C.L.S. series. One American instructor, at least, found the latter singularly inapropos when he was asked to teach a group of Korean priests.

No longer are we wholly dependent upon the A.C.L.S. and Michigan series for domestic use. English Language Services, the American Language Institute at New York University, and similar centers at Georgetown and Columbia have all produced their own sets of materials, adapted to the particular conditions which prevail at those institutions. The English Language Services material is available from a commercial publisher. Moreover, there are textbooks designed for specific purposes, such as Kenneth Croft's *A Practice Book on English Stress and Intonation,* C. L. Glover's

exercises designed to extend the student's vocabulary, and Thomas Crowell's glossary of phrases with prepositions, all of which can be used as auxiliaries to a general textbook. In the most recent bibliography, a listing of general text materials alone occupies thirty-five pages.

Moreover, linguistically oriented teaching materials have begun to appear in a number of foreign countries, many of them produced by Americans or by natives with American training. Instances of this are Agard and Roberts' *L'inglese parlato* for Italians; a nine-volume series in Mexico, published by the Instituto Mexicano Norteamericano de Relaciones Culturales; and the series prepared for use in the Filipino elementary schools by the Philippine Center for Language Study. A listing of what is currently known to be available occupies more than eighty pages in the current C.A.L. bibliography.

In this connection it must be pointed out as well that the contrastive studies upon which such materials are based have likewise multiplied in the past decade. Important among these is the series published by the University of Chicago Press and prepared by the Center for Applied Linguistics under a contract with the U.S. Office of Education. The first to appear were *The Sounds of English and German* and *The Grammatical Structures of English and German.* Similar volumes for Spanish and Italian are available now; those for Russian and French will appear shortly. In addition to these, there are studies of smaller scope embracing such languages as Indonesian, Telegu, Cebuano, Japanese, Finnish, Iraqi Arabic, and Turkish, to name only a few. And again, through the C.A.L. publication, *Contrastive Studies in Linguistics,* bibliographical information is now available where there was none before.

One series which merits particular mention because it illustrates the kind of cooperative effort which can be successfully launched when there is the will to do so is *English for Today,* a set of six volumes designed for use abroad at a level that would correspond to the American junior and senior high school. It was produced by the National Council of Teachers of English under contract with the U.S.I.A. It is a general purpose text, not designed to meet the specific learning problems of the speakers of any particular language. Nevertheless, according to the terms of the publishing agreement with McGraw-Hill, the way is left open for adaptations to be

made, to fit the needs of any particular country. At present, French and Arabic adaptations are under way, and two others, for Slovenia and Nigeria, are being negotiated. One interesting feature of the series is the sixth volume, an anthology of literature in English, which includes selections from Australian, Canadian, Irish, and Indian authors as well as from English and American. The British Council has praised this feature of the volume lavishly.

The gap between the teaching materials needed and what is at hand is closing rapidly. As time goes on, there are fewer instances of ill-digested linguistics. It is admittedly true that the Peruvian or the American in Peru setting out to develop a series of textbooks does not take advantage of all the experience that has accumulated in Japan, Italy, the Philippines and elsewhere, but at least he does not have to work totally in the dark, and generally he does not.

There has been considerable development of audio-visual aids, especially in films and television, though evaluation is a difficult matter. Again, using the U.S.I.A. as a sample, we find three English-by-television series, offering a total of 260 quarter-hour lessons. Accompanying each of the programs is a teacher's script designed to help local television stations present supporting practice sessions immediately following the showing of the films.

In radio, the agency has completed eight series designed for use by intermediate and advanced students including a series of twenty-five quarter-hour lessons on American English stress, rhythm, and intonation, and a series devoted to verb structures and practice on conversational speech patterns. The B.B.C. probably has as much as this, if not more, and Australia has developed materials for teaching by radio as well.

The story on language laboratories is less encouraging. Here the virtuosity of the electronic technician has outrun the ingenuity of the language teacher. Tape has replaced the earlier records; dialing systems are the latest dazzling attraction. Unfortunately a clear line has never been drawn between the potential of the laboratory as a means of reinforcing instruction given through conventional methods and the laboratory as a means of expanding the instructional program or even as a self-teaching device. The latter require different types of materials, and too often the distinction has not been made. Moreover, we have frequently proceeded upon two mistaken assumptions, first that the student will generally be able

to recognize a difference between the language of the model on tape and his attempt to reproduce it, and second that if he does recognize the difference, he will know what to do about it. Actual experience has shown that this is often not the case. Moreover, we know very little about laboratory monitoring, including those procedures which are productive of good results, and those which constitute little more than interruption and annoyance. This constitutes a whole area of sorely needed research.

English testing entered its current phase with a Conference on Testing the Proficiency of Foreign Students, held in Washington in May, 1961. The group went on record "as recognizing the desirability of, and urgent need for a comprehensive program using carefully constructed tests of the English proficiency of foreign students, suitable and acceptable to all educational institutions in the United States and to various other organizations, chiefly governmental." In 1962, a National Council on the Testing of English as a Foreign Language was established. The Ford Foundation later announced a two-year $250,000 grant to assist the council in initiating the testing program it had proposed, and early in 1964 the first proficiency tests were administered.

Again, this is an exemplary instance of coordinated effort involving some thirty member organizations and made possible through the assistance of a foundation. It is still somewhat early to venture a prediction about the success of the program, but since from its very beginning it was planned and shaped by foreign-student advisers and teachers, admissions officers, student exchange specialists, and government officials—the very groups with a stake in its success—it is reasonable to assume that the tests will be widely used.

The Teacher Shortage

In view of the tremendous expansion of activity on virtually every front during the past decade, the personnel problem looms large. The supply of trained teachers of English as a foreign language, supervisors, and program planners has been far short of the demand, both here and abroad. In Poland, for example, English is still in third place among foreign languages elected in the secondary schools simply because not enough teachers are being turned out by the universities. With the projected lengthening of the period of

compulsory education in Thailand, it will be but a matter of a few years before a critical shortage develops there. The multiplication of secondary schools in Africa is bound to produce the same result.

At home every government agency involved in teaching English has positions to be filled. The mail is replete with requests from colleges and universities for persons who can teach or administer a program in English as a foreign language. The most recent survey of training facilities at American institutions of higher learning shows but a single university (New York) offering an A.B. degree in teaching English as a foreign language and possibly six others offering a degree in a field in which it may be elected as a major or minor specialty. We are strongest at the M.A. level with ten institutions providing an M.A. in this subject and nine others offering a program in a field where such work is permitted. At some six or seven a student may earn a Ph.D. or an Ed.D. in the field. This represents a considerable expansion over the past ten years, due in no small part to assistance provided through the National Defense Education Act (N.D.E.A.). In-service training in this country has also benefited by a recent interpretation of the N.D.E.A. enabling act to the effect that teaching English at foreign language institutes may qualify for support if they serve American teachers of the subject who teach in American schools. Although at first glance this may seem restrictive, the teaching of English in urban areas, in parts of the country where there is a large foreign-language speaking population, and on the Indian reservations has been greatly aided. A remaining major problem is that of convincing students that teaching English as a foreign language offers a promising and rewarding academic career.

The training of foreign teachers in this field represents a problem of a different nature. In some countries such as Japan, with 60,000 teachers of English in the secondary schools alone, we seem to be confronted with an impossible task. Here the only solution appears to be to train those who train the teachers, or even those who train the teacher-trainers. India presents a comparable situation. Elsewhere, for example in the small Latin-American countries, or in an Eastern European country such as Bulgaria, a series of well-planned in-service courses could reach almost the entire teacher corps in a space of five or six years. It boils down virtually to having a plan for every country, based upon an accurate assessment of the

English-teaching situation there.

Books and materials on pedagogy and methodology have also multiplied enormously in the past decade. There is a good assortment of books in the field, by British as well as Americans, appealing both to special and to general interests. The anthology by Harold B. Allen of essays and research articles on teaching English as a foreign language provides a valuable supplement. No longer need the instructor in a methods course be reduced to lecturing for want of a proper textbook.

But current needs in this field have not altered materially since the C.A.L. published its pamphlet, *English Overseas,* in 1961, appropriately subtitled "Guidelines for the American Effort in Teaching English as a Second Language." English cannot fully assume its position as a world language without material and professional assistance of the first magnitude. Particularly important in this pamphlet is the final section on research, which calls for linguistic and area research, the development of measures of the effectiveness of various kinds of instructional materials, the evaluation of current methods of language instruction, and basic work on the psychology of language learning. Research in all of these fields is still very much needed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Harold B. (Ed.) *Teaching English as a Second Language: a Book of Readings.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

————. *TENES: A Survey of the Teaching of English to Non-English Speakers in the United States.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966.

American Council of Learned Societies. *Spoken English Series.* Washington, D.C.: A.C.L.S., 1953-. (Available through Columbia University Press, New York.)

Center for Applied Linguistics. *A Bibliography of Contrastive Linguistics.* John H. Hammer and Frank A. Rice (Editors). Washington, D.C.: C.A.L., 1965.

————. *English Overseas: Guidelines for the American Effort in Teaching English as a Second Language.* Washington, D.C.: C.A.L., 1961.

———. *Reference List of Materials for English as a Second Language, Parts 1 and 2.* Sirarpi Ohannessian, editor. Washington, D.C.: C.A.L., 1964-6.

———. *Conference on Short-Term Training for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Washington, D.C.: C.A.L., 1966.

———. *Programs in English for Foreign Students: Summer 1967,* and *Academic Year Programs in English for Foreign Students.* Washington, D.C.: C.A.L., 1967.

———. *University Resources in the United States for Linguistics and Teacher Training in English as a Foreign Language: 1966.* Washington, D.C.: 1966.

English Language Teaching. London: Oxford University Press, 1945-. Quarterly.

English Teaching Information Centre. *English-Teaching Bibliography.* London: The British Council, 1963. *Supplements* 1965-.

Fries, Charles Carpenter. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

Harris, David P. *English as a Second Language: Testing.* A Ford Foundation Reprint from *Overseas,* 3 (5), January 1964.

Lado, Robert. *Language Testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

———. *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1957.

———. and Charles Carpenter Fries, et al. *An Intensive Course in English.* Revised edition 4 vols. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958-64.

National Council of Teachers of English. *English for Today.* 8 vols., picture cards and tapes. William R. Slager, Ralph F. Robinett, et al, eds. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962-66.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. *TESOL Quarterly.* Washington, D.C. 1967-. Quarterly.

———. *TESOL Newsletter.* Washington, D.C. 1967-. Occasional.

United States Information Agency, *Annual Report.*

———. *English Teaching Forum.* Washington, D.C. 1963-. Quarterly.

Teaching and Research on Foreign Languages

KENNETH MILDENBERGER
Director of Programs,
Modern Language Association
of America

The progress in teaching and research in the foreign language field is best treated in two parts: the commonly taught languages in American education and the less-taught but significant world languages. The commonly taught modern foreign languages are French, German, Italian, and Spanish. All of these have been traditional in the American educational curriculum, but as recently as a decade ago the study of these languages had declined dangerously, and the interest of students, teachers, and administrators needed to be regenerated. The study of even the more important languages in the second category existed on only the most modest scale a decade ago.

A few statistics will suffice to show the recent increase in the study of modern European languages. In 1954 only 43.6 per cent of public secondary schools offered a modern foreign language; in 1958 this figure was up to 60 percent and by 1965 up to 77.7 per cent. In the same period enrollments in public high schools in these five languages rose from 14.2 per cent to 26.4 per cent of the total public high school population. Innumerable school systems have initiated language study in the lower grades. The number of language majors in college has grown rapidly. The study of the more important of the other world languages has expanded also, although it has not attracted general interest. In most instances only generous subsidization from outside sources has enabled institutions of higher education to maintain offerings and recruit

students. Efforts to encourage the study of Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese in the schools have met with negligible success. Only Russian has made significant headway both in schools and colleges; yet it must still be regarded as "neglected," given its critical importance as a world language.

Language Learning: Theories and Research

This period of development and expansion has been marked by the wide-spread adoption of the theory of language learning called the "audio-lingual habit theory." According to this theory, it is important to introduce the student early in the learning process to the problems of listening to and speaking a foreign language: gradually the student develops habits that facilitate both listening comprehension and speaking of the new language. Characteristic features of this approach include long sequences in the curriculum (beginning in elementary school if possible), structural drills, language laboratories, and so forth. A second and quite different theory of language learning, the "cognitive code-learning theory," has been less widely accepted. Proponents of this theory believe that the student must begin learning a foreign language by acquiring knowledge about the structure of the language and that deductively he will make functional use of the language as circumstances require.

In the early 1950s, innovation by foreign language teachers was confined to experimenting with elements of the audio-lingual approach. Under the auspices of the Modern Language Association (M.L.A.), responsible professional leaders framed policy statements encouraging development of this approach. The National Defense Education Act (N.D.E.A.) in 1958 authorized programs of financial assistance which were designed to encourage the use of audio-lingual language teaching methods.

Empirical study of problems associated with the teaching of a foreign language was as recently as ten years ago insignificant in volume. Since then, an increasing number of language teachers, psychologists, and professional educators have concerned themselves with a variety of problems. So far their efforts have not produced notable results. The psychologist John B. Carroll has reviewed the research periodically and in detail and he concludes that, on the whole, psychological research has not produced much

data to support either of the current theories of foreign language teaching. The linguist Noam Chomsky has recently aroused bitter dispute among colleagues by his skepticism about the significance for foreign language teaching of either present-day linguistics or psychology. A great deal of fundamental research will be necessary before any scientific assessment can be made of the basic audio-lingual teaching procedures.

Insofar as research findings have been useful, they have not been made sufficiently available to the teachers, supervisors, authors of instructional materials, and educational administrators, or to researchers themselves. This problem seems on the way to solution with the advent of the U.S. Office of Education's Educational Research Information Center (E.R.I.C.) program. E.R.I.C. is a decentralized network of clearinghouses, each with a defined area of specialization, which will acquire, process, store, retrieve, and disseminate significant informational or research documents. Bibliographical data and abstracts will be computer-stored, and documents will be accessible in microfiche or hard copy. The M.L.A. has been designated E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (with special reference to the commonly taught languages). Concurrently, the Center for Applied Linguistics has been designated E.R.I.C. Clearinghouse on Linguistics and Uncommonly Taught Foreign Languages.

Improvement of Language Teaching

As is frequently the case in education, there is no real shortage of language teachers as such at the school or college level, but well-qualified teachers are everywhere in short supply. In 1958 few teachers in the schools possessed either the language skills or the knowledge of methodology to apply the audio-lingual approach, but eight years of participation in N.D.E.A. summer language institutes has improved the preparation of nearly 30,000 teachers. Conducted by a cadre of able college professors, the summer institutes have become a highly effective means for upgrading in-service language teachers. However, the institutes are peripheral to the regular college curriculum, and effective institute practices have been inadequately incorporated into most undergraduate programs for preparing new language teachers, so that the N.D.E.A. institutes continue to serve in large part as remedial activities.

Tools for improving both undergraduate and high school instruction do exist. Very successful tests of teacher qualifications are available, and the M.L.A., in collaboration with the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (and with Carnegie Corporation support), has developed detailed "Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages." However, the higher education curriculum traditionally changes slowly. The relationship of language programs in institutions of higher education to those in school systems is characterized by anything from total indifference to constructive cooperation. An instance of cooperation is the Indiana Language Program. Supported largely with Ford Foundation funds and conducted by Indiana University, this program has employed various models of college-school relationships for the advancement of language instruction in the schools. While there seems an increased readiness in college language departments to improve such relations with the schools, for the most part such activities remain unofficial and slight.

Instructional Materials

The preparation of effective audio-lingual materials generally involves the contributions of a number of specialized co-authors, and the publication of such materials is expensive because of their format and the need for auxiliary aids (tapes, recordings, visuals, tests, and so forth). Publishers at first were unwilling to take the economic risks. But the success of three such ventures (*Modern Spanish*, begun in 1956 by the M.L.A. with Rockefeller support; the A-LM high school materials, begun in 1959 with Federal support; and the aural-oral series begun in 1959 by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston without subsidy) launched an avalanche of materials labeled "audio-lingual," some good, but many just superficial imitations of the three pioneer successes. The audio-lingual teacher has adequate instructional materials available now, if he is careful in his choice, and responsible publishers may be expected constantly to improve the selection.

Professionalism

In the quiet past, foreign-language teachers devoted most or all of their working time to teaching; there was little concern among

them for the principles and methods of teaching languages, nor for their professional identity as language teachers. Teachers taught from the book, and publishers generally decided the format of the book and its contents. Association meetings—local, state, regional, or national—were essentially social and frequently merely ceremonial. But with the rapid expansion of language teaching in the past decade a new professionalism has been emerging. In 1958 only three state departments of education employed a person as state supervisor or consultant for foreign-language teaching; in 1966 some forty-six states, as well as the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, had one or more positions. In 1958 perhaps a dozen school systems maintained a similar position; but in 1966 488 foreign-language supervisors or coordinators existed in school systems with an enrollment of 5,000 or more students. Further, a number of college teachers who taught high school teachers in N.D.E.A. institutes acquired new prestige and heightened professional consciousness through their participation in these institutes. The 30,000 teachers who have attended the institutes were introduced to new pedagogical concepts and vocabulary which they now see regularly in publications and which they hear and use in meetings with colleagues.

In the belief that foreign-language teaching is now ready to move into a phase of active professionalism, the Executive Council of the M.L.A. has recently authorized staff and funds to develop a new national pedagogical association—the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages—for teachers of all languages at all levels of education. One pundit has commented that this may be the first time a professional association was founded before there was a profession. At any rate, foreign-language teachers have never before been so close to becoming professionalized, and an effective national membership organization may provide opportunities, in publications and meetings, to focus wide attention on successful practices and promising research.

Federal Financial Aid

The concept of Federal developmental aid to educational institutions in fields other than agriculture or science took a long while to mature, but foreign-language instruction seems to be one of the first new fields to receive government attention. Legislative plans

for such support were under way in the U.S. Office of Education many months before the first Soviet sputnik in the fall of 1957 shocked American complacency and led to the National Defense Education Act. The major source of Federal support for the development of instruction in the commonly taught languages has been from the N.D.E.A., administered by the U.S. Office of Education since 1958. In the original legislation, modern foreign languages, together with science and mathematics, were selected to receive certain kinds of financial aid. (a) Institutes were authorized (N.D.E.A., Title XI) to improve the qualification of modern foreign-language teachers in the schools. In the summer of 1967, forty-nine such institutes were conducted by U.S. colleges and universities, seventeen of them abroad. (b) A program of language research and studies was authorized (N.D.E.A., Title VI) permitting the development of specialized language materials, the conduct of research and experimentation in language teaching, and the administration of statistical surveys. In the current year, $3.1 million are authorized for this program. Normally more than half the appropriation is used for research and studies in the less-taught languages, and under a new policy the Office of Education will also make part of the appropriation available for research in "other fields needed for a full understanding" of speakers of any foreign language (e.g., anthropology, history, sociology, and so forth). (c) Matching funds were made available to the states to develop supervisory services for the teaching of foreign languages (N.D.E.A., Title III). The appearance of a nationwide echelon of state language supervisors resulted from this authorization. (d) Matching funds were made available for the purchase of equipment, reference works, and audio-visual aids by public schools (N.D.E.A., Title III). As one result, the number of schools with language laboratories increased from sixty-eight in 1957 to at least 9,000 recently.

The administrative reorganization which has recently been taking place in the U.S. Office of Education has seriously weakened the concentrated impact of support programs for foreign-language instruction. From the point of view of administrative convenience and efficiency, the changes perhaps make good sense; but they mean no effective planning or coordination in language development on a national scale now exists in the U.S. Office of Education, nor indeed anywhere else. Consequently, we have no assurance

that the new broader programs of generalized Federal assistance will reflect concern for language development, nor that whatever concern is shown will have other than purely local and immediate significance.

When the N.D.E.A. was passed in 1958, state departments of education were given little control over the new Federal funds. Such funds as did pass through the state departments of education were earmarked by the legislation for specific purposes. This fact seems to reflect the low esteem in which key members of Congress at that time held the professional education "establishment" which seemingly had allowed American education so to deteriorate that the Soviet Union was outpacing us in aerospace and nuclear development. In effect, the Congress asserted the principle of "national interest" as a basis for Federal aid. The more recent, diverse, and heavily funded legislation offers a greater degree of flexibility: for some of this new Federal aid the state education department is the intermediary controlling agent; in other programs Federal money flows directly to local authorities.

Neglected Languages and Federal Support

The over-all situation with regard to neglected languages is today considerably better than ever before. Our national weakness in this area was revealed during World War II, and only the modest Intensive Language Program that had been pioneered by the American Council of Learned Societies (A.C.L.S.) made possible a remotely adequate military training program. After the war, the three major foundations (Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford) contributed significant sums of money to develop non-Western studies, including language instruction, at selected universities. The Ford Foundation also granted $500,000 to the A.C.L.S. for the purpose of developing instructional materials in Oriental languages based on linguistic principles for Oriental languages.

Since 1959, some $20 million in Federal funds have been distributed to American colleges and universities for the study of neglected languages, and in the 1966-67 academic year more than $4.5 million was allocated among sixty-seven centers that chiefly serve graduate students and thirty-one that exclusively serve undergraduates. Probably more than half of the Federal funds helps to support instruction in related fields other than language (history,

anthropology, political science, literature, and so forth). Each center deals with a non-Western area (East Asia, Southeast Asia, USSR, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and so forth). In the aggregate, these centers during 1966-67 offered instruction in nearly 100 of the less-taught languages and dialects.

The second pertinent N.D.E.A. program provides generous stipends for advanced study of foreign languages. These have been withheld from students of French, German, and Italian, and the majority of recipients have had as a prime disciplinary interest a field other than language teaching. Since 1959, such stipends have aided 4,597 graduate students, 114 postdoctoral fellows, and 1,108 undergraduates at a total cost of over $27 million.

The third relevant N.D.E.A. program is the research authority of Title VI, mentioned earlier. The bulk (perhaps $12 million) of appropriated funds has been employed to develop a variety of instructional materials in more than 200 languages. This activity has rich linguistic and scholarly values. Most of these materials are audio-lingually oriented, though much less sophisticated pedagogically than the better materials in the commonly taught languages. Nevertheless, this program is creating a stockpile of teaching instruments in many languages of the non-Western world, any one of which may become vital to our national interest.

This forced feeding of Federal funds, augmented by judiciously placed foundation funds, has greatly strengthened our academic competence in dealing with non-Western nations. However, the entire structure of this enterprise remains very shaky indeed, dependent as it is upon subsidy. Except in a few universities, it might very well collapse if the subsidies were cut off. As the more established graduate centers produce specialists, academic positions must be found for them. The N.D.E.A. language and area center program has answered this need by extending increased appropriations to additional graduate and undergraduate centers. On the whole, American higher education has not yet found it possible to carry on non-Western instructional programs without external financial aid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Axelrod, Joseph, "NDEA Foreign Language Institute Programs: The Development of a New Educational Model." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 82 (September 1967), 14-18.

Beckmann, George M. "The Non-Western World in Higher Education: The Role of the Foundations." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 356 (November 1964), 12-22.

Bigelow, Donald N. and Lyman H. Legters. *NDEA Language and Area Centers: A Report on the First Five Years.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1964.

Brooks, Nelson. *Language and Language Learning.* Second Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

Carroll, John B. "Research in Foreign Language Teaching: The Last Five Years." In *Reports of the Working Committees, Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1966.* New York: Modern Language Association, 1966, 12-42.

Chomsky, Noam. "Linguistic Theory." In *Reports of the Working Committees, Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1966.* New York: Modern Language Association, 1966, 43-49.

Diekhoff, John S. *NDEA and Modern Foreign Languages.* New York: Modern Language Association, 1965.

Mildenberger, Kenneth. "The Non-Western World in Higher Education: The Federal Government and the Universities." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 356 (November 1964), 23-29.

———. (compiler). "ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages." A department which appears regularly in *Foreign Language Annals*, official quarterly journal of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10011.

Moulton, William G. *A Linguistic Guide to Language Learning.* New York: Modern Language Association, 1966.

Paquette, F. Andre (compiler). *Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages: An Exposition*, complete issue of *Modern Language Journal, 50* (October 1966). (Available as reprint from Modern Language Association).

Parker, William R. *The National Interest and Foreign Languages.* Third Edition. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

Willbern, Glen. "Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, 1965." *Foreign Language Annals, 1* (March 1968), 239-252.

Implications of the New Technology for Language Teaching

WILBUR SCHRAMM
Director, Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University

My principal concern in this paper is less with the new educational technology per se than with its application. Most of the available machines and electronic devices have existed for some time, and their technical capabilities are well known. We know what kind of signal they will transmit, and what kind of manipulation is within their power. The uncertainties are in the area of their use for teaching and learning.

These devices have seldom if ever been utilized as effectively for education as they could be. For the most part, they have been used, rather than studied; introduced, rather than planned; researched, if at all, rather than developed; judged usually without hard or comparative evidence. Therefore language teachers would be well advised not to think of the new technology solely in terms of what it claims to do but rather in terms of what it *might* do if they were to learn to use it as well as possible to meet the needs for which it is suitable.

We can talk of the available technology under three headings: Type I—devices which are now available, the usefulness of which seems to be little doubted by language teachers (language laboratories and tape recorders); Type II—devices whose usefulness lies if at all in the future, and which need not immediately occupy the major attention of language teachers (communications satellites and

computers); and Type III—devices, presently available, about which there are striking differences of opinion among language teachers (programmed learning and television, for example).

Type I Technology

Language laboratories (a shorthand way of referring to the use of language recording and listening devices) have now proved their usefulness widely. They relieve a language teacher of much of the drudgery that goes with his job and are capable of providing models that may be better than the teacher himself. Furthermore they do not threaten the teacher; they do not bring a second and attractive teacher into the classroom, as does instructional television. Rather, they are faceless and faithful servants, available at the beck and call of teacher and student. The importance of this latter circumstance should not be underestimated, for it means that laboratories exercise a minimum of constraint upon the schedule, and permit a maximum of flexibility in response to need and situation.

True, research to date has produced conflicting and inconclusive results. In eight studies that permitted a clear comparison of classroom instruction alone with classroom instruction *plus* and *minus* language laboratories, six studies show a significant superiority on the part of the class with language laboratory training. Usually the advantage is in the area of language skills emphasized by the laboratory practice—listening comprehension, or ability to produce the sounds of the language. A very large study in New York State, however, went contrary to the trend: most of the differences favored the classes that were taught without the laboratories; students of average IQ were found to be relatively unaffected by use of the laboratories, and students at the top of the IQ distributions generally did better without the laboratories. Still another study, in which the teacher was freed for conversational drill by using the tape recorder to handle much of the routine practice, failed to show any significant increase in class achievement. On the other hand, teachers of German at Oberlin found that they could double the size of their classes without lowering the level of student accomplishment if they had the students make extensive use of language laboratories. And in a Wisconsin experiment it was found possible to teach a foreign language to high school students using corre-

spondence supported by tape recordings and monthly visits by an instructor; the students so taught did at least as well, on the average, as students taught in the classroom. Obviously, there is no magic about the use of language laboratories, but the evidence is enough to encourage teachers to use them and to learn to use them as well as possible.

Laboratories seem to work not only in advanced countries but also in developing countries; for example, at least one rather elaborate installation is in use in East Africa. On the whole, a language laboratory or some less elaborate collection of tape recorders is the type of assistance most likely to be used and appreciated by the average language teacher, and the one that may prove to contribute most to the learning opportunities of a class of language students.

A few reservations need to be noted. For one, these devices are chiefly useful for teaching a second language. No one seems to have found an obvious way to use them for literacy teaching.

In the second place, they are not cheap. A tape recorder of reasonably high fidelity costs several hundreds of dollars; a classroom-size language laboratory costs some thousands of dollars. Therefore, a wide dependence upon these devices would present a developing country with financial problems.

Because of these costs, alternatives within the field of sound recording might be considered. Phonograph records can be pressed in quantity more cheaply than tapes, and can be programmed in the same way, leaving time for responses. Of course, they cannot be used to play back the student's response. Even a single tape recorder, without being hooked into a language laboratory, can provide a great deal of practice for a class. A dual-track recorder can be fitted with a loop that will go round and round, letting the student practice the same response repeatedly, and even in some cases letting him hear his own response in comparison with the model. In a Denver project, for example, a tape-recorder device was used which contained a programmed tape and a practice loop. The stimuli from the tape transferred one by one to the loop. The student heard them from the loop, responded, listened to the original stimulus again, listened to his own response, and tried his response again and again until he was satisfied with it. Then he pressed a button, the loop was erased, and the next stimulus

from the tape transferred to it. Unfortunately the device cost about $500, although quantity production would have somewhat reduced that. Such variations upon the language laboratory pattern are most promising and we should expect more of them to become available in the years ahead.

Type II Technology

If Type I technology demands relatively little of our attention because it is already well accepted, Type II—for example, communications satellites in their several versions—demands little because it is not immediately available in usable form.

A communications satellite is essentially a device to relay an electronic signal over a very large area—about one-third of the earth when the satellite is stabilized in equatorial orbit at 22,300 miles. A satellite does not ordinarily originate signals; it relays television, radio, telephone, telegraph, teletype, facsimile—any kind of electronic signal we want to put through it. Present satellites operate on very low power and require elaborate and costly transmitting and receiving stations. Future satellites will be capable of much higher power and be able to deliver signals to much less costly installations. The nearer that satellites come to serving ordinary home or school receivers, the more significance they will have for education.

What is the time scale? At present, of course, we are in the age of point-to-point satellite communication, when a transmitter costing in the millions of dollars sends a signal to the satellite, which relays it to receiving stations also costing in the millions of dollars. We are about three to five years away from what has sometimes been called the "distribution" satellite, which will be powerful enough to serve receiving stations costing something on the order of $50,000 to $100,000. This is the stage at which it may become feasible to distribute network television by satellite rather than microwave to local stations; and when satellite television may be cheap enough to be within the reach of school systems or village redistribution points in countries which do not already have telecommunications for that purpose. We are something like ten years away from still another generation of satellites which will be able to broadcast directly to receiver installations costing perhaps $500 or a little more. Obviously, "broadcasting" satellites will introduce

many new possibilities for services to schools and adult education, and language teachers will have to consider seriously how satellites fit into their plans. The real educational excitement, if any, concerning communications satellites is likely therefore to come about ten years from now. Many engineers feel that the technology is already far enough advanced that third-generation satellites could be made now. However, the cost of development and the unsolved questions of control of satellite communications make ten years seem not at all a pessimistic estimate.

The ability of communications satellites to cover such vast areas will undoubtedly be both an advantage and a disadvantage educationally. Only a few countries—Indonesia, China, the Soviet Union, the United States, Canada, India, perhaps Brazil—are large enough to use a satellite efficiently. Almost any educational use of a satellite would spill over national boundaries. If Bolivia, for example, were to use a satellite to serve its own schools and adult centers, the signal would cover all Latin America and some of North America as well. This is not important as long as only a few very expensive receiving stations can pick up the signal. But when the signal can go directly to home receivers, then all the sensitivity of nations in regard to what their people see and hear from abroad, and what goes into their educational systems from foreign sources, will be roused. Any extensive use of broadcasting satellites is clearly going to have to be preceded by a large number of agreements to share in programming or to control content, and might result in arguments over propaganda and attempts to "jam" or "take over" another country's satellite. Therefore, it is entirely possible that a telecommunication tool of very great power may not, after all, be highly potent in the future of education.

If we try to think of what communications satellites might mean to language and literacy teaching, we have to look rather far into the future and speak largely in conjectures. Satellites could have great potential usefulness in political development and nation building, and some of these uses may have an important secondary impact on language teaching. For example, any very large use of broadcasting satellites might provide a considerable incentive toward adoption of world or regional languages. Again, suppose that a country like Indonesia, where the population is spread over more than 3,000 islands, many of them separated from others by

hundreds of miles of open sea, were to begin to use an all-purpose satellite to tie the nation together. In this case, the central impact would be on national economic and political development, but the satellite would certainly be used in part to bolster the schools and support literacy programs. The mere existence of a communication link of this kind would be a powerful incentive to learn a single language. Suppose that India, which has fourteen major languages and many cultural groups, were to begin to use a communications satellite with one video and fourteen audio channels. Not only would this assist the national effort to bring good teaching to small schools, communicate development information to the 560,000 villages, and provide the leaders of the nation for the first time an opportunity to speak to all their people, but also, if well managed, it would encourage cross-cultural interest and a broad program of language learning so that direct cross-cultural communication could take place on a wider scale.

Along with other Type II technology it may be useful to say a few words about developments in computers. A development of potential importance may be expected perhaps within ten years, when we have a computer unit able to decode human speech reliably. Within ten years we may also expect important developments in language translation. Structural linguists and computer programmers have made long steps in constructing algorithms for moving from one language to another, but the product is still so rough that at present it is cheaper to have translations made by bilinguals than to put a text through a computer and then have it cleaned up by translators. There is reason to expect that this situation will improve, although there is no immediate breakthrough in sight.

The service that computers are most likely to offer language teachers within the next five years is the opportunity for a much more subtle and sophisticated kind of programmed instruction than is possible by means of printed programs or lesser teaching machines. This may well prove an efficient way to teach vocabulary, to manage written exercises, and, if desired, to manage the kind of oral exercise that language laboratories provide. Time-shared computer use is already with us, in a somewhat primitive fashion, so that a number of pupils can use a computer to study different programs at the same time. Even so, computers are expensive, and

designing suitable language programs will be costly and slow. Therefore, this is not something that is likely soon to be of great use for developing countries or to transform the teaching of language even in the advanced countries. We are dealing with a time scale of something like five to fifteen years.

Type III Technology

The chief controversy is over Type III developments, where the technology is already at hand, much of it in use, and perceived as threatening by many teachers and as restrictive by many administrators.

Programmed learning is a bit different from the other technologies of this type, inasmuch as it is a method, whereas the others are carriers of any method. There is already evidence that programmed materials can systematize a student's practice of vocabulary and written exercises, and thus free the teacher from a certain amount of routine, just as the language laboratory frees him from some of the routine of aural-oral practice.

The research on written language practice is fairly encouraging. The Hamilton College project in teaching French and German with the aid of written programs achieved about 20 per cent higher scores on a test of written language, grammar, and translation, than the average made by students on the same test during the preceding two years when no programs were used. It was shown in 1958 at Harvard that students working by themselves with programmed materials in German learned about as much in an average of 47.5 hours as they would be expected to learn in a one-semester college course. This was comprehension of *written* German and mastery of vocabulary and translation, of course, not speaking German or understanding spoken German. The Naval Training Center at Albuquerque arranged a crash course for reserve officers, during which they spent seventy hours during ten days in study of the Russian language. They worked through a long program, and supplemented it with the Semeonoff text and spoken Russian recordings. The supervisor reported that the officers had learned about as much Russian in the ten days of intensive work as he would have expected them to learn in about one and one-half semesters of a college-level course.

Such results make it difficult to scoff at the possibility of using

programmed materials (either oral or written) as an adjunct to classroom teaching and thereby not only systematizing the students' practice but also relieving the teacher of some of his most routine chores. Studies in Denver in 1963 found that if the use of automated drills is postponed until the students are adequately grounded in oral use of the language (usually some time in the second semester), then the programmed materials can be substituted very effectively for teacher-drill.

Thus, given skillfully made programs used with discretion, programmed learning seems to offer a potential assist to the language teacher—not a substitute for him. It is a way to supplement his efforts and let him use his time more efficiently.

Television, radio, and films, and particularly television, bulk somewhat larger now in language teaching than does programmed learning. The widest differences of opinion, the most emotional reactions, center around television.

One encounters two main sources of advice about these new media as tools of language teaching. One of these is the enthusiast. He is more likely to have his base in broadcasting than in teaching or to be a salesman of machinery or software. He is dangerous because he tends not to approach the problem from the needs of pupils and teachers but rather from the technical capabilities of his gadgets, and from a generalized missionary belief in the efficacy of change.

The other source is the teacher and administrator who has graduated from teachers college before the new media were widely available in education, does not really understand them, feels uncomfortable with them, perhaps vaguely threatened or degraded by them. This is the source from which we hear the advice: "Teaching technology will never replace the teacher. We must be careful not to dehumanize education. We must do nothing that might lower the quality of teaching. Let us wait and see." Despite the undoubted soundness of these statements, they add up to a generally conservative and rear-looking viewpoint which has done perhaps more than anything else in recent years to inhibit even worthwhile change and sabotage educational innovation, in developed as well as developing countries.

The first source is the pied piper of education; the second is the educational hippopotamus. The language teaching establishment,

it seems to me, should avoid both these points of view, and try to work in the area between them. In other words: it should examine the evidence, decide neither on the basis of a missionary invocation or a conservative rejection, try to find out under what conditions these new tools can be effective, and how, if at all, they may usefully be worked into teaching and learning experiences.

Ten years ago, this conclusion would have been less realistic. Since then a great deal of evidence has built up—both controlled research and evaluated experience. Although there has been surprisingly little research in the United States on language teaching by television, radio, or films (as compared, for example, to a great outpouring of studies on mathematics and science teaching), still, in the case of television particularly, there is a spectacular difference in the information we have now and what we had a decade ago. This includes rather solid studies of educational media use in developing countries, and ten-year observations of some television projects in the advanced countries. Let me try to sum up the general conclusions that seem to be emerging from this experience.

1. The closer one looks at this body of experience, the less likely one is to have much confidence in television (or radio, or films) alone as teacher of language. True, every once in a while someone comes from a far corner of the earth, speaking beautiful B.B.C. English and claiming that he learned the language entirely from the B.B.C. In the past, some immigrants to the United States, able at least to make themselves understood in English, have said that they learned the language from American movies. But these are rare, and the general conclusion is that these media are used best as partners to face-to-face teaching. They are used, that is, as elements of integrated systems of learning opportunities.

2. In the last half dozen years there has been a significant shift in attention from the transmitting end of the educational media to the receiving end. Not that what goes into the pipeline is not important, but the overwhelming concern with program quality which existed a few years ago has been tempered by a concern over the kind of learning activities that take place at the receiver. Communication research has shown how active and obstinate an audience really is, and educational research has shown how active a classroom audience must be if learning is to take place. Much of the attention of informed students of educational media has

turned now to the kind of individual practice and problem solving that a television, radio, or film lesson can stimulate, and what the classroom teacher can do to build the lesson into a context of active learning experiences.

3. Television instruction is most effective as part of a system of teaching. Where these media are used well, they bring a teacher into the classroom. In Samoa, for example, the pupils greet the television teacher affectionately and personally when he or she appears on the screen, and they respond to the television teaching almost as to their classroom teacher. Where instructional television appears to be effective, it is used almost as a form of team teaching. The teacher in the studio, the teacher in the classroom, and sometimes a third teacher who helps to make materials, plan together, combine their talents, keep in touch, divide the tasks, and in fact operate as a team to stimulate the sort of learning activity that they know will most benefit their students.

There is a great deal of research and case material on the effectiveness of the media when integrated into such a teaching-learning system, and some of it deals directly with language teaching. Hagerstown's television seemed to work best when the system as such worked best. Even the widely praised television series "Parlons Français" proved to be effective in the classroom in proportion to the time and variety of the related drill provided by the classroom teacher.

4. The experience of being thrown into such a system of instructional-television often threatens and discomfits school personnel. The classroom teacher finds himself playing a new role: sharing his classroom with an attractive and expert teacher on television; compelled to schedule a class at a set time, to carry out certain specified drills and activities, to make his lesson plan conform to a general pattern. The school administrator, too, finds his role changing when television enters. He has less control over schedule and curriculum, and is required to behave more as a supervisor of his classroom teachers. These have been the main sources of resistance to instructional television.*

*As videotape recording becomes cheaper, it will solve some of this problem by giving the classroom teacher more control over timing and repetition of broadcast programs.

Television has never been introduced extensively into school classrooms anywhere in the world without a certain amount of such resistance. And therefore the school systems where it seems to work most efficiently are those where there has been strong support from the top for the new activity, and where special efforts have been made to involve the classroom teachers from the beginning in the planning and the revisions, so that, as nearly as possible, the system does work in the spirit of team teaching.

5. The peculiar strength of a medium like television is that it gives a school system the power to redistribute and share its teaching resources. It can share an excellent teacher or a specialized demonstration. It can offer, throughout its schools, subject matter that otherwise could not be offered in more than one or two places.

Thus, where good teachers are plentiful and teaching aids are readily available, there is usually little reason for instructional television. There is very little apparent reason, for example, why Newton, Winnetka, or Palo Alto should have any high priority need for instructional television, and it is ironic that schools like these with superior teachers and excellent facilities should be the ones most likely to try television. It is predictable that such schools should find the medium of disappointingly little use to them, whereas in some of the deprived schools of this country, if the trial were made, the verdict might be quite different.

This is seen most dramatically in the developing countries. Niger, for example, has a total of sixty-six teachers who have been through high school. Seeking to bring several hundred thousand more children into school, where they are taught entirely in French although most of them have never heard the language before, Niger has turned to television to share its few expert teachers more widely. Samoa, trying to lift the level of its schools in a few years from the most traditional rote learning to modern education, also has turned to television so that a few expert teachers can have their influence multiplied and bolster 300 less-educated, less-trained Samoan teachers. Australia, with hundreds of thousands of children living on isolated ranches far from schools; Japan, with almost half its high-school-age young people in jobs instead of school; Peru, with a great shortage of school places and a phenomenal rate of dropouts; Senegal, with a desperate problem of literacy teaching and adult education, and a great scarcity of qualified teachers and ex-

tension workers—all these have found good reason to use television or radio, plus either study groups or correspondence study, or both.

6. There is little doubt that good television, radio, or film teaching has a positive effect on classroom teaching. These media are extremely effective in direct in-service training, and even incidental exposure to skillful teaching of his own class on television is bound to improve the performance of the classroom teacher. I watched the effect of foreign-language teaching by television on the Denver fifth- and sixth-grade teachers in the early 1960s. At the beginning of the experiment, very few of those teachers were competent to conduct good language classes. At the end of three years, they were all perfectly competent to conduct excellent classroom practice, and many of them were quite able themselves to do the whole job of teaching. If television can thus work itself out of a job, that should be a source of satisfaction for all of us.

7. Finally, these new media work most efficiently when they are used in sufficient mass to achieve low unit costs. Colombia, which teaches a quarter of a million students with the aid of television, can deliver the televised classes for five cents per student per hour; another country, however, has gone very tentatively into television which now costs it forty times as much per student hour as Colombia pays. Thailand can deliver school radio to 800,000 students for less than one cent per student per hour; a certain other country pays twenty times that amount. The curve of unit costs falls very fast, but below a certain size of system the costs are hardly acceptable. Beyond the matter of costs, however, there is the matter of impact. There are very few developing countries where television seems to be working well if it is not being used on a fairly large scale and integrated into the syllabus of the classroom.

What evidence is there on the effectiveness of these media specifically for language and literacy teaching?

The general response of the language teachers of the United States to a question of this kind is that television has proved disappointing as a vehicle for second-language teaching. Many people expected it to be able to carry much more of the weight of the teaching than it did. Few expected to have to devote so much effort to integrating television teaching into classroom activities and to building a coherent context of classroom practice around it.

Actually the evidence on its effectiveness, where measured, is not so unfavorable as the official opinion would indicate. Reviewing studies through 1964, I have come upon nine experimental comparisons of television classroom teaching with classroom teaching of second language. The comparisons came out three in favor of television instruction, three in favor of face-to-face, and three with no significant differences. Even if we disregard these comparisons, we find that studies which measured carefully the progress of students without comparing it with ordinary classroom progress show that when television was integrated in some way into classroom teaching of language, the students were making very satisfactory scores on both standardized and local tests.

I have no doubt of the general verdict that teaching of language by television in American schools has not been a great success. Undoubtedly this teaching has taken place in many schools where an assist from television was little needed and where the medium has been used in a far from optimal way—in particular without any real integration into the classroom teaching and without adequate commitment to it by classroom teachers. But there surely are schools in the United States which could use it to their benefit, in ways that are more effective than those that have been used before.

In developing countries, the verdict is somewhat different. In Niger, for example, the teaching of French by television in the beginning grades resulted in consistently and significantly higher scores than had been made on the same tests by pupils in previous years without television. Niger is using qualified teachers in the studio and monitors in the classroom. In Samoa the general agreement of observers, and the import of such tests as have been given, is that more progress has been made in teaching English in the schools during two years of television than in all the preceding years of American administration of those schools. In many countries, television has been used successfully to help teach literacy. Italy, with its "Non è mai troppo tardi" program, has carried literacy teaching into hundreds of villages where expert teachers were not available, and has thus taught many thousands of persons each year to learn to read and write and do simple arithmetic. The present enrollment is around 15,000, even after many years of offering the course. Peru is using television to support literacy study groups led by monitors, far up into the Andes. The Ivory Coast is using tele-

vision to train future foremen to read and write French, so that they can carry out their new duties. The employer supplies a meeting room, and a chairman who can read and write but has had no training in teaching literacy. About 800 of these key workers have now been made literate in French, taught simple arithmetic, and raised to a new level of capability and responsibility. The point is not that this is necessarily the best way to teach literacy, but rather that all over the world thousands of people *are* learning to read and write with the aid of television, and without it they might have no opportunity to do so.

As these programs go on, the tendency is to lean less on the television, more on the monitor and the study group. In Italy, for example, it is now possible to replace many of the little-trained monitors with schoolteachers working outside school hours or after retirement. In other countries, new efforts are being made to upgrade monitors. In fact, one of the great problems of education in the developing countries now is how to train monitors or unqualified teachers quickly to do an effective job at the receiving end of television or radio.

It is interesting to observe the present policy of Britain which, of all countries, has perhaps the longest experience in teaching its language throughout the world. The B.B.C., of course, has offered opportunities to learn English for a number of years through its radio services. The Center for Educational Television Overseas, which works closely with the BBC and offers assistance to many television systems in developing countries, has, after long efforts, recently filmed an English-language course for schools and adults, which has already been adopted for television and classroom use in Ethiopia, Ghana, Singapore, Brazil, and Zambia. At the same time, looking at the shortage of campus facilities and the growing need for college education in Britain itself, the British government has been working on a University of the Air, which will offer non-honors degrees throughout the country by means of television and correspondence study.

France has been taking steps in the same general direction—helping countries in the former French orbit to use television as an aid in teaching French, and exporting filmed series for teaching the French language on television. Last summer, when the number of failures on the spring baccalaureate examination had reached

what critics considered scandalous dimensions, the French government called on television to repair some of the damage, and throughout the summer review classes were broadcast on the French TV network. The autumn rate of pass was considerably higher.

Where there is a clear and appropriate need, therefore, whether in an old or a new country, it is often possible to find an effective solution using television or one of the other new media. The problem, it seems to me, is not to reject the technology out of hand, but to find and concentrate on the situations where technological assistance of some kind may be of real help, and then to draw upon the mounting evidence and experience to find effective ways to use the appropriate technology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antioch College. *Experiments in French Language Instruction.* Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1960.

Blyth, J. W., B. H. Gere, C. A. Godcharles, O. K. Liedke, and M. I. Morand. *The Hamilton College Experiment in Programed Learning.* Clinton, N.Y.: Hamilton College, 1962.

Brown, J. J. *An Experimental Comparison of the Mental Processes of Children Taught in a Radio Situation with Those of Children Taught in a Face-to-Face Situation.* Nedlands, Australia: University of Western Australia, 1959.

Carroll, J. B. "A Primer of Programmed Instruction in Foreign Language Teaching." *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 1* (1963), 115-141.

————. "Research on Teaching Foreign Languages." In N. L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, 1060-1100.

Coleman, W. H. Jr., E. Dutton, and J. C. Bookout. *Learning Auraloral Spanish Skills by Television.* University, Ala.: University of Alabama, 1960.

Ferster, C. B., and S. M. Sapon. "An Application of Recent Developments in Psychology to the Teaching of German," *Harvard Educational Review, 28* (1958) 58-69.

Garry, R., and E. Mauriello. *Summary of Research: Parlons Francais I, II, III* (Videotape Edition) and Parlons Francais I (Film Edition). Boston, 1960 (mimeo).

Gordon, O. J., K. M. Engar, and D. R. Shupe. *Challenging the Superior Student by Making the Study of Russian Available in the Elementary School Curriculum via Television.* Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah, 1963 (mimeo).

Hayman, J. L., Jr. *The Denver-Stanford Project—Increasing ITV's Effectiveness through Contextual Activities,* Denver, Colorado: Denver Public Schools, 1964.

Hocking, E. *Language Laboratory and Language Learning.* Washington: Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association, 1964.

Lane, H. "Programed Learning of a Second Language." In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Teaching Machines and Programed Learning, II: Data and Directions.* Washington: Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association, 1965, 548-643.

London, I. D. (translator). Conference on the Improvement of Soviet Foreign Language Teaching (translation of documents in *Sovietskaia Pedagogica,* 1958, 22, 146-150). *School and Society, 87* (1959), 200-202.

Morton, F. R. *The Language Laboratory as a Teaching Machine.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Language Laboratory, 1960.

NHK (Nippon Hosai Kyoku) Radio-Television Cultural Research Institute. *The Effects of "Radio Japanese Classroom," The Listening Effects of "Radio English Classroom."* Tokyo: NHK, 1955.

Pickrel, G., C. Neidt, and R. Gibson, "Tape Recordings Are Used to Teach Seventh Grade Students in Westside Junior-Senior High School, Omaha, Nebraska." *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin,* 52 (1958), 81-93.

Porter, D. "A Report on Instructional Devices in Foreign Language Teaching." In Lumsdaine, A. A., and R. Glaser (Eds.), *Teaching Machines and Programmed Learning.* Washington: Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association, 1960, 186-205.

Schramm, W., P. H. Coombs, F. Kahnert, and J. Lyle. *The New Media: Memo to Educational Planners.* Paris: UNESCO and International Institute for Educational Planning, 1967.

UNESCO and International Institute for Educational Planning. *The New Media in Action.* 3 vols. Paris: UNESCO and I.I.E.P., 1967. (See especially case study of use of television for teaching French in Republic of the Niger, vol. I; and, among others, research on language teaching in Hagerstown, vol. I).

Xoomsai, X. M. T., and P. Ratanamungala, *A Survey of Results of Using School Broadcast as a Teaching Method, 1958-59.* Bangkok, Thailand: Educational and Psychological Test Bureau, Department of Educational Research, College of Education, 1959.

Ford Foundation Foreign and Second Language Activities 1951-1966

MELVIN J. FOX
Deputy Representative,
Ford Foundation,
Lagos, Nigeria

The Ford Foundation's activities in the language field have had two major objectives—one to increase the foreign-language competence of students at various levels of the educational system in the United States; the second—which is related to the Foundation's more general concerns with national development abroad—has been to satisfy the need in many parts of the world for English as a second language (ESL). Much of the work assisted by the Foundation has perforce been experimental, because it covered new ground where there were no models to be followed. Some programs have been clear successes, and both this account of the Foundation's activities and the other papers in this volume tend to dwell on achievements. But some efforts partially succeeded and partially failed, and these too have provided valuable lessons.

Most of the grants by the Foundation in the language field were part of its extensive International Training and Research program (ITR), which was designed to strengthen the capacity of American institutions of higher learning in international matters. While the program was terminated as a separate administrative entity in 1966, the Foundation is continuing on a modified scale some of the activities it supported. Some of the language grants were made under the Foundation's Overseas Development program, which is concerned with modernization of less-developed regions of the world.

As of the end of 1967, the Foundation's direct assistance in the language field totalled about $27 million.* If one were to include those portions of international and area studies grants to large universities that was applied to foreign-language instruction or to language research, and the portion of the Foundation-assisted Foreign Area Fellowship Program that were devoted to language study, the figure would be about $10 million higher.

Support of Foreign Language Teaching

Linguistics. Although attention was to some extent preempted by the need to expand the actual teaching and learning of foreign languages, including English as a foreign language, the Foundation recognized the direct bearing of basic linguistic training and research both on how to teach and what to teach.

In the early 1950s, individual linguistic scholars received some support under a Foundation program in behavioral sciences. Subsequently, under the International Training and Research program, the Foundation supported summer linguistics institutes under grants to the American Council of Learned Societies (A.C.L.S.) and provided fellowships to permit up to eighty advanced graduate students to complete their Ph.D.s in linguistics. Also, two grants were made to Georgetown University to aid its unique Ph.D. program, which combines work in linguistics, foreign languages, and English as a second language.

*This sum does not include experimental activities in elementary and secondary schools supported by the Foundation's Education Program and the Fund for the Advancement of Education. For example, part of a $3 million grant the Foundation made in 1965 to the Center for Applied Linguistics is being applied to reforms in the teaching of reading, writing, and speaking English in American schools, including the retraining of teachers. It is also being used in part for an urban-language research project in the Washington, D. C. public schools. Many of the language problems in the urban ghettoes of the United States have similar characteristics to problems faced by developing countries. It is estimated that in ten years a majority of the central-city school population could be speakers of English that is considered substandard in terms of education and routine job requirements. About 11 per cent of the United States' population is estimated to have a mother tongue other than English—in the Southwest, for example, two million children have a first language other than English. Most efforts to teach the dominant (English) language, however, have ignored cultural differences. What the layman and the English teacher have labeled as "incorrect" or "slovenly" speech the linguist has learned to recognize as a distinct language system—with its own pronunciation, grammar, and style—having its origins in a separate existence and a different culture.

In 1966 the Foundation made a five-year grant of $330,000 to Princeton University for a program of both basic and applied research in Chinese linguistics. Preceding by one year a major Foundation-supported effort to strengthen training and research programs in China studies, this program facilitated a concerted attack on the language barrier in this field.

In addition to giving direct support for linguistic studies, the Foundation made large grants to universities with major foreign area studies programs (University of California at Berkeley, Stanford, Michigan, Washington, Chicago, and Columbia, for example), part of which encouraged considerable research in both language and linguistics.

The Foundation has also provided support for linguistic research overseas. In Asia, a relatively small program has been carried on in Pakistan. At New Delhi University, grants have been made for a program aimed at increasing the number and quality of Indian linguists. Cornell University has served as the backstopping institution for this program. Survey work on African languages, conducted by the West African Linguistic Council, has been assisted by three grants totalling $391,000. The Center for Applied Linguistics of the University of Dakar received support for research on the languages of Senegal and the development of new materials for teaching French and English. In 1967 the Foundation undertook assistance (including grants to the University of California at Los Angeles, the Center for Applied Linguistics, and the University of East Africa) for a sociolinguistically-oriented survey of language use and language training in eastern Africa.

Although the problem of bilingualism has been considered most frequently with reference to developing countries, it is, of course, of critical importance to the political integration of countries like Canada and Belgium. A $400,000 grant was made in 1967 to Laval University in Quebec for the establishment of an international Center on Bilingualism.

A major program aimed at improving language training in Brazil's secondary schools is being assisted by four grants totalling approximately $275,000; the principal means are the study of linguistics and the training of teachers.

The Inter-American Program for Linguistics and Language Teaching, a program that has received modest Foundation support,

is worth noting because of its potential importance in future efforts in Latin America. A genuinely inter-American effort to develop hemispheric agreement on standards and priorities in attacking foreign language training and research problems, it has become a recognized scholarly and educational body representing Latin American scholarship.

Teaching World Languages. The Foundation's active support of improved instruction in the so-called modern foreign languages began with its grant to the Indiana Language Program in 1962; with a renewal grant in 1966, support has totalled $1,190,000. The program has sought to coordinate the roles of state and local boards of education, superintendents, language supervisors, and other local educational leaders and to link them to the colleges and universities that produce teachers, methods, and materials. Indiana was first to develop a statewide policy and strategy for improving language teacher-training, teaching methods, and classroom materials and techniques. A second program, in the state of Washington, is attempting to establish language speaking and listening goals (in addition to the more traditional reading and writing goals) for each grade and to develop proficiency tests to measure student achievement.

Teaching Critical Languages. The major effort of the Foundation has been concentrated on the "critical unfamiliar languages" (e.g. Chinese, Urdu, Bengali, Hindi, Thai, Tagalog)—a phrase that did not gain currency until 1959, when the passage of the National Defense Education Act (N.D.E.A.) required the establishment of national priorities. Foundation efforts started in 1952, through the materials development program of the A.C.L.S.; another early program that served to increase the competence of graduate students in the unfamiliar languages was the Foreign Area Fellowship Program, which emphasized language proficiency. Subsequently, a knowledge of relevant languages became an essential component of area studies programs at such universities as Columbia, Cornell, Yale, Harvard, Indiana, Michigan, Chicago, Washington, Wisconsin, Kansas, Berkeley, Stanford, Oregon, and Northwestern, all of which received support from the Foundation; these area studies programs prepared the way for the establishment of N.D.E.A. language and area studies centers. Ford Foundation grants to universities, as well as support of the Foreign Area Fellowship Pro-

gram and the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants to the Soviet Union and East Europe, provided much of the fellowship support that helped young scholars to learn critical unfamiliar languages for research purposes.

Certain critical language groups suffer from a dearth of effective teaching resources, both personnel and teaching materials. In 1957, support began for a series of efforts to mobilize scholar-teachers from several institutions for intensive study during the summer. Examples are an Inter-University Summer Training Program in Middle Eastern Languages and a summer program of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation for beginning and intermediate students of Chinese and Japanese. In addition to providing language training, these programs have contributed a great deal to the development of new types of intensive teaching materials.

Such programs can ameliorate but not solve the problems of graduate students who have difficulty in fitting into their already taxing programs the study of languages requiring many contact hours for reasonable mastery. (Chinese and Japanese, for example, require 1,600 to 1,800 contact hours, compared to 600 for most other languages.) Languages using a different orthography and a tonal rather than an inflectional system cannot be mastered without concentrated effort. As more students began to study South and Southeast Asia, the Far East, and the Middle East, it became clear that means had to be found to accelerate the language-learning process. With Foundation support several different model language programs were established that enabled students to undertake intensive language study overseas. The first such program was developed in 1956 at the initiative of Cornell University. Representing twelve universities active in China studies, Cornell set up an inter-university committee to select for advanced study in Formosa language students who had already finished studying basic Chinese in this country; the students took advantage of instructional facilities provided by a special Chinese language school set up in Formosa by the Foreign Service Institute. Two other programs that provide overseas training in Chinese and Japanese for graduate students are available, in Taipei and Tokyo respectively; they are managed by consortia of universities with major commitments to Chinese and Japanese area studies. These programs represent the first effort at accommodation between humanist scholars, who tradi-

tionally stress the reading and writing skills necessary for literary studies, and social scientists, who stress the oral-aural communication skills required for the study of current social problems.

Research Tools and Teaching Materials. Starting in 1952, a series of grants to the A.C.L.S., Indiana University (in support of the Archives of the Languages of the World), and Franklin Publications (for a Persian dictionary) made possible the development of dictionaries, contrastive studies, teaching materials, and other research and training tools that facilitate the study and teaching in American universities of certain principal languages of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa.

One of the most fruitful efforts assisted by the Foundation (with grants totalling $500,000) is the Program on Oriental Languages, established by Mortimer Graves and managed by the Committee on Language Programs of the A.C.L.S. Basic linguistic descriptions, dictionaries, grammars, and graded readers have been produced in thirty-eight of the critical unfamiliar languages, e.g., *Phonology of Colloquial Arabic, Burmese Glossary, Indonesian Dictionary, Spoken Telegu, Vietnamese Dictionary, Vietnamese Graded Reader.*

Professional Perspectives. Although the Foundation has limited its direct support for conferences, one conference it assisted proved to be a major turning point in bringing those engaged in "pure" linguistic research into closer touch with applied linguists and in improving understanding and communication between them. Held at the University of Michigan, July 28-30, 1957, and known as the Ann Arbor Conference, it also brought both groups into contact with classroom teachers. The conference also stimulated collaborative efforts to deal with the problem of teaching English as a foreign language.

Prospects. The teaching of foreign languages has expanded considerably since the early 1950s, and the scale of the foreign language teaching field in the United States is such as to require support mainly by the Federal government rather than by private foundations. Although the Ford Foundation will continue its interest in language teaching, therefore, the scale of support will be diminished.

English as a Second Language

Within the general field of language training, English as a second

language (ESL) has received the largest single block of Foundation support. The Foundation's ESL projects started overseas, but it soon became apparent that there was an urgent need for domestic resources that would backstop the growing efforts abroad.

Domestic programs. The most important contribution by the Foundation to the domestic "resource base" was the establishment of the Center for Applied Linguistics (C.A.L.), in Washington, D.C. Since its activities began in February 1960, it has received Foundation grants totalling about $5 million. Although the C.A.L.'s early work concentrated on ESL, it has become a principal national resource for the application of linguistics and of new methods generally to the teaching and learning of second languages. The C.A.L. serves as an active link among U. S. government agencies, academic institutions, and foundations concerned with these matters, and between organizations operating in the United States and those abroad.

The Foundation has made other efforts to strengthen ESL resources in the United States and in Britain, all with two purposes: 1) to expand the supply of competent scholar-teachers and 2) to increase the capacity of certain academic institutions to engage in research, training, and overseas service. Fellowship assistance to ESL teachers seeking linguistic training was provided under grants to American University, the Universities of Michigan and Texas, and, through the A.C.L.S., to Summer Linguistic Institutes. Grants totalling $928,000 have also been made to U.C.L.A., Cornell, and Teachers College, Columbia University, to strengthen teacher training, graduate training, research and overseas service resources and to permit the institutions to provide more effective ESL teaching overseas and to integrate overseas activities with on-campus training in applied linguistics. Initial efforts in Britain to give academic attention to ESL and to strengthen university training and service capabilities were assisted under grants totalling $177,000 to the universities of Edinburgh, Leeds, and London, and to the University College of North Wales. Thereafter the British Council began to collaborate with United States institutions in the development of ESL teaching, and British universities began to accept applied linguistics—and particularly the application of linguistics concepts and techniques to the teaching of English—as a legitimate academic subject.

Overseas program. The Foundation first became concerned with the ESL field in response to requests for assistance from less-developed countries. The first came from Indonesia, where the government decided early that it wanted to replace Dutch with English as the nation's official language and as a major language of instruction. Subsequently leaders of new governments in Africa and the Middle East requested assistance for the adoption of English as a language of wider communication and more rapid modernization.

To make English-language competence an effective part of a national educational effort or a national language program is generally difficult and costly and, at times, politically sensitive. The Foundation granted $8.7 million in ESL efforts in seventeen countries between 1952 and 1966.

Assistance for ESL programs took several forms: the development of teaching materials for selected groups of students (in Turkey, Syria, Iraq); teacher-training (in Japan, the United Arab Republic, Tunisia); strengthening of university programs (in Spain); provision of laboratory equipment (in Mexico, Tunisia); the establishment of special national ESL training centers (in India); and the progressive building of a self-sustaining system from the advanced training of scholars to the production of teaching materials for all levels (in Indonesia).

Second-language teaching is enveloped in political questions that are quite as complex as the technical problems inherent in the field. On the technical level, agencies seeking to support second-language development must ask: What is the appropriate educational level for intervention? How extensive a series of interrelated texts is needed to assure a program that can be sustained and become institutionalized? Does the leadership for national improvement of English language teaching come best from an independent institute, as in India and Tunisia; a university, as in Spain; a teachers' college, as in the Philippines; or a ministry of education, as in Kenya? To what extent must any work in English be related to efforts to improve the teaching of local languages? How can one best create the local specialists necessary to man the new programs?

The essentially political issues which may affect an ESL project in a particular country include: Does the project relate to a national plan and strategy for teaching local and regional languages?

Does the project have full governmental support? Is the project design in tune with public sentiment and political realities, or does it run counter to current attitudes or nationalist policies? Will local sentiment accept the number of expatriate specialists and the volume of external aid needed over a considerable period of time to keep the project moving until local specialists can take over its direction, or will the external presence tend to exacerbate nationalist antagonism to outsiders?

The Foundation engages in careful and sensitive study of both the technical and political questions before launching support for ESL projects in the countries in which the Foundation is supporting development programs.

Prospect. Although the teaching of ESL continues to be of great importance in many countries, the Foundation is viewing ESL increasingly in the context of the broader language problems of individual countries.

The Foundation's experience in the language field has heightened our awareness of the place of linguistic problems in the internal development of countries as they attempt to achieve effective national unity with a minimum of conflict among linguistic groups. Many nations face severe problems in achieving access to the modernized world without loss of cultural identity. Such projects as the current linguistic survey of eastern Africa, for example, seek to assemble the basic data for greater understanding of the total language situation. And, as Fishman's paper indicates, a new appreciation of the role of language in society is stimulating the growth of a new discipline of sociolinguistics. The Foundation and others are beginning to sense the wider understanding that is necessary if they are to contribute effectively to the language component of central development questions in many countries.

The future of the Foundation's support to work in language teaching, linguistics, and other aspects of language development will be affected by the growth of governmental programs and the shifting sense of priorities arising from current studies, but the importance of language problems in the developing world assures our concern. It is likely that the Foundation will assist ESL and other language projects only as they are part of a general effort to meet a country's overall language needs.

Publications

The following is a selected list of publications available without charge from the Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, 320 East 43rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017. A complete publications list is also available.

The Ford Foundation Annual Report.

About the Ford Foundation: A brief account of objectives, programs, and structure.

An American Foundation and Technical Assistance: by Harvey P. Hall, Union College Symposium, Vol. 2, No. 3, Summer 1963.

Context the World: Activities in international training and research.

Design for Pakistan: Assistance to the Pakistan Planning Commission by the Foundation and Harvard University.

Ford Foundation Grants in Population: A report on projects in the field.

Language Doors: Foreign-language training and the teaching of English as a second language.

The New Teacher: Assistance for experiments with new patterns of teacher preparation.

A Richer Harvest: Agricultural assistance in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Roots of Change: The Foundation program in India.

Scholars' Work and Works: Support of publication in the humanities and social sciences and of research on library problems.

Tapestry for Tomorrow: The Foundation program in the Middle East.

Two African Patterns: Training of government personnel and legal development in Tropical Africa.

Ford Foundation . . . "to advance human welfare"