DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 453 48 FL 001 528

AUTHOR	Freeman, Stephen A.
TITLE	Independent Evaluation of the Language Institute Program for the Summer of 1960.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Nov 60
NOTE	18p.; Report taken from Bulletin on the National Defense Education Act, Title VI, No. 11
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS	*Audiolingual Methods, Audiolingual Skills, Curriculum Design, Educational Strategies, Evaluation, Evaluation Methods, Institutes (Training Programs), Institute Type Courses, Instructional Improvement, Instructional Innovation, *Language Instruction, National Programs, *Program Evaluation, *Secondary School Teachers, Second Language Learning, *Summer Institutes, Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	National Defense Education Act, NDEA

ABSTRACT

This report on the 1960 National Defense Education Act Summer Language Institutes for elementary and secondary school teachers is the second such evaluation prepared under the direction of Dr. Stephen A. Freeman. Descriptions and general objectives of the Language Development Program in the 37 NDEA Institutes for some 2,000 teachers are reviewed as well as evaluation procedures used in the report. Discussion of advanced-level and second-stage Institutes underscores the problem of too great a diversity of linguistic achievement in participant background; program flexibility is discussed as a possible solution. Faculty, briefing conferences, teacher competence, opportunity for practice of audio-lingual skills, housing and physical arrangements, demonstration class, culture courses, and language laboratory utilization are favorably emphasized in this evaluation. Major problems described relate to: (1) quality control of participants' practice teaching, (2) pattern drill construction by participants, (3) participant reaction to applied linguistics courses and their structuring, (4) damaged student morale resulting from taking standardized tests, and (5) credit for Institute study. For the report of the 1959 Institutes see FL 001 529. (RL)

Bulletin on the National Defense Education Act - Public Law 85-864

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

Title VI: No. 11

November 30, 1960

TO : All Persons Interested in Language Institutes

FROM : Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Chief
Language Development Section
U. S. Office of Education

SUBJECT: Independent Evaluation of the Language Institute Program for the Summer of 1960

(In the summer of 1960, thirty-seven Institutes for elementary and secondary school teachers of modern foreign languages were conducted by American institutions of higher education, under authorization of Section 611 in the National Defense Education Act. This program was organized under the supervision of Dr. Lawrence Poston, Jr., head of the Language Institute Unit in the United States Office of Education. Many of the Institutes were visited by members of the Language Development staff or by Regional Representatives of the Higher Education Financial Aid Branch. The faculty and students at each Institute also collaborated in a self-evaluation, submitted to the Chief of the Language Development Section in an Institute director's report. Additionally, a contract was made with Middlebury College to conduct, for the second summer, an independent, unhindered field survey of the Institutes, under Dr. Stephen A. Freeman, Vice President, and Director of the Middlebury Summer Language Schools. The following formal report has been prepared by Dr. Freeman, based upon detailed studies of each Institute.)

GENERAL REPORT: 1960 SUMMER LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

At the request of the United States Office of Education, a team of independent observers was again created last summer, as in the summer of 1959, under contract with Middlebury College, to make an objective report on the thirty-seven Summer Language Institutes authorized under the National Defense Education Act. The team had a dual commission. It was asked to make an impartial evaluation of each Institute, studying its strengths and weaknesses, its successes and its difficulties. At the same time, it was very much concerned with discovering how the Institutes had met and solved their problems, overcome difficulties, developed new and original ideas, and set up patterns of

procedure in administration and instruction which could be helpful for the Institutes of the summer of 1961. On the basis of its observations, the team was requested to make positive and specific recommendations on the organization and policies of the 1961 Institutes.

The team of visitors was composed of the following:

Mr. John B. Archer of the St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire; Professor Joseph Axelrod, Humanities Division, San Francisco State College; Professor Arthur H. Beattie, Romance Language Department, University of Arizona; Professor Guillermo del Olmo, Spanish Department of Yale University; Professor Archibald T. MacAllister, Italian Department of Princeton University; Professor Robert G. Mead, Jr., Spanish Department, University of Connecticut, and editor of Hispania; Miss Elizabeth Nichols, of the Modern Language Materials Development Center; Miss Filomena Peloro of the Hackensack, New Jersey, Schools; Professor J. Alan Pfeffer, German Department, University of Buffalo, and editor of the Modern Language Journal; Professor George Scherer, German Department, University of Colorado; Professor Laurel Turk, Romance Language Department, De Pauw University, Indiana; Professor George B. Watts, French Department, Davidson College, North Carolina; and Professor Stephen Freeman, Vice-President of Middlebury College, as Director. All of the Institutes except the two abroad were visited twice at different times during the session, and some were visited three times. The whole team held two general conferences, one in June, and an intensive two-day conference in September.

The Summer Language Institutes of 1959 had been, to a very large degree, pilot projects; and the very idea was a bold experiment. The thirty-seven Summer Institutes of 1960 were a dynamic and positive achievement. They gave some two thousand modern language teachers unprecedented experience--in professional stimulus, in upgrading of language competence, and in cultural enrichment. They amplified and extended the impact of the 1959 Institutes, creating a new spirit in the country about the teaching of modern languages. They contributed toward meeting the rapidly increasing demand for better-trained, more competent secondary school and grade school teachers of modern languages. Nearly all these Institutes were successful, many of them outstandingly so; all rendered a real service. Only a few had grave defects. Almost without exception, the participants have gone back to their classrooms fired with enthusiasm to do a better job, stimulated by watching new procedures in action, more fluent and more correct in their oral use of the foreign language, and with a very considerable baggage of professional information, instructional materials, and even prepared exercises and taped recordings.

The most outstanding characteristic of the program of 1960 was its dynamic and forward-looking attitude. Many new ideas were put into action, and there were many evidences of vigorous initiative on the part of the directors and the teachers. Many imaginative experiments were tried out, most of them with considerable success. In addition to the Institutes conducted on the same basis as last summer, there were three advanced-level Institutes: one located at Bad Boll, Germany, one at the University

of Puerto Rico, and one at Hollins College. There was one Institute with a section for Italian. Two Institutes offered Russian; one was a single-language Institute exclusively for Russian, at Dartmouth. In fact, there were five single-language Institutes. There were two all-FLES Institutes. Many new and interesting techniques were developed for instruction. The approaches to the problem of teaching applied linguistics were many and varied. Much progress was made in the equipment and utilization of laboratories. The demonstration classes became the central core of instruction in methods. Not only were the programs of these Institutes unlike the usual summer schools; they differed widely among themselves; and they were unlike anything which many of the participants, or even many of the faculty members, had ever experienced before. Varying degrees of success were achieved in various aspects, but the program of the Institutes is not fixed in a sterotype pattern. It is ready for new and vigorous experimentation in 1961.

The lessons learned from experience in 1959 were well learned, and in most cases, the Institutes of 1960 profited fully from them. The Institutes of 1960 were authorized much earlier than in 1959 and the severe handicaps experienced in 1959 in the recruiting of faculty, the reservation of physical facilities, and the preparation of materials were avoided. The confusion and the duplication of effort resulting from multiple applications and multiple acceptances in 1959 were completely avoided by an ingenious procedure developed in the April 1960 Conference of Directors at Colorado. The preparation of instructional materials for the Institutes was adequately managed in almost all of the Institutes, although some difficulty arose from the inability to estimate exactly the linguistic level of the participants. A few Institutes were rather lax in preparing oral practice drills for upgrading the participants' own competence. The Belasco Manual and Anthology of Applied Linguistics (prepared under Office of Education contract) arrived too late for the best utilization in the courses in linguistics. Faculty briefings were held before the opening of the session in most Institutes, and were generally found to be effective and profitable.

We understand that the United States Office of Education is planning a still further increase in the number of Institutes for 1961. If the necessary funds are allocated, the total number may reach as many as sixty. The most important aspect therefore of the detailed report made by this team of observers to the United States Office of Education was a series of recommendations for the improvement of an expanded program in 1961, based upon the needs of the profession and the strengths and weaknesses observed in the 1960 Institutes.

The location of these Institutes is not a simple matter. Three major considerations must be kept in mind: the area of the greatest need, the proper geographical distribution, and the density of population. Some of the most useful Institutes in the past two summers have been those located in areas where nothing of the sort had existed before, and where the linguistic preparation of the participants was very low indeed. More Institutes should be created if possible in the

South, the plains States, and the Rocky Mountain area. Consideration might also be given to one Institute in Hawaii. The density of population should be kept in mind, particularly as regards California and the eastern seaboard.

The location of Institutes depends also upon finding colleges with the proper facilities, laboratories, dormitories, etc. It would be desirable to bring into the program a larger number of the small colleges and well-equipped private institutions in the country. There are many advantages to establishing an Institute on a small campus where it has the exclusive use of facilities, and where a homogeneous atmosphere can most easily be created. At the same time, the matter of climate is important; and it is practically essential that Institutes in the south be housed in air-conditioned buildings.

There seems to be no rule for the optimum size of an Institute. The most advantageous number that can be handled depends on many factors, including the staff, physical facilities, size of the laboratory, etc. Two of the most successful Institutes in 1960 had a hundred participants, whereas many of the small Institutes with not over forty participants were also excellent. Each language group in an Institute must be large enough to create its own esprit de corps, its pride in being a separate entity. It must also be large enough so that when several levels or sections of ability are created each section is large enough for effective work. In many ways, greater economy of operation can be achieved by having larger Institutes, thus reducing overhead costs, office staff, administrative salaries, and other basic expenses. At the same time there must be adequate staff to permit the creation of small practice sections for upgrading language competence, averaging about eight to ten. With careful organization we see no difficulty in raising the average size of the Institutes to seventy, especially for successful Institutes which are repeated in 1961.

We recommend a large increase in single-language Institutes. Most of the Institutes in the past have been for at least two languages and some of them for three. It is of course good for teachers of one language to see their colleagues in another language working on the same problems and subjected to the same discipline. On the other hand, experience has taught us that the single-language Institute is by far the most effective, and the simplest to operate. There is a conspicuous unity in a single-language Institute which facilitates the creation of a cultural island and the complete immersion in the single language and culture. In a two-language Institute, where dormitories, dining rooms, classes in linguistics, and the laboratory are shared, it is impossible to avoid a considerable use of English.

We recommend that all Institutes should have at least six full weeks of class instruction, in addition to the periods of testing at the beginning and end. The Institutes this summer which ran for only six weeks found the short period highly frustrating, especially since

the MLA Qualification Tests (prepared under contract with the Office of Education) took up two or three days at the opening and again at the close. Some Institutes ran for eight weeks, but sometimes found their participants becoming very fatigued by the end of the session. Seven weeks, including placement tests and final examinations, would seem to be about right, save for exceptional cases.

Much more emphasis should be given in 1961 to separate FLES Institutes. There were only two this summer, while the great majority of the FLES Institutes were combined with secondary school Institutes. There are many reasons for our recommendation for more separate FLES Institutes. The needs of FLES teachers are quite different from those of secondary school teachers, and the program of instruction should therefore be different. Since FLES teachers become the personal models for their class through direct imitation, the primary need of FLES teachers is for an upgrading of their language competence, particularly oral competence. Pronunciation is very important, linguistics less so. The courses in civilization and culture should be different for FLES teachers. They need information on folklore, customs, songs, and games, rather than literary history. It is true that there are some advantages to a combined FLES-secondary school Institute. If such a combination is carefully planned for the purpose, it can give teachers at each level an opportunity to see what is going on at the other level, and to make some progress in solving the problem of articulation between grade school and junior high school. A certain amount of cross-visiting in demonstration classes would be very useful. Such combinations should take place in a single-language Institute, where the only problems of diversity would be in the levels of teaching and the levels of preparation. Some attention should also be given next summer to the different levels of FLES, that is third grade, fourth grade, fifth grade, and sixth grade. If the same proportion of FLES programs is kept in 1961, there should probably be about fifteen FLES Institutes, of which perhaps as many as nine should be pure FLES Institutes. It may be noted that the proportion of FLES applications accepted in 1960 was quite high. More attention should be given to the geographical distribution of FLES Institutes, with the larger number of Spanish FLES Institutes located in the west and southwest; German in the north; French in the east, far west, and south.

It is strongly recommended that a small number of advanced-level Institutes be created in 1961. By an "advanced-level Institute" we mean one for participants who have already attained a high degree of fluency in the foreign language and a considerable amount of professional experience. They are the people who in the past two summers have generally been rejected as candidates for admission to an Institute, because they are "over-prepared." In the endeavor to upgrade the average or the poorly prepared teacher, these superior teachers, possessing native or near-native fluency in the foreign language, have been passed over. In some cases, a mediocre teacher, through the prestige gained from an Institute certificate, has been promoted or appointed to a position of authority, and thus given preferment over a more competent teacher. These advanced-level Institutes should also be defined as first-year Institutes,

open to teachers who have not yet had the experience of an Institute, but for whom a special advanced-level instructional program should be prepared. They should be different from the so-called "advanced-level" Institutes of this past summer, which generally accepted only the graduates of the 1959 Institutes. An advanced-level Institute such as is now proposed should have a clean, brand-new program, with a different objective. There would be no need of practice classes for upgrading language ability nor of remedial work in pronunciation or oral fluency. Linguistics could be taught more successfully; literature and culture could be presented at a higher level, with a larger use of literary and philosophical texts. In the area of methods, however, much insistence should be laid upon the new procedures and the rationale of the audio-lingual approach.

An Institute of this sort would solve the problem of several cases of native or near-native speakers in Institutes this summer who felt bored and frustrated with the average program. It is difficult to over-emphasize the strategic importance of such well-trained teachers who can readily become professional leaders, models, and stimuli for the best kind of language teaching in the country. Indeed, a specialized Institute might be considered for these types of teachers who would need some courses in education -- the history, philosophy, and psychology of education, tests and measurements, and other theoretical requirements -- in order to be qualified for appointments as language supervisors and for administrative positions at the State and local levels. Another type of advanced-level Institute should be considered in order to train teachers especially for third and fourth year high school classes and advanced placement classes, and to study the problems of articulation between high school and college. The very important problem of "advanced placement" and articulation with college has hardly been touched in the Institutes program as yet.

As distinguished from advanced-level Institutes, there should also be a few second-stage Institutes. These should be defined as Institutes for participants who have already been enrolled in the summer of 1959 or 1960 and are now accepted as regular participants for a second summer. Difficult questions immediately arise about the selection of candidates and the type of program to be offered. It is our consensus that neither the "cream" nor the lowest quality of participants of the past two summers should be accepted, but rather a careful selection of those at the middle level who have shown the greatest ability to profit from instruction and who have made the greatest progress, both in language ability and in attitude. Naturally the program should not be a mere repetition of a first-year Institute but should represent a higher level of achievement with different emphases.

At this point, we raise a major question of policy. Is it justifiable and necessary to give any large number of language teachers a second summer of training at public expense, while there are still 22,000 teachers of foreign languages who have not yet had the opportunity of

even one summer? There are still in many areas of the United States thousands of poorly prepared language teachers who are aware of their deficiencies and deplore their situation and who would profit immensely from a summer at an NDEA Institute. We interpret the primary purpose of the NDEA Institutes as a stimulus, a challenge, and an eye-opener. It is probably better, therefore, to spread this opportunity as widely as possible, rather than to try to give any considerable number of teachers the three or four summers of Institute study which would be necessary to bring the average teacher to a superior level of preparation. It would be wiser, and certainly more economical for the American tax-payer, if we could give second-stage participants a scholarship to encourage them to go to an already existing institution, defraying part of their own expenses themselves. It may confidently be assumed that the intelligent, conscientious and dedicated teacher, having been challenged by the new procedures and the realization of his professional needs, will continue to seek the necessary training and is willing to make personal sacrifices to secure it in some of the good language summer schools or year-round institutions in the U.S. and Canada.

A few second-stage Institutes should undoubtedly be conducted abroad in 1961. The Institute in Spanish at Puerto Rico and the Institute in German at Bad Boll, Germany, were very successful in adding new elements, new cultural insights, to the training of the participants. The few weaknesses in these two Institutes were largely related to the difficulties of making proper arrangements in a foreign country, and to the added expense of travel (which is borne by the participants). The environment in both Institutes provided all the advantages of a complete immersion into the foreign language and the foreign culture, and the participants seem to have taken full advantage of these opportunities. In 1961 there may well be several additional Institutes abroad. Admissions should be strictly limited to participants who have already distinguished themselves in an Institute in this country. The location of these Institutes must be chosen with great care. Complete cooperation by any foreign institution must be guaranteed; and there must be assurance of good physical facilities for housing and dining.

In regard to the quotas to be set for 1961 in each language, the proportionate division between French, German, and Spanish seems approximately correct. The teaching of Russian in secondary schools has increased tremendously in the past few years. There were only two Institutes in Russian this summer, and the one at Dartmouth was commissioned too late to secure the full value of its publicity. There should probably be more Russian Institutes in 1961, with some located in California where Russian studies have expanded rapidly. There was only one Italian Institute this summer. We recommend two for 1961, one on the east coast and one on the west coast, in view of the large and high-grade population in California. Thought should also be given to the possibility of an Institute for Japanese. The need for well-trained teachers of Japanese at the secondary-school level is not large as yet, but the supply is almost non-existent.

We come now to a number of recommendations concerning the organization of the individual Institutes. The key figure in the administration of an Institute is the director. No Institute can be successful unless the man at the head possesses an almost ideal combination of qualifications. This may indeed be the most serious limitation on the number of Institutes for 1961. The director must be a skillful organizer, diplomatic, patient, but at the same time firm and decisive. He must have unlimited energy and initiative. He must be keen enough to see the weaknesses of his organization, visiting classes regularly, holding conferences with faculty and students, and personally familiar with every detail of the operation of his Institute. There should be no change in the director from the beginning of preparation in winter until the close of the session. The director must be in residence and on the spot at the institution during the entire spring and summer. We do not recommend the appointment of a visiting director from another institution. The director should also give his full time entirely to the Institute, and not divide it with other occupations on the campus. In a two-language Institute, the director should be aided by an assistant director in charge of each language, leaving the director free for over-all supervision and avoiding any appearance of favoritism. He should have adequate secretarial assistance, not only during the period of preparation and during the Institute, but for the multitude of details following the close of the session.

The selection of the faculty of an Institute is crucial. The teachers in an Institute must, with the possible exception of professors of linguistics, be fluent speakers of the foreign language, experienced teachers thoroughly at home in the foreign medium, and convinced supporters of the new approaches in modern language teaching. It is desirable that a considerable portion of the faculty be natives of the foreign country, provided they have had good American experiences. There has been a regrettable tendency in some Institutes to use a number of people from the local faculty of the institution, simply because they were on the spot and wanted the job, who were not qualified for the task, either because they were not fluent in the foreign language, or because they were not in sympathy with the new procedures. There were, of course, many exceptions of highly competent local people; but we recommend that in general the directors should seek the very best possible faculty on a nation-wide basis and not "make do" with people nearest at hand.

The faculty members of an Institute should receive a salary commensurate with their heavy responsibilities. Their work-load is far more than a certain number of class-contact hours. They are responsible to assist in all kinds of remedial work, individual coaching, and extra-curricular duties. The director should have a clear understanding with each one, in writing, concerning his extra-curricular duties of all types, attendance at language tables at mealtimes, assistance with special programs, remedial sessions, supervision of excursions, and the multitude of other necessary parts of a Language Institute program.

The warning and even the pessimism, expressed in the report of the visiting team of 1959 concerning the shortage of competent teachers, was fortunately proven unnecessary. Many good teachers, particularly demonstration class teachers and laboratory assistants, were found for 1960 among the participants of the Institutes in 1959. Some of the most successful teachers of the culture courses were young men, well informed and enthusiastic, who were willing to build a new course adapted to the needs and level of the participants. We are confident that many good new teachers will be discovered for 1961. There should be much discreet publicity, in order to assist the directors to find them. The directors of 1960 can be most helpful, and the leaders of language organizations in each State should be encouraged to make suggestions. It is difficult to insist sufficiently, however, on the need for extreme care in the selection of faculty members.

Native consultants or informants contributed a great deal to many of the Institutes by giving opportunities for informal conversational practice. The use of these young native speakers should be increased, as a valuable means of upgrading the participants in language fluency. They should be better supervised, and they should be given clear instructions, materials, and a program to work on. Most of them are untrained and inexperienced, and do not know the best ways of drawing out the participants in these "informal" meetings. When supervision, prepared materials, and a clear program were provided, the results were most helpful.

As in 1959, the participants were chosen in general from the middle range of applicants. The very well prepared and the unusually poorly prepared were generally not accepted. Nevertheless, in spite of the best efforts on the part of the directors, almost every Institute had participants ranging from near-native ability in the foreign language to those who could hardly put a few coherent words together, much less understand a discussion in the foreign language. Our observers report that the greatest single obstacle to effective teaching this past summer was the wide diversity of preparation among the participants. This problem must be attacked in several ways in 1961.

It is evident that paper records and questionnaires filled out by the applicant are a weak instrument in securing a homogeneous group. Years or semester hours enrolled in language classes mean little. We believe that the basic admission policy of first-year Institutes in 1961 should still be the middle level of preparation. But drastic changes must be made in the procedures for selection, in order to make this policy more effective. Many suggestions have been made--personal interviews, telephone conversations, compositions in the foreign language, and the submission of three-minute tape recordings. All of these would be most helpful, but would be very expensive in time and money, for both the applicant and the admissions officer. At least some of these means should be used, as the present situation is far from satisfactory.

After every possible device has been used, we still expect that the level of preparation of the participants in most Institutes will be extremely heterogeneous, from near-native to desperately poor. The best solution of this problem seems to be to create several levels of instruction within each Institute, or language group. The instruction would then be flexible, adapting the materials and tempo to the ability of the participants at the various levels. Lectures in culture which may be boring and lacking in challenge for an upper level group may pass completely over the heads of the lower level group who cannot understand the language. Language practice classes for the upper levels can work on materials of a very different sort from the basic explanations of grammar and the pattern practice necessary for near beginners. This also means that the Institute must have available the extra staff necessary to organize new sections at unexpected levels, and to create new materials when needs develop at levels which had not been planned on. Flexibility is the key solution to these inevitable variations in participant preparation.

In many Institutes this summer there were a few participants who had a native or near-native command of the language. Some had been admitted by accident. Sometimes they were admitted intentionally by the director in order to provide a stimulus for conversation and a model for the weaker students. We recommend strongly against this practice. Certain advantages may accrue, but the results were generally harmful. These native speakers are usually bored and frustrated because they are deriving no profit from the instruction. Even where the native speakers gave full and smiling cooperation, they became unofficial teachers, in return for their participant stipend.

Problems raised by dependents in 1959 seem generally to have been solved. It is still necessary to recommend however that participants should leave their dependents at home. This is not so much a matter of the housing and feeding of dependents, but rather that the presence of dependents interferes with the creation of a cultural island and the complete immersion of the participant in the foreign language.

The objective of the NDEA Institutes is "to increase the audio-lingual competence of teachers of Modern Foreign Languages and to introduce them to new teaching methods and techniques." In general, the curriculum offered in the Institutes was wisely planned to aid the participants in the attainment of this objective. The Institutes were left free to set up their individual programs, and no attempt was made by the Washington Office to insist upon a standardized program nor to require the offering of certain courses. Through stimulating the imaginative initiative of various directors, there is hope that new ideas, new procedures, new experimentation may lead to further progress in the teaching of modern foreign languages. There was therefore a wide variety of courses and many differing emphases among the thirty-seven Institutes this summer. In some, the participants all took the same basic program, allowing for differences in levels; in others there was

a considerable amount of choice between the courses offered. Widely varying amounts of attention were given to the main elements of the curriculum -- language study, methods and demonstrations, linguistics either theoretical or applied, laboratory techniques, and culture. Even with differing emphases, different combinations often resulted in good programs. A reasonable amount of flexibility is an asset to an Institute curriculum.

At the same time, however, our team of observers felt that some Institutes needed greater guidance in the formation of an optimum program. A few Institutes still spent a large proportion of time on theory, with correspondingly less opportunity for practical participation in the foreign language by the student. In some Institutes a large proportion of the instruction was given in English; whereas in the better Institutes the proportion of English was kept to less than half. The following recommendations, while not diminishing the opportunity for flexibility, are aimed at avoiding the weaknesses which appeared in some of the Institutes last summer in various aspects of the curriculum.

We recommend as absolutely essential that briefing conferences be held on a national scale during the coming winter and spring, for the teachers of the various curriculum areas or disciplines in the 1961 Institutes. These briefing conferences will give an opportunity for the teachers of methods, linguistics, demonstration classes, laboratory techniques, language practice, and culture to get together with their colleagues in the same division of the curriculum to talk over their plans, methods, and materials; to arrive at a general agreement on their operation; to share the experience and the imaginative procedures of last summer; to describe to each other the most successful new ideas; and, without attempting any standardization, to work toward the desired efficiency.

Most of the 1960 Institutes constructed an intelligent weekly schedule, skillfully adapted to the activities of the participants. There were, however, a number of Institutes where the schedule was far too heavy or too rigid. No Institute should have a solid block of classes during the entire morning without a break. The time spent in a coffee break is not lost, because it is usually devoted to the discussion of a previous class or demonstration and it usually gives the participant some additional practice in the use of the foreign language. The pace in these Institutes is so intensive that some time must be allowed merely for the assimilation of ideas. Free time is also necessary for browsing in a realia room or for unscheduled practice in the laboratory. Most Institutes wisely gave very little homework, arranging for the participants to do all of their preparation during the day in laboratory or exercise sessions. On the other hand, some Institutes gave an excessive amount of homework for the evening, besides scheduling the evening full of extra-curricular activities. The surreptitious kind of evening assignment was particularly demoralizing, when the participant is parenthetically reminded in class of a large amount of reading which he is supposed to have already done.

The central core of an Institute curriculum, and the point of departure of all improvement in language teaching, is the upgrading of language competence. The participants generally, and most of the Institutes, realized clearly that no amount of instruction in new methods and techniques, in laboratory procedures or linguistics, can be of any avail unless the teacher has first of all a good knowledge of the foreign language. Therefore, the successful programs in most of the Institutes, both in the eyes of the students and of our visitors, were the programs where the greatest relative emphasis was laid upon improving competence in the foreign language, and where all parts of the instructional program were focused upon the use of the foreign language. Conversely, dissatisfaction and complaint from participants in a few Institutes arose from the failure to provide adequate instruction in and opportunity to use the foreign language. Courses in linguistics, laboratory techniques, and some parts of the discussion of methods may be more wisely given in English. The culture course should be given in the foreign language, although adaptation may have to be made for the pupils who do not understand the language readily. The discussion of methods and of the critiques of the demonstration classes should be handled in the foreign language as much as possible, especially for upper-level groups. It is generally agreed that at least half of the students' weekly class activity should be in the foreign language. No simple rule can be given, however, since there is a great difference between listening to a lecture in the foreign language, doing phonetics exercises, informal conversation, and participating actively in discussions. We have regretted to find that several Institutes this summer fell considerably short even of the low ideal of spending half of the time in the foreign language.

The greatest need lies, of course, in the area of audio-lingual competence. This is especially difficult in the case of participants who are also pitifully weak in grammar. Several of the Institutes lacked proper materials for pattern practice at the lower level. In some of them, even the Glastonbury Materials were used by weak participants for their own upgrading, and such was their need that they profited greatly from them, even though the vocabulary and the ideas are pretty thin for adults. We noted good work in the area of remedial correction of pronunciation, which prevents the drilling of errors. Imaginative ideas were also developed for stimulating conversation, although in general the young native informants needed more supervision and more systematic materials.

There was distinct progress over 1959 in the use of the foreign language outside of the classroom. We found that the participants were generally very eager to use the foreign language, at language tables, in the lounges, and in conversation with the faculty. Still, a few Institutes were weak in this respect. The effective use of the foreign language was sometimes thwarted by bad housing arrangements or bad dining arrangements, or because the Institute closed up completely on week-ends and all the participants went away talking English.

There were very few cases this summer of courses in theoretical methods in the abstract. Profiting from the experience of 1959, all but a few Institutes succeeded in making the instruction in methods highly practical by gearing it to the demonstration classes. The demonstration class is indeed the heart of the entire program of instruction in methods and procedures. The great majority of demonstration classes this summer were superbly handled, by well-trained, experienced, and enthusiastic teachers who became master teachers and models for the participants. A few problems still remained. A few Institutes had an agreement with the local high school to cover a certain unit of work so as to give the pupils credit at the high school. The result was that the demonstration class took up too much time; or the aspects of demonstration and experimentation for the participants were subordinated to the desire to cover a stated syllabus.

It is essential that there should be very close contact and cooperation between the demonstration teacher and the methods teacher, if they are different persons. The best procedure was for the methods teacher to prepare the participants in a previous briefing session for what they were to see in the demonstration; and then afterward there was discussion on the demonstration, assisted by the demonstration teacher herself. Discussion of the demonstration class was the most successful function of the methods class. The participants cannot be trusted to draw all the necessary conclusions or to observe all the important aspects of the technique and procedures. These have to be pointed out both in advance and afterward.

We regret to report that the practice-teaching as observed in the Institutes this summer was not very satisfactory. There were isolated cases of exceptionally fine practice-teaching being done, but by and large the practice-teaching by the participants was poor and in many cases it was unwise. In theory, it is desirable for the participants to have an opportunity to practice-teach under the supervision of the master teacher. Nevertheless, a participant does not profit from sitting and watching for an hour while other participants demonstrate the same sort of mistakes over and over again. In the meantime, the pupils in the demonstration class are making no progress. Some Institutes allowed successions of practice-teaching participants to take over the demonstration class for ten minutes each, without ever seeing a model by the master teacher. It is therefore our recommendation that the demonstration class should be kept chiefly as a model, largely intact under the guidance of the master teacher, and that the continuity of good demonstration must not be broken up. On infrequent occasions, after careful briefing, a participant with some special talent may be allowed to take a small portion of a class. Much practice-teaching by the participants should not be a part of the Institute program, and it should be discouraged except under conditions as stated above. One might secure some of the benefits of practice-teaching by doing practice-teaching on a group of other participants, even though this situation is artificial. In some Institutes it might be possible to have two demonstration classes, one to be taught exclusively by the

master teacher and the other to be used largely for practice-teaching under careful guidance and briefing.

In a number of Institutes, the participants spent a considerable amount of time creating pattern practice drills on their own textbooks, following the model of the "Glastonbury Materials" (prepared under Office of Education contract). It is argued that secondary school teachers will be forced for some time to use old-fashioned textbooks, and that the development of pattern drills and dialogues in the "new-key" will make their use more successful. On the other hand, many of our visitors felt that too much time was spent on the construction of pattern drills. Seven weeks is hardly time enough to teach the participants how to use good materials well. The average participant does not have the experience, nor the basic knowledge of linguistics, nor even sometimes a sufficient command of the foreign language to construct good pattern drills; and it is worse to construct bad ones than not to make any at all. It is our general recommendation that the construction of pattern drills be kept to a rather low minimum. A small amount may be done under careful guidance, in order to teach procedures, and as a basis for the understanding of applied linguistics, and for the analysis of old and new textbooks.

Instruction in linguistics was more successful this summer than in 1959. Better definition, more limited objectives, and a more careful selection of teachers resulted in less resistance and more positive accomplishment than in 1959. The presentation of linguistics, in a course of modified objectives and with constant practical application, was very well done at a number of Institutes this summer. Nevertheless, teaching of linguistics is still one of the most thorny problems that the 1961 Institute will have to face. In some Institutes the attempts at teaching linguistics were a partial or even a total failure, with serious student complaint about the uselessness of the course and the time wasted. Some courses required the purchase of a large number of expensive texts which the students had no time to read. There were several cases where courses in linguistics, taught by highly competent linguists, sincerely trying to make the subject practical for the students, still failed of the desired results.

The problem is complicated and very important. Certain basic principles of linguistics lie at the root of teaching in the "new-key." It is not really possible for a teacher to understand completely why the new audio-lingual procedures are shaped as they are without knowing something of what general linguistics tries to teach -- the structure of language in general, its fundamentally oral nature, the resemblances and differences between languages, and the most efficient approach to the analysis of language. On the other hand, it is equally true that the entire field of general and descriptive linguistics does not need to be covered in order to give this basic understanding. Some of the linguistics teachers this summer made the mistake of trying to give a thorough introduction to general linguistics in the seven weeks of a summer Institute.

It is therefore our recommendation that, except for those Institutes where the course has been completely successful, the linguistics course be reduced to a series of lectures, which might be entitled "Topics in Linguistics For Modern Language Teachers" or "The Linguistic Rationale of The New Key" or something similar. These lectures should cover the basic theory and major principles through which linguistics can contribute significantly to modern language teaching. The objectives of the course should be very carefully defined and limited, in terms of the needs of these language teachers. There is indeed a shortage of linguistic teachers who can do this. It is our general feeling that such a course can best be taught by a trained language teacher who has also made a careful study of linguistics. We do not consider it wise to spend several weeks of an Institute in a detailed analysis of American English.

The Belasco Manual was received late by the Institutes, too late in most cases for the teacher of linguistics to revise his course enough to include the Manual as a helpful part of his syllabus. The Manual is being revised during this winter. If it can be made less complicated, less difficult and detailed, it can be of very considerable service in 1961. The recommended national conference of all teachers of linguistics in the Institutes for 1961, referred to above, should be able to draw up something which might approach a workable syllabus for the average Institute.

The language laboratory was far more successful this summer than last, partly because the laboratories were in better working condition, and partly because the directors and the technicians knew better what a laboratory was expected to do. The wasteful courses on electronics given in 1959 had been largely eliminated, although there was still too much discussion of electronic theory. Regular scheduling for participant use was still not satisfactorily done in many Institutes. From the point of policy, there is still a lack of clear definition between the various uses of the laboratory by participants. These can be listed as follows: 1) to upgrade the participant's own language competence by listening, by oral exercises, by pronunciation drills, etc.; 2) to become familiar with laboratory equipment and techniques, so as to operate the laboratory in his own school; 3) to prepare the tapes of exercises and other recorded material, either by new recordings or by dubbings for use in his own school; 4) to observe the use of the laboratory by the demonstration class as an aspect of methods. These are all distinct objectives, and require different types of instruction, different assistance from the staff, and even a different schedule. Some improvement still needs to be made in systematic and scheduled instruction in the use of a laboratory in a secondary school situation.

Several of the Institutes this summer gave excellent courses in the foreign culture. One of them could well serve as a model for courses in culture in 1961. The lectures in this program lasted for half an hour, as the first class exercise of the day. They contained material on the most significant contributions to literature, the arts,

and the sciences, but they stressed the familiar elements of today's life -- education, the family, working conditions, religions, sports, etc. Participants were furnished an outline of the lecture, but they were forbidden to take notes, so that they would focus all their attention on listening and understanding. Each lecture was recorded on tape, and the weaker students subsequently listened as often as necessary to arrive at complete comprehension. The topics of the lecture then became the material for discussion later in the day in small classes for oral exercises, in directed conversation. Echoes of the material were heard even in the content of pattern practice drills. Regular written compositions involving the same cultural material were also required.

By contrast, there were still too many lectures in the "old key." There was some practically straight lecture work in literature; and some Institutes gave too large doses of reading, necessitating much late evening study. In general the lectures upon culture should be given in the foreign language, and preferably by a native speaker. We recommend against the practice of inviting visiting experts from the outside to give special lectures in the evening; these special lectures are usually given in English, and they are not integrated into the total program of the Institute. We recommend also against the practice of spending a large amount of class time showing extraneous illustrative material to the class, such as long films, recordings of foreign music, and reproductions of foreign paintings. A little of this is very helpful, but too much wastes valuable class time.

Some of the most effective work in culture is done outside of class, either in conversation with the faculty and the native informants, or by the study of realia exhibits in a special room, or by the singing of popular and folk songs, visits to museums, and many other informal participant activities. It is of great importance to create an informal, enthusiastic, social spirit, in the atmosphere of the foreign culture. When the participants begin to laugh and joke in the foreign language, half the battle is won.

Physical arrangements at most of the Institutes this summer were excellent and generally far better than in 1959. Only a few details need to be mentioned for improvement in 1961. We recommend that there be an easily accessible central office for the director's headquarters where he can be found regularly for consultation with staff and students. There should be likewise a good central office for the faculty, as a locus for the essential coordination, and also where the faculty can meet socially for relaxation. There should not be too great distance between the classrooms commonly used in the schedule; nor indeed too great distance between the classrooms and the dormitory and the dining hall. Some Institutes did not even have a dormitory of their own on the college campus. We recommend strongly that with rare exceptions no Institute should be located at an institution which will not arrange to house and feed the participants in its own accommodations, and in units which can be successfully segregated into language-speaking units.

The MLA Qualification Tests were given in all the Institutes at the beginning of the session, and generally again at the end. The purpose was partly to assist the directors in sectioning the participants at the proper levels of instruction, and partly to measure the progress of the participants during the session. From many of the directors and participants, and also from our visitors, came the report that these tests had been a violent shock, even in some cases a traumatic experience, damaging for student morale. The directors for some Institutes had held a briefing session at the beginning of the Institute, in which they explained the administration of the tests and the purpose of giving them. Some of the participants stated that the test had been a shock, but that it was a constructive and salutary shock, an eye-opener for the rather self-satisfied teacher, who was now suddenly forced to be aware of his basic ignorance and tackle the program of instruction with a less cocky attitude.

Several ways can be suggested in which these tests can be made more helpful and less damaging in the 1961 Institutes. The directors should take time to familiarize themselves with the tests in advance, and explain them to their participants. It is really not necessary to give the entire battery of tests at the beginning of an Institute. The average participant in his first summer has little or no knowledge of linguistics; and even the professional preparation test can be skipped. In fact, only the four language competence tests need to be given at the beginning. It seems to this team of visitors that the tests were too long and also too hard. Item analysis will undoubtedly show unsatisfactory groupings on the curve. The tests were not properly devised for FLES teachers since their needs and abilities are quite different from those of secondary school teachers. We question whether the same tests should be given to FLES teachers. Some revisions should also be made in the items of the civilization test, which smacked too much of the factual information in the manuals. Finally, if all Institutes last for at least seven weeks, there will be time to take these tests in stride. It is also our recommendation that there is no need for any other formal final examinations in the Institute. The MLA tests can be used as a basis for grading, and the participant is usually well enough known to the teachers in his classes so that a grade can be assigned without a final examination. It is important to reduce still more the "examination psychosis" and the worry over final grades, which still this summer prevented some participants from deriving the maximum benefits from the last few weeks.

The problem of credit for Institute study is still not solved. In general the directors appeared opposed to the giving of credits, but they are forced to it, both by the Institutions and by the participants. Some of the universities consider that a course is not worthy of attention unless it is listed as a graduate course giving graduate credit toward a degree. The participants themselves want official credit in order to secure raises in salary and promotions, or to satisfy the rules regarding certification and tenure. Another danger is that

these universities are usually willing to grant credit for theory courses but not for the practical courses in language upgrading, oral practice, or for the demonstration classes. They put the premium therefore exactly where we do not want it in terms of the Institute objectives. Because of the wide divergence of preparation among the participants, it has been practically impossible to arrive at any comparative standard of achievement or grading. Most of the students who work hard (and practically all of them do) get a passing grade. It is entirely evident that the emphasis should not be on graduate credit, particularly on credit toward a graduate degree. We feel that the Institutes do well to give block credit, that is, a unit of credit for the entire session in all the work, rather than credits for separate courses. The best solution for this problem seems to be that the Institutes should give a block of credit, entitled "post-graduate credit," not undergraduate credit, with a certificate which would entitle the participant to salary raises, promotions, certification, tenure, etc. This post-graduate credit should be distinguished from credit toward a specific degree at the institution where the work was taken. Subsequently, the participant might enroll for a Master of Arts degree at that same institution or another one, and the institution would apply its own rules toward the acceptance of this post-graduate credit. We also recommend that no graduate credit be allowed in second-stage Institutes. We consider it dangerous to embark on a program of financing Master of Arts degrees at specific institutions at Government expense. Here is an area in which we wish to differ in policy from the National Science Foundation Institutes.

The Language Development Program, in its Summer Institutes of 1959 and 1960, has proven its worth. We are confident that an expanded program in the summer of 1961, profiting from the experience of the two preceding summers, will have an even greater measure of success.