DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 166 FL 011 991

AUTHOR Eddy, Peter A.: And Others
TITLE Chinese Language Study in American Higher Education: State of the Art. Language in Education: Theory and Practice. No. 30.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-87281-092-5
PUB DATE 80
CONTRACT 400-77-0049
NOTE 59p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Applied Linguistics, 3520 Prospect Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20007 ($7.95).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Chinese: *College Second Language Programs: Enrollment Trends: Financial Support: Graduate Students: Higher Education: Instructional Materials: Language Proficiency: Language Research: Language Teachers: *Second Language Instruction: Surveys: Teaching Methods: Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken in order to provide current data and comprehensive information about Chinese language instruction in United States higher education. This report is based on the responses to a survey in 1979. In addition to the discussion of the survey responses, an examination of changes that have taken place since a previous report in 1969 is provided. The discussion of the survey report deals with the following data: (1) an overview of the survey procedures: (2) enrollments and enrollment trends, including "language-learning" and "language-using" courses, courses about Chinese offered in English, summer courses and extension courses: (3) teachers of Chinese--their responsibilities, pedagogical and linguistic training, openings for instructional personnel, and opinions on language-teaching changes: (4) a catalog and assessment of instructional materials that are most used and/or needed: (5) aspects of Chinese language instructional programs in American higher education: (6) students' language competence and reasons for studying Chinese: (7) funding of Chinese language instruction on United States campuses: and (8) a summary of the findings of the survey and the recommendations that follow from it. (AMH)

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

30

Chinese Language Study in American Higher Education: State of the Art

by
Peter A. Eddy
James J. Wrenn
Sophia A. Behrens

with
Leonard A. Shaefer, Jr.
Nadine Mandel
Donna Vanderhoff

Published by
Center for Applied Linguistics

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education under contract no. 400-77-0049. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or ED.

The research reported in this publication was performed under a grant from the Division of International Education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under the authority of the National Defense Education Act, Title VI, Section 602.

Language in Education: Theory and Practice
Series ISBN: 87281-092-5

ISBN: 87281-129-8

September 1980

3520 Prospect Street NW
Washington DC 20007

Printed in the U.S.A.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) is a nationwide network of information centers, each responsible for a given educational level or field of study. ERIC is supported by the National Institute of Education of the U.S. Department of Education. The basic objective of ERIC is to make current developments in educational research, instruction, and personnel preparation more readily accessible to educators and members of related professions.

ERIC/CLL. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics (ERIC/CLL), one of the specialized clearinghouses in the ERIC system, is operated by the Center for Applied Linguistics. ERIC/CLL is specifically responsible for the collection and dissemination of information in the general area of research and application in languages, linguistics, and language teaching and learning.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE. In addition to processing information, ERIC/CLL is also involved in information synthesis and analysis. The Clearinghouse commissions recognized authorities in languages and linguistics to write analyses of the current issues in their areas of specialty. The resultant documents, intended for use by educators and researchers, are published under the title Language in Education: Theory and Practice.* The series includes practical guides for classroom teachers, extensive state-of-the-art papers, and selected bibliographies.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either ACTFL or NIE. This publication is not printed at the expense of the Federal Government.

This publication may be purchased directly from the Center for Applied Linguistics. It also will be announced in the ERIC monthly abstract journal Resources in Education (RIE) and will be available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Computer Microfilm International Corp., P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. See RIE for ordering information and ED number.

For further information on the ERIC system, ERIC/CLL, and Center/Clearinghouse publications, write to ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3520 Prospect St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

From 1974 through 1977, all Clearinghouse publications appeared as the CAL-ERIC/CLL Series on Languages and Linguistics. Although more papers are being added to the original series, the majority of the ERIC/CLL information analysis products will be included in the Language in Education series.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

The cooperation in this project of the Language Processing Center, Georgetown University, is hereby gratefully acknowledged. Our thanks also go to Elizabeth Massey, The Japan Society; Ronald Walton, University of Pennsylvania; Dayle Barnes, University of Pittsburgh; Donald Willis and Patrick Moran, University of Colorado; George Chao, University of Chicago; John Wang, Stanford University; Timothy Light, University of Arizona; John DeFrancis, University of Hawaii; Eleanor Jorden, Cornell University; James Wrenn, Brown University; and Gilbert Roy, University of Virginia, for their help in developing our survey questionnaire. Finally, we have greatly appreciated the support of the Chinese Language Teachers' Association through all phases of the project.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken in order to provide current data and comprehensive information about Chinese language instruction in U.S. higher education. This is not a new area of interest for CAL and the ERIC Clearinghouse; in 1968 we commissioned a work by James J. Wrenn, Chinese Language Teaching in the United States: The State of the Art. Two major works treating Chinese studies have appeared since Wrenn's publication: Lindbeck (1971), Understanding China and Lambert (1973), Language and Area Studies Review. However, these contain limited discussion of Chinese language teaching and treat data through the end of the 1960s only. The surveys conducted by the Modern Language Association have provided enrollment statistics for Chinese language courses in fall 1970, 1972, 1974, and 1977, but they offer only an indication of overall trends, since the MLA collects only total enrollment figures for undergraduate and graduate courses.

The present report is based on the responses to a survey questionnaire we mailed out early in 1979. The report follows the structure of the questionnaire, with the exception of Section 2, a retrospective view by Wrenn of his earlier report. In this section, Wrenn examines the changes (or lack of them) that have taken place since 1968 in the areas of teacher training, materials of instruction, library resources, and overseas language-training resources.

Section 3 of the report provides an overview of our survey procedures and descriptions of the institutional categories by which we cross-tabulated much of the information obtained from our respondents. In addition, we discuss the rate of return of the survey and the responses obtained from institutions which, at the time of the survey, had recently abandoned their Chinese language instructional programs.

Section 4 treats overall enrollments and enrollment trends, and compares them with data obtained from the MLA surveys. It examines the number of enrollments in "language-learning" and "language-using" courses, courses about Chinese offered in English, summer courses, and extension courses. It also describes the undergraduate and graduate degrees offered by our respondents' institutions and provides statistics on the number of students having received these degrees during calendar year 1978.

Section 5 deals with the teachers of Chinese, as described by our respondents. What responsibilities do they have? What proportion are native speakers, and how recently have they had the opportunity to upgrade their pedagogical and linguistic training, and their knowledge of current idiomatic usage in Mandarin? How many openings for instructional personnel are there likely to be over the next five years in American institutions of higher education? What instructor-related changes are considered by our respondents to be most important for the betterment of Chinese language instruction on the campuses in this country?

An extensive list of Chinese materials of instruction has been published recently by CAL--Dora E. Johnson et al., Languages of Eastern Asia (A Survey of Materials for the Study of the Uncommonly Taught Languages), 1976--and the file of these materials at the Center undergoes constant updating. Information has not been available, however, about what materials are most used in first-year through fourth-year Chinese (both basic texts and character instruction materials) as well as supplementary materials (both printed and audiovisual). In Section 6 of our report, we attempt to catalogue this information and to obtain an assessment from our respondents as to what sorts of materials are most needed, as well as what materials of instruction individuals are now developing on their own.

In Section 7, we discuss a number of aspects of Chinese language instructional programs in American higher education. Chinese is taught in American colleges and universities in a variety of different types of academic "units," some of them quite surprising to the uninitiated observer. In addition to commenting upon this issue, we catalogue the various ways in which Chinese language instruction is organized and discuss class size and number of sections of first-year Chinese, as well as the total number of hours of instruction per year per student in first-year through fourth-year language courses. We also analyze the amount of emphasis placed upon various language skills (for example, pronunciation, mastery of grammatical structures, mastery of Chinese characters) in different kinds of institutions from elementary through advanced language instruction. We review the kinds of testing that are done both for placement and for demonstration of achievement. We consider study abroad, including the number of students who go to the Far East for Chinese language study and what institutions they attend there. Finally, we analyze the returns from a small survey done of institutions that provide instruction in Chinese only through a self-instructional mode.

In Section 8, we consider questions relating to students of Chinese at the undergraduate and graduate levels. What is the language competence in Chinese of incoming students, and how have they obtained this competence? What is the language competence of departing students? Why are these students studying Chinese, and what do they end up doing after they receive their diplomas?

Section 9 deals with the funding of Chinese language instruction on U.S. campuses. In addition to analyzing the information returned by our respondents, we review the results of our investigation of a number of federal agencies and private foundations that have provided funds in the past for Chinese language instruction and materials development.

Section 10 of the report summarizes the salient findings of our survey and enumerates the recommendations that follow from the information gathered in this research.

Even as the data were being keypunched and analyzed in summer and fall 1979, there was evidence that enrollments in Chinese language courses were increasing rather dramatically in some institutions because of the impact on American public opinion of normalization of relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China. It is extremely likely, therefore, that the enrollment figures and some of the other information discussed below no longer reflect accurately the current status of Chinese language instruction. For instance, enrollments in elementary courses in fall 1979 were probably higher than in fall 1978, the year for which we gathered our data. In any event, the comprehensive data we have gathered for academic year 1978-79 will serve as baseline information for similar studies to be conducted with our questionnaire or an adaptation of it--in the future.

2.0 CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE U.S.: THE STATE OF THE ART - A RETROSPECTIVE VIEW,[1]

James J. Wrenn

In reviewing the state-of-the-art report that I prepared in 1968, it is clear that some of the problems that were with us then are still with us, some have been brought to partial solution, and much has changed in response to advances in the field and to a different political climate. Some problems, once perceived as simple, have begun to show their complexities.

2.1 The Difficulty of the Chinese Writing System

We assumed then, and still do, that most students learn written Chinese after they have some control over spoken Chinese, but that they learn Chinese so that they will be better able to read Chinese, to talk in Chinese with others about their reading, and, at more advanced levels, to conduct research using sources in written Chinese. Chinese is still not studied as a spoken language alone (even though a few students have this as their ultimate goal), and in addition to spoken Chinese, students are expected to learn--and teachers to teach--the Chinese writing system and the reading of Chinese. The dialect taught in American schools is still Standard Chinese (Putonghua or "Mandarin"), although other dialects are also taught in a few institutions.

Reading is introduced in most Chinese courses, but because of the difficulty of the writing system and its lack of dependence on the spoken language, the level of reading competence that is reached after two or three years of study is still so low as to leave the student "functionally illiterate." While many of the "familiar" Western languages are closely related to English, Chinese, by contrast, has almost no common stock of words that are similar in form or meaning to any of the European languages, and it uses grammatical categories that are unfamiliar to speakers of most European languages. In the case of the more familar languages, we can assume that the student, in learning to listen and speak, will achieve a parallel competence in reading; we cannot make this assumption for Chinese.

In addition, the continuity of the Chinese writing system forces us to live with the fact that any item out of the past can exist in modern usage, so we must accommodate our methodologies to the entire range of script modifications, styles, and literary genres that characterizes the written record of the last two and one-half millennia of Chinese literary output.

2.2 Demands for Language Training

There is still a strong demand for language training in Chinese, although we no longer have a sense of emergency in our need. Americans now have increased opportunity for contact with the Chinese-speaking world, and more and more students and administrators are willing to commit time and resources to the learning and teaching of Chinese.

But there has been a shift. As we begin to take for granted the wider availability of those who can speak and read Chinese, we are now aware that in all but a few narrowly defined areas, much more is needed. We need content specialists who are competent in Chinese. The number of opportunities for scholars and researchers with advanced degrees in Chinese has become sharply restricted.[2] Opportunities in scientific research, business, and teaching--both here and in Chinese-speaking areas--are more widely available to those with competence in Chinese. However, we still need to develop attitudes toward the study of Chinese that will encourage more intelligent and highly motivated students to begin the study of Chinese as a foundation for careers in business and in disciplines for which Chinese language skills are prerequisite.

The single element that inhibits more rapid increase of institutions offering Chinese language instruction at all levels at the present time is cost. Federal funding for language programs has been

sharply reduced, and the prospect that it will be expanded is not sufficiently certain to encourage academic administrators to commit scarce institutional resources to the expansion of old programs, much less to create new ones.

In this time of financial stress, university administrators are speaking less of humanistic goals and more of cost effectiveness. We are being encouraged to look less at the quality of our graduate faculty and more at the quality of our undergraduate instruction. Clearly, we must do both.

2.3 Teacher Development

Earlier anxieties about manpower resources have abated with time and continual training, especially with the development of a large number of specialists in Chinese linguistics, many of whom are able language teachers as well. The need for Chinese language training will continue to expand, but slowly; we will not need many more teachers in the near future. However, we are still short of qualified teachers who understand the importance of good language habits, who understand how to teach language, and who believe language teaching is important.

Although teachers' manuals for newer materials provide careful directions, the specific skills required in the teaching of Chinese to non-native speakers of Chinese have rarely been taught formally. Bilingual Chinese/English education has begun to take a higher priority.

In many smaller institutions with limited offerings on China, the expectation persists that someone who is "in Chinese" is necessarily competent to teach the language. Although Chinese language teachers are asked less often to teach Chinese area or civilization courses, there are still many individuals who are by training and inclination historians or political scientists pressed into service as language teachers.

Thus, although there have been notable improvements in the teaching materials available to us, the lack of formal training in language teaching and the use of part-time teachers whose primary interests are not in language teaching have kept our language-teaching techniques at a consistently low level of development in many institutions.

At the secondary school level, there is considerably less interest in developing new programs in Chinese language, and existing programs can be adequately staffed from the pool of available teachers, as long as there is a small number of replacements for those who retire or change careers. The problems of cultural and linguistic adaptation for native Chinese who are beginning to teach in this country have become reduced through improved English language teaching in Taiwan, where most of our native Chinese teachers come from. The increasing opportunities for Americans to live in Asia in Chinese-speaking communities during their undergraduate and graduate training have made it possible for them to gain better fluency in the language. The development of materials for teaching Chinese language that are suitable for use by relatively unskilled teachers has also temporarily reduced the need for expensive teacher-training programs in Standard Chinese.

Because we have a relatively stable population of language teachers, many of whom have come most directly from Taiwan and are out of touch with recent changes, we will continue to have a slow accommodation to, and recognition of, changes in the writing system, lexicon, grammar, and culture resulting from political events of the past thirty years. This is a problem that can be effectively addressed through the preparation and use of materials that present these changes.

2.4 Teaching and Reference Materials

With the development of new materials for the teaching of Chinese during recent years, it is inappropriate to rely on Professor Nicholas C. Bodman's excellent survey of 1965,[3] but I will attempt to preserve the tone of his original in updating my 1968 overview. I will omit extensive comments on the particular texts available, since they are treated in great detail on pages 1-19 of Johnson et al.[4] I will limit my comments to texts that both integrate well with the oral-aural approach in its many forms, and which are new or have stood the test of time.

DeFrancis' Beginning Chinese, Intermediate Chinese, and Advanced Chinese are thorough and include excellent drill materials. These texts emphasize the basic sentence method. Other popular texts that emphasize a somewhat different teaching philosophy are Speak Chinese, Speak Mandarin, and Chinese Dialogues. Rather than using basic sentences, they stress acquisition of the basic construction types in the pattern sentence method, which is well exemplified and drilled, but does not require the degree of memorization inherent in the basic sentence method. Another philosophy is represented by the situational method, which emphasizes the acquisition and drill of sentences that are appropriate to a particluar, well-defined common social situation, as exemplified in the series of modules prepared under the title Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach.[5] This method risks the problems of introducing high-frequency, but complex grammatical elements earlier in the course than the other materials, in situations where they would naturally be used, and requires careful organization and grammatical notes to help the student master the material.

There are three issues involved in dealing with the introduction of the written component: when to introduce it, whether to teach the "full" or "simplified" script forms first, and whether one should be taught to the exclusion of the other. It is possible to study spoken Chinese without reference to the

written language; any of the above materials is suitable for such an elementary or intermediate course. However, students are generally interested in learning to read Chinese, and teachers to teach reading, either because of an intrinsic interest in the writings or the writing system, or--more probably--as a tool for reading in a specific field. In a two-year sequence of courses, about half the time is spent in reading. But there is a wide variation in the point at which the writing system is introduced and how much time is devoted to speech and to reading. A text that introduces speech and reading at the same time is Elementary Chinese (Beijing 1971), which has been in a continual stage of development since it was published as a reader in Beijing in 1958. In its later metamorphoses, its basic sentence format has been supplemented by the Elementary Chinese Companion by John Jamieson and Li-lin Shih, which provides exercises, reviews, and structural and lexical analyses to help overcome the drawbacks of the text and make it easier to use.

Generally, most programs allow two to four weeks before the written component is introduced. Two approaches are used: in one, initial emphasis is on the characters that represent spoken items with which the student is already familiar; in another, emphasis is on the systematic presentation of the writing system. The Read Chinese series of three books and the DeFrancis Beginning Chinese Reader, Intermediate Chinese Reader, and Advanced Chinese Reader do both; they introduce characters, and base reading exercises on the materials that are assumed to have been introduced in the oral-aural materials to which they are companions. Both sets make no attempt to parallel the companion texts closely, and in later stages the DeFrancis materials and the more advanced texts in the Yale materials accommodate to the divergencies between spoken and written language, and base material more on written than spoken models.

One series, Modern Written Chinese, A New Approach, presents a more systematic introduction to the writing system than any of the above materials. It is prepared as a self-study text to be used with a teacher, but does not assume familiarity with spoken Chinese, although it does emphasize that familiarity with spoken materials is an asset in learning to read.

The choice of script styles is partly dictated by pedagogic considerations, since only Elementary Chinese and its Companion use simplified forms exclusively, and partly by a desire on the part of the students (or of teachers acting in their students' long-term interests) that they be familiar with the full forms of characters as well. Both the DeFrancis texts and Modern Written Chinese, A New Approach present the full and simplified forms of the characters. The DeFrancis texts assume the full forms will be learned first; the exercises in simplified characters are short and keyed to the lesson in the full forms. In Modern Written Chinese, the simple or the full forms alone may be chosen, or both may be studied. If both are selected, the full forms are learned first. This text contains about an equal number of reading selections in both Taipei and Beijing newspapers.

Although the range of newspapers and books printed in simplified characters is increasingly widespread, and there are a few collections such as Easy Chinese Readings prepared by the Beijing Language Institute (Beijing, Commercial Press 1975), there is a real shortage of suitably annotated text materials at every level and for every field.

In view of the small market, the high cost of typesetting, the planned introduction of more simplified characters to the approved list, and the prospect of the need for continual revision, it seems unlikely that materials for students in the West will become widely available as a result of normal textbook production forces. The production of such annotated reading materials is now of high priority. Students need materials that will present the usage of present-day China and supply the annotations that will help them see the effect of recent changes--changes that may well be beyond the experience of their teachers. To the extent that annotations expand the awareness of both teachers and students, they will be doubly valuable.

For reading materials at the intermediate and advanced levels written in the full forms of characters, there are, in addition to those described above, the Intermediate Reader in Modern Chinese by Harriet Mills, the character version of A Sketch of Chinese History by Henry Fenn, the Chinese Newspaper Manual prepared by Tien-yi Li, and such texts as I Want to Study! and The New Year's Sacrifice, for which the Chinese Linguistics Project at Princeton has prepared Student's Companion volumes. Toward the end of two or three years of study, the student will no longer be working with textbooks and will be expected to make use of an increasingly wider variety of Chinese sources.

Remarkable improvement in Chinese lexicography has taken place over the past decade, and many of the fruits of years of effort are already available or will soon become available in college bookstores. The most popular comprehensive dictionary, available in a number of sizes from desk to pocket, is A New Practical Chinese-English Dictionary, edited by Liang Shih-chiu and published in Taipei (1971) by the Far East Book Company. Soon to become widely available is The Chinese-English Dictionary, prepared by the Chinese-English Dictionary editorial committee of the Beijing Language Institute, published in Beijing in 1979 by the Commercial Press. This has extensive examples of modern usage in simplified characters, with the examples translated into English.

An excellent Chinese-Chinese dictionary, also emphasizing modern usage, is the Xiandai Hanyu Cidian (Dictionary of Contemporary Chinese) prepared by the Institute of Language of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and published by the Commercial Press in Beijing (1978). If the student is working in earlier periods of Chinese, he or she will also want the Tz'u Hai, which is written in a modified literary style but gives full citations of sources. George A. Kennedy's informative and often amusing guide to the Tz'u Hai (ZH Guide, An Introduction to Sinology) is helpful to students unfamiliar with its use. The English-Chinese Dictionary, by Herbert A. Giles, is still available (Cihai 1979 edition, Shanghai Commercial Press) and continues to be useful for both classical and documentary styles.

2.5 Audiotaped Materials

Except for the tapes that are the core of the text series Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach, taped radio news broadcasts with accompanying glosses (such as those recently done by the University of Kansas) or those produced by James Liang at the University of Pennsylvania with a book of annotations (Topics on Chinese Society), very little has changed in the preparation of Chinese language tapes, largely for the same reasons noted in my 1968 state-of-the-art report. Very few teachers have the skills to prepare integrated programs in which tapes have a full teaching role. Institutional goals continue to be varied, thus limiting the market, and commercial publishers are not willing to enter such a small field. The university presses that supply most Chinese texts are not able to absorb heavy losses on low volume. We are still where we were in 1968, dealing with garbled, low-fidelity second and third-generation copies of tapes that were often badly conceived and ill prepared.

But, like radio, audiotape has not died. It is relatively simple to prepare and edit and, unlike videotape, both the recording and playback equipment are widely available, inexpensive, and built to a single set of international standards.

2.6 Movies and Television

Movies and videotaped materials are still under-utilized, partly because the arrangements for using the equipment are often incovenient, and partly because teachers are often unfamiliar with the equipment that is available to them. It is still true that emphasis on literacy training operates to the detriment of training in auditory comprehension and almost assures that a student with only two years of Chinese will not be able to understand programs originally directed at a Chinese audience. While we may assert with some justification that extensive use of these media should not be made until we change our priorities, we should look at what we are missing when we refuse to adapt our teaching to their use.

Both film and television provide a wide range of situationally correct usage, much of which could never find its way into a classroom in any other way. The kinesic range for typical characters is sharply defined, for example, as is the full tonal range appropriate to normal conversational and emotionally stressful situations. All these elements provide a view of the culture that can be missed even if one is taking part in it.

Movies bring greater clarity of image than television, but at greater cost and with some loss of flexibility, since film projection equipment lacks the capacity for easy replay of short segments. For both television and film, adaptations of the original sound track for students with lower levels of comprehension are expensive, either because adaptation usually requires that the movies or tapes be owned by the institution or because of incompatibility of equipment. Another possibility is careful preparation of such ancillary material as scripts, notes, and exercises to make the films easier for students at many levels to use. This method has been used recently at Princeton in the preparation ot study manuals for two films of the late 1940s, Biao (The Watch) and Ai Le Zhong Nian (The Sorrows and Joys of Middle Age). A similar approach has been employed in the Chinese videotape project conducted by the Stanford-Berkeley Joint East Asia Language and Area Center. Four videotapes from Taiwanese television have been adapted for use in intermediate language instruction and advanced language maintenance for Mandarin. Eight language lessons have been written to accompany the videotapes, and the eleven additional tapes are accompanied by lists of characters and short scene-by-scene synopses in English as well as summaries in Chinese.

2.7 Computer-Assisted Instruction

The television screen has another function when teamed with a suitably programmed computer: it is an excellent presentation device for various types of computer-assisted instruction. In recent years as the price of computers and the cost for large memory units have lowered dramatically, we have begun to renew our interest in developing forms of programmed learning. Improvements have been startling; characters that are readable--if not aesthetically pleasing--can be stored and presented relatively cheaply, and a number of experimental programs for the teaching of Chinese language have been developed and tested. The capability of these systems has been proven, but the rising cost of computer programming keeps it from being a cost-effective device for teaching reading. For teaching writing--a more complex and therefore more expensive programming task--it has the additional disadvantage of being kinaesthetically unsatisfying as well. As more responsive hardware and programming become available at acceptable cost, we can look for a revival of interest in computer-assisted instruction in Chinese.

2.8 Libraries

In addition to the textbooks, reference works, and taped materials that are generally available, some of the more important resources for the study of Chinese language and literature in America are those shared by the community of scholars throughout the country. The most important of these is the totality of library holdings in Chinese language and literature in the United States and Canada. In June

of 1967, these holdings amounted to a total of 2,734,820 volumes; by June of 1975[6,7] they had increased to a total of 4,023,895. Since the 1968 report, the number of libraries with holdings of more than 25,000 volumes has increased from 24 to 35, with 20 libraries holding more than 50,000 volumes each. These 20 libraries are listed in Table 1 in order of the size of their holdings in Chinese.

TABLE 1

HOLDINGS OF CHINESE BOOKS IN AMERICAN LIBRARIES AS OF 30 JUNE 1975

Ranking		Holdings
1.	Library of Congress Oriental Division	414,963
2.	Harvard University	336,023
3.	University of Chicago	210,772
4.	Princeton University	220,229
5.	Columbia University	200,818
6.	Cornell University	195,071
7.	University of California, Berkeley	173,755
8.	University of Michigan at Ann Arbor	169,151
9.	Yale University	164,135
10.	Hoover Institute Library	156,709
11.	University of British Columbia	137,038
12.	University of Washington, Seattle* Far Eastern Library	130,398
13.	University of California, Los Angeles	(83,445)
14.	University of Wisconsin	(78,090)
15.	Brown University	71,187
16.	University of Toronto	60,316
17.	University of Arizona	57,659
18.	Ohio State University	55,675
19.	University of Minnesota	52,918
20.	Dartmouth College	50,160

( ) estimates

*Additional holdings in the Law Library: 15,000 volumes.

In the light of the increasing costs of acquisitions and of the labor costs involved in cataloging these acquisitions, there is an increasing need to rely on interlibrary activity and to consider libraries as regional and national resources. However, it is increasingly apparent that the burden of maintaining adequate catalogues for scholarly researchers will become prohibitive in a very few years, and although the best-financed libraries will be able to continue to maintain their collections for a few years, there must be an increasing emphasis on cooperative cataloguing, searching, and acquisitions.

Competent librarians in Chinese collections are already working at the limit of their capabilities. Very few of the librarians and bibliographers responsible for the development of Chinese collections have been trained for the level of responsibility they have been forced to assume, and there is a real danger that they cannot be replaced. Some good Chinese collections have been developed almost solely on the basis of the excellent series of reprints now widely available from many sources.

Library acquisitions have put us closer to our research goals than we were ten years ago. National and local collections have expanded, but the challenge for real cooperation in the development of sophisticated bibliographic controls is still with us. Changes are taking place, but commitment to fund the research capability that will carry us into the 21st century is still lacking.

2.9 Language Laboratories

Language laboratories as separate facilities have become less important than they were, largely as a result of improvement in the drive mechanism of the portable cassette tape recorder and the development of chip circuitry that makes improved fidelity available at a lower price. This shifts some of the burden of maintenance and replacement of expensive equipment from the institution to the language learner and has accelerated the shift from scheduled group study in the language laboratory to individual study in surroundings most comfortable for the learner, at times convenient for the learner, and at the pace the learner finds best.

There is also more emphasis on the ordering of the content of the tape materials so that they are more effective for individual study. Such materials are often supported with workbooks that offer problems for solution, exercises for practice, and self-correcting answer sheets.

This shift of the burden of learning from the classroom teacher to the learner and away from the traditional language laboratory does not mean that teacher time and institutional space will be saved; rather, the ultimate saving of time requires much more time from skilled teachers or teams of teachers and materials planners to make effective use of the learner's time.

2.10 Language Centers in America

The national need for an intensive year-long program in Chinese available to the academic community has been substantially met by the successful and regularly over-subscribed Full Year Asian Language Concentration (FALCON) offered at Cornell.

Intensive summer programs are offered at a small number of institutions in different areas of the country. Some of these are integrated into the regular academic year programs and are of the same quality as the regular programs; others are perceived by some students as lightweight academic vacation periods. Strong summer programs provide us with the opportunity to meet the professional and academic needs of our most able and ambitious students. However, for students in institutions that are not able to staff a Chinese language program during the academic year, the benefits of an intensive summer are often lost without an opportunity to maintain their language skills. Institutional arrangements for part-time language teachers, partial credit for part-time courses, and informal meetings of students with language interests can provide a valuable continuation of intensive summer work. These arrangements are difficult to fund at national levels, but represent a low-cost commitment that should be borne by institutions unable to fund a full language program. Careful local management should develop a widespread, perhaps cooperative, network of individuals who would make better use of the regular summer and academic year offerings of larger institutions.

Some institutions that do offer academic-year programs in Chinese do not have regular summer sessions but make use of the summer session at other American or overseas institutions. The most successful of these select students carefully, arrange for supervision by staff members competent in Chinese, and offer a rigorous but varied program of language-learning activities. Such programs may vary their institutional affiliation depending on the effectiveness of instruction or other factors, or may become influential in shaping the curricula at summer sessions to which they send students. Examples of such programs are the Middlebury Summer Chinese School, administered separately from the academic year program, and the summer program at the University of Pennsylvania, which has been able in recent years to make use of unfilled spaces in the Inter-University Program in Taiwan.

2.11 Overseas Language Centers

There is a small number of centers for Chinese language instruction overseas that have been so closely identified with successful language instruction of our students that they must be considered as part of our national language-teaching resources. They are also a source of teachers, since many of the best teachers in these overseas programs are invited to take up teaching posts in America. These institutions exist in Chinese-speaking communities where both the language and the culture for which it is a vehicle make up a more comprehensive language experience than can be supplied in any institution in the West. After two or three years of language study in the U.S., the student is equipped to make full use of this experience.

The most influential of these institutions is the Inter-University Center, housed at National Taiwan University and administered by Stanford University; others are located at the Taiwan Normal University, Fu Jen University, Yale-China in Hong Kong, and Nanyang University in Singapore.

In general, these institutions offer instruction that is likely to be one-on-one but also likely to be slightly lower in quality than that offered in America, partly because their best teachers come to the U.S., and partly because they are out of touch with advances in teaching. This situation has not changed over the past decade: our best students and scholars continue to work with less skilled teachers at a time when they are having their most significant exposure to Chinese culture.

With expanding opportunities for cultural exchange with China, teaching and scholarship resources in China will become increasingly available to our students. Currently, however, only a limited number of opportunities for advanced scholars and researchers are available through the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China.

In time, the Beijing Language Institute will become more important to students from America, but BLI will first have to recover from the shock of the loss of many of its finest teachers, who have been sent to staff new language programs in Europe and Africa. BLI is also suffering from the growing pains caused by the expansion of its curricular offerings from one to four years, with major reassignment of experienced staff members. Other programs for training foreigners that are now under development at a number of universities in China may also become valuable resources for us. Enlightened self-interest mandates that we make every effort to help improve the quality of instruction in these overseas institutions in every way that we are able.

3.0 THE SURVEY

3.1 Identification of Institutions Teaching Chinese

In order to ensure the largest possible return for our questionnaire, we first identified individuals responsible for Chinese language instruction in the colleges and universities where such instruc-

tion is taking place. We began with the list of 210 institutions that had been reported by the Modern Language Association in its survey of college and university registrars in fall 1977. To this list we added several institutions whose names we had discovered through our search of the literature relating to Chinese language teaching. In addition, we contacted the Chinese Language Teachers Association for their membership list and included those institutions that did not appear on the MLA list. Finally, we consulted the Directory of Programs in Linguistics in the U.S. and Canada (LSA Bulletin, No. 80, December 1978) to be sure that we had not missed any institutions where Chinese was listed as an uncommonly taught language. By combining these different sources, we ended up with 250 different colleges and universities on our initial mailing list.

In October 1978 all 250 institutions were mailed a letter explaining the project, with a return postcard enclosed on which was to be indicated the name of the individual responsible for Chinese language instruction. It turned out that some 70 of these institutions were not then teaching Chinese using regularly employed instructional personnel. We then constructed a master mailing list of the remaining 180 institutions, all of which were mailed the long form of our survey instrument.* We subsequently discovered that 5 of the institutions on our master list of 180 were actually teaching Chinese in a self-instructional mode, and that 11 of the 70 institutions we had treated as having abandoned their Chinese instructional programs actually maintained a self-instructional program. Our rate of return statistics are based upon returns from both the long form and the self-study survey.

3.2 Conducting the Survey

The intitial mailing of the survey form was made in February 1979. Those institutions not returning the questionnnaire were mailed an additional copy of the questionnaire and a reminder letter in early March 1979. Those still not returning the questionnaire forms were telephoned in March and April.

In the process of examining the returns from our initial survey form, we realized that it would be valuable to design two shorter forms, one for institutions that housed self-instructional Chinese language programs and one for institutions that had recently abandoned Chinese language instruction programs. (A list of respondents to the long survey form may be found in Appendix B.) These short forms were mailed to respondents in March and April 1979. Coding and keypunching of questionnaire data took place between June and September 1979.

3.3 Rate of Response

Table 2 shows a return rate of 63.4% for all institutional categories for the long survey form. Given the length and detail of our questionnaire, we feel quite pleased with this figure. No doubt a contributing factor was our procedure of identifying beforehand by name on each campus an individual who would feel committed to the return of the questionnaire.

TABLE 2

RATE OF RETURN OF LONG SURVEY FORM, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large Univ.	Small Univ.	4-year College	2-year College	No AAUP Category	TOTAL
No. institutions on mailing list	17	72	49	22	12	3	175
No. usable returns received	12	46	28	14	11	0	111
Percent return	70.6	63.9	57.1	63.6	91.7	0	63.4

For the 70 institutions (of the original 250 identified) that reported that they had no functioning Chinese language instructional program as of the date of our survey, we attempted to discover the nature of the abandoned program and the reasons for its abandonment. Section 3.5 below is an analysis of the 25 responses that we received to our inquiry.

As mentioned earlier, 5 of the 180 programs surveyed with our long questionnaire and 11 of the 70 "non-programs" turned out to be self-instructional programs of Chinese, frequently managed according to procedures established by the National Association for Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP). Programs operating in this mode exhibit special characteristics; the returns of our self-study survey are discussed in detail in Section 7.7. The rate of return for our small survey on self-study programs is shown in Table 3.

*Our survey form appears as Appendix C in "Chinese Language Study in the United States: The State of the Art. Final Report." This report is being processed by the ERIC Document Reproduction Service and has been assigned Clearinghouse number FL 011 414. It will be announced in a fall 1980 issue of Resources in Education.

TABLE 3

RATE OF RETURN OF SELF-STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large Univ.	Small Univ.	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
No. institutions on mailing list	0	6	4	5	1	16
No. usable returns received	0	5	4	4	1	14
Percent return	0	83.3	100	80	100	87.5

In all, we contacted 191 institutions with our 2 survey forms: 180 institutions with the long form and 16 (including 5 from the long-form group) with the self-instruction form. We received returns from 125 institutions, for an overall return rate of 65.4%.

3.4 Institution Types

We consider it essential to reflect the diversity of types of institutions in American higher education in the analysis and display of information collected in our survey. We have used the institutional categories defined by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), adding only one institution type to our analysis: programs of Chinese language instruction that are carried out at institutions housing a Far Eastern language and area center (NDEA center) funded by the United States Department of Education. Most of the tables included in this report subdivide the responding institutions into the following categories:

NDEA Centers--Institutions housing either a graduate or an undergraduate federally funded language and area studies program.

Large Universities--Institutions which offer the doctoral degree and which conferred in the most recent three years an annual average of 15 or more earned doctorates covering a minimum of three non-related disciplines.

Small Universities--Institutions awarding degrees above the baccalaureate, but not included in the preceding two categories.

Four-Year Colleges--Institutions awarding the baccalaureate or equivalent degree.

Two-Year Colleges --Two-year institutions with academic ranks.*

3.5 Why Institutions Drop Chinese Language Instruction

Abandoning Chinese language instruction is not a phenomenon restricted to a particular type of institution. Among the 25 responses we received to our letter requesting information about the reasons for program abandonment, 22 are from four-year colleges and universities, while 3 are from two-year colleges. These institutions are evenly distributed across the country; several are well-known, well-endowed universities.

The commitment of a number of these institutions to Chinese language instruction is obviously not great: Chinese language courses were reported to have been conducted by faculty members from English and physical education departments, while 3 schools indicated that graduate students from departments other than foreign languages had been responsible for instruction. Only 2 of the abandoned programs had been conducted by foreign language departments, while 7 institutions reported that classes had been conducted through an East Asian area studies program. This last result is surprising, since Chinese language study is normally considered a rather high priority in institutions with such programs.

Fifteen out of 25 respondents indicated that they had dropped Chinese instruction because of insufficient student enrollment. The definition of "sufficient enrollment" varies considerably by institution, however. For some institutions, a half-dozen students were insufficient to justify the offering of a beginning Chinese course; for some other institutions, 30 students were not enough. Four institutions cited lack of funds. One of these indicated that despite adequate enrollment, the program had to be

*Quoted--with the exception of the first definition--from "Explanation of Statistical Data by Institution," AAUP Bulletin 64, No. 3 (September 1978), p. 211. *All NDEA Centers are, by AAUP definition, large universities. For purposes of this study, however, NDEA Centers have been placed in a separate category.*

abandoned when federal funding terminated and the university could not absorb the continuing cost of the program. One California institution was forced to drop its Chinese language instruction because of passage of Proposition Thirteen. In 4 cases, program abandonment was due to lack of faculty. Three of these schools explained that when faculty members left, they were not replaced because of institution-wide pressure to reduce staffing levels.

With regard to the future of Chinese language instruction in these 25 institutions, 5 indicated that they had definite plans for resuming classes in Chinese in fall 1979. Nine said that they would indeed offer Chinese again given adequate enrollment levels and necessary funding. Seven institutions said that they would not begin classes, because they were doubtful of the availability of funding. Four institutions did not respond to this question.

The picture that has just been painted shows the ephemeral nature of instruction in a curricular area that can only be called "marginal" on a large proportion of American campuses. The offering of even a smattering of Chinese frequently depends upon the presence of a faculty member who is willing to teach an overload, or a graduate student willing to assume teaching responsibilities either gratis or for a small fee (see Section 7.7), or a group of students willing to agitate for Chinese instruction and large enough to assure a minimum enrollment.

4.0 ENROLLMENTS AND DEGREES AWARDED

4.1 Data From Modern Language Association Surveys

Since 1959, the Modern Language Association of America has been collecting enrollment data in foreign language studies from the registrars of American colleges and universities. For the purposes of the present study, we have gathered MLA data for enrollments in Chinese from the 4 most recent MLA surveys, conducted in 1970, 1972, 1974, and 1977. These data, reproduced in Table 4, reflect the rapid growth in Chinese enrollments from 1970 to 1974--an increase in total enrollment of approximately 74%. During this time, enrollments in Chinese at two-year institutions almost tripled, undergraduate enrollments at four-year institutions grew by 70%, and graduate enrollments increased by almost 40%. By 1977, however, the MLA data show overall enrollments down by slightly over 7%, with graduate enrollments having decreased by more than 30% over those of 1974, and enrollments on the increase only in two-year colleges.

TABLE 4

M.L.A SURVEY DATA: ENROLLMENTS IN CHINESE REPORTED BY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY REGISTRARS

	Undergraduate		Graduate	TOTAL
	2-year Institution	4-year Institution		
1970	381	4,898	796	6,075
1972	890	7,867	1,201	9,958
1974	1,140	8,328	1,108	10,576
1977	1,353	7,698	758	9,809

4.2 Data from CAL Survey: Enrollments in Fall 1974, '77, '78

In addition to requesting fall 1978 enrollments in Chinese language instructional programs, we requested that our respondents furnish us enrollment figures for fall 1977 and 1974. (See Table 5.) We did this in the hope that we would be able to compare the enrollment statistics we obtained with those obtained by the Modern Language Association. Our hypothesis was that the MLA figures reflect enrollments not only in Chinese language, but also in such courses as Chinese literature in translation and other non-language courses that are given by Chinese language faculty.

Although the overall rate of response to our questionnaire was quite good, as mentioned earlier, the fact that we did not achieve a higher rate of return makes it difficult to compare our statistics with those of the MLA, which are based upon responses from virtually 100% of the registrars polled. The discrepancy is particularly large in the case of two-year colleges: for fall 1977, the MLA survey reported 1,353 enrollments, whereas CAL survey respondents reported only 383. We suspect that this

discrepancy is due in part to our not having identified all the two-year colleges teaching Chinese. Another reason is that 1 two-year college in California that reported almost 500 enrollments in 1977 (more than 35% of the MLA-reported enrollments for two-year colleges that year) did not fill out our long questionnaire, but did indicate that about 250 students were enrolled in Chinese as of fall 1978.

The CAL sample respresents 63.4% of those institutions teaching Chinese (see Table 2). This group reported enrollments of 4,891 students in fall 1977; estimated enrollments for all institutions teaching Chinese would then be 7,992, compared with the 9,809 enrollments reported by the MLA for fall 1977 (see Table 4). One might hypothesize that the discrepancy between these two figures, 1,817 enrollments, is the number of enrollments in courses about Chinese given in English.

TABLE 5

C.A.L. SURVEY DATA: ENROLLMENTS IN CHINESE REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS FROM CHINESE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

	Undergraduate		Graduate	TOTAL
	2-year Institution	4-year Institution		
1974	208	3,979	737	4,924
1977	383	3,876	632	4,891
1978	469	4,316	697	5,482

The CAL survey enrollment figures, despite the deficiencies that we have just discussed, provide two pieces of information concerning trends in Chinese enrollments. First, the CAL survey results corroborate overall trends in enrollments between 1974 and 1977 as reported in the MLA statistics. That is, there were fairly small decreases in both graduate enrollments and enrollments in four-year institutions between 1974 and 1977, and at the same time, enrollments in two-year institutions were increasing slightly. Second, this enrollment trend was reversed between fall 1977 and fall 1978, with fairly substantial increases in undergraduate enrollments in both two- and four-year institutions as well as in graduate enrollments. These increases in enrollments, it must be remembered, took place before the impact of normalization with the People's Republic of China could have been felt.

4.3 Enrollments in "Language-Learning" and "Language-Using" Courses: Fall 1974, 1977, 1978

In the CAL survey form, a distinction was made between language-learning and language-using courses. The former term is used to refer to courses where the primary intent is to develop language proficiency; the latter refers to courses conducted in Chinese about literature, linguistics, history, philosophy, etc. It was reasoned that enrollments in language-using courses would be a good indication of the development of functional language ability in Chinese. Table 6 displays the returns obtained from survey respondents.

For the most part, enrollments in language-using courses are quite small in comparison to total enrollments, ranging between 6% and 15%, with a mean of approximately 12%. This is true for all undergraduate courses, be they located in institutions having an NDEA area studies center, a major university without an area studies center, a college or university offering advanced degrees in a limited number of displines, or a four-year institution granting only the bachelor's degree.

An encouraging trend may be noted, however, in the percentage of overall enrollments in language-using courses. In virtually all types of institutions, this figure has been increasing. For instance, in 1974, language-using courses constituted approximately 9% of total enrollments; by 1978, the percentage had risen to approximately 12%. In four-year colleges, enrollments in language-using courses were approximately 7½% of the total; in 1978, they were approximately 10%.

One might assume that a much higher percentage of graduate enrollments might be in courses of the language-using type. This, in fact turns out to be the case in large universities, smaller ones, and four-year colleges. We hypothesize that the graduate students whose enrollments are being reported here are studying chiefly language and literature and are therefore obtaining a level of competence in Chinese language that will permit them to receive their instruction in Chinese. For example, in the institutions just mentioned, the percentage of enrollments in language-using courses varies from about 25% to almost 40%.

The situation is very different in institutions housing NDEA area studies centers. These institutions, which include the vast majority of graduate students studying Chinese language, show only between 7% and 14% of their graduate Chinese enrollments in language-using courses. The probable reason for this low percentage, when compared with the other institutions in Table 6, is that graduate students in area studies centers tend to be concentrating on advanced work in one of the social sciences rather than

on Chinese language and/or literature. The fact that the percentage of graduate enrollments in language-using courses in these centers increased from about 7% of total graduate Chinese language enrollments in 1974 to about 14% in 1978, indicates that the language competence of these students may be on the rise. We will return to the question of language competence of area specialists in section 8 of this report.

TABLE 6

LANGUAGE LEARNING (LL) AND LANGUAGE USING (LU) ENROLLMENTS, BY INSTITUTION TYPE AND YEAR

Type	Year	LL	LU	TOTAL	LL	LU	TOTAL	LL	LU	TOTAL
NDEA Center	1974	1193	124	1317	451	32	483	1644	156	1800
	1977	892	135	1027	354	40	394	1246	175	1421
	1978	1056	154	1210	387	61	448	1443	215	1658
Large University	1974	1317	150	1467	116	60	176	1433	210	1643
	1977	1357	189	1546	100	33	133	1457	222	1679
	1978	1362	244	1606	99	42	141	1461	286	1747
Small University	1974	875	57	932	44	27	71	919	84	1003
	1977	923	84	1007	71	28	99	994	112	1106
	1978	962	81	1043	75	29	104	1037	110	1147
Four-year College	1974	235	18	253	5	2	7	240	20	260
	1977	261	35	296	4	2	6	265	37	302
	1978	321	36	357	4	0	4	325	36	361
Two-year College	1974	208	0	208	0	0	0	208	0	208
	1977	383	0	383	0	0	0	383	0	383
	1978	459	10	469	0	0	0	459	10	469
Totals	1974	3828	349	4177	616	121	737	4444	470	4914
	1977	3816	443	4259	529	103	632	4345	546	4891
	1978	4160	525	4685	565	132	697	4725	657	5382

4.4 Enrollments in All Courses Dealing with Chinese Language during Academic Year 1978-1979

In addition to the information just discussed concerning enrollments in fall 1974, 1977, and 1978, the CAL questionnaire sought information about enrollments in the whole range of courses in Chinese language that were offered in academic year 1978-1979. Respondents were asked to list enrollments in courses offered during summer 1978 as well. Table 7 displays this information.

If the returns from our survey are representative of the total population, we may draw two conclusions about the Chinese language instruction in this country, based upon the information in Table 7. First, the largest portion of Chinese instruction does not take place in NDEA language and area centers; it takes place in large universities that do not have such centers. Second, the fact that about 30% of the enrollments reported by large universities for academic year 1978-1979 are in courses in English about Chinese confirms our hypothesis (see Section 4.2) that a fairly substantial portion of MLA-reported Chinese enrollments is actually in courses of this type. It appears that only a very small amount of Chinese study is done during the summertime and in extension courses.

The information contained in Table 7 enables us to make some inferences about "attrition" in Chinese language study. In order to perform a truly legitimate study of attrition, one would have to approach the question longitudinally, beginning with a group of students in first-year Chinese and noting their subsequent progress (or lack of it) for through what in this case is a 4-year sequence of courses. As we were not able to do such a study for this report, we are instead inferring from enrollment patterns during 1 academic year what might happen over 4 years. During academic year 1978-79, enrollments in first-year Chinese for our respondents totaled 4,706; for second-year Chinese, enrollments were 2,215, or 47% of those in first year. Enrollments in fourth-year Chinese were 882, or approximately 19% of those in first year. If these proportions are indicative of the attrition rates for second- and fourth-year Chinese studies, Chinese language students are about as persevering as students of the more commonly taught languages in the second year, and show considerably more staying power than students of the commonly taught languages by the fourth year.

The proportion of second-year students to first-year students varies considerably by institution type. NDEA centers and large universities have approximately 41% and 55%, respectively, as many students in second year as in first. Small universities, however, have a surprisingly high 62%, while four-year

colleges have only 39%. Two-year colleges report only 10% of their first-year enrollment are taking second-year Chinese. For NDEA centers and large universities, enrollments in fourth-year Chinese were 27% and 23%, respectively, of those in first year. This is a very low rate of attrition, when compared with enrollments in the commonly taught languages.

TABLE 7

UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS IN CHINESE COURSES DURING ACADEMIC YEAR 1978-79 (INCLUDING SUMMER 1978), BY INSTITUTION TYPE, WITH PERCENT OF FIRST YEAR ENROLLMENT

Course Type	NDEA Center		Large Univ.		Small Univ.		4-yr. Coll.		2-yr. Coll.		TOTAL	
	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year	No.	% 1st Year
First-yr. Chinese language	1288	-	1767	-	891	-	295	-	465	-	4706	-
Second-yr. Chinese language	530	41	968	55	554	62	116	39	47	10	2215	47
Third-yr. Chinese language	565	44	429	24	150	17	96	29	14	02	1244	26
Fourth-yr. Chinese language	342	27	401	23	129	14	10	03	0	0	882	19
Summer Chinese language	161		405		66		65		0		697	
Courses in English	411		1754		192		229		0		2586	
Extension courses	63		49		5		0		46		163	

*The enrollment percentages do not reflect what happens to individual students but simply illustrate that there is a drop in enrollment after the first year.

While the figures in Table 7 represent both graduate and undergraduate enrollments, it is interesting to compare them with the estimated attrition rate reported by our respondents for their undergraduate students; Table 8 presents this information.

TABLE 8

ATTRITION RATE FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS, AVERAGED BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Of students enrolled in first-year Chinese,	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College
% finish 2nd year	54	48	56	64	51
% finish 3rd year	31	29	37	53	-
% finish 4th year	17	24	41	26	-

Two-year colleges indicate that 51% of their first-year Chinese students go on to take a second year; Table 7 shows that in actuality this appears to be an extremely optimistic view, since enrollments in second-year Chinese were only 10% of those in first year. Respondents from four-year colleges were also overly optimistic about the percentage of students taking second-year Chinese; they indicated that 64% of their first-year students continued their Chinese studies, while Table 7 shows that enrollments in second-year Chinese were 39% of those of first-year. And, while these same respondents estimated that 26% of their first-year students continued through fourth year, Table 7 shows that actual fourth-year enrollments were only 3% of those in first year during academic year 1978-1979. With only a very few exceptions, respondents from NDEA centers and large and small universities were considerably more realistic about the percentage of their first-year students who went on to study Chinese for 2, 3, or 4 years.

4.5 Anticipated Enrollment Trends and Estimated Impact of Normalization with the People's Republic of China

Respondents were asked to anticipate enrollment trends in Chinese language instruction at their institutions at both the undergraduate and graduate levels over the next 5 years. Only 3.6% foresaw a decrease in undergraduate enrollment in Chinese language; 13.5% thought that enrollments would stay the same. Sixty-one percent thought enrollments would increase slightly over the next 5 years, with at least 50% of each institutional category responding that this would be the case. Approximately 19% of the responding institutions indicated that they thought Chinese language enrollments would increase by 50% or more over the next 5 years. Of the institutions indicating this anticipated large growth, 2 presently house USOE-funded area centers, 12 are large universities without area centers, 4 are small universities, 2 are BA-granting institutions, and 1 is a two-year college.

With respect to graduate enrollments, of the 52 institutions indicating that they had graduate students currently enrolled, 32, or 62%, thought that graduate enrollments would increase slightly over the next 5 years. Seventeen (33%) believed that enrollments would stay about the same over the next 5 years. Only 2 institutions believed that graduate enrollments would increase by 50% or more.

In response to a question about evidence of increased interest in Chinese language study because of the recent normalization of relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China, 72% of our respondents indicated that they had experienced more interest on the part of students, 39% stated that they had seen more interest from business or professional people who desired to learn some Chinese, and 32% mentioned that the administration of their institution had expressed some interest in Chinese language instruction. Only 12% said that they had seen no such evidence, and less than 4% said that it was too early to tell.

4.6 Degrees Awarded during Calendar Year 1978

Table 9 shows that less than one-third (32%) of the institutions teaching Chinese included in our sample offer an undergraduate degree or a concentration in Chinese language. As one might expect, the proportion of NDEA centers offering an undergraduate degree in Chinese (73%) is substantially larger than that exhibited in other institutional categories. But it is surprising to us that 3 NDEA centers, according to our returns, do not offer such degrees. On the other end of the spectrum, only 1 of 11 two-year colleges in our sample offers a degree in Chinese. The proportion of institutions in the other categories offering undergraduate degrees or certificate programs in Chinese lies between these two extremes, as indicated in Table 9. Of the 35 institutions reporting the existence of an undergraduate degree program or concentration, 4 offer 2 separate undergraduate degree programs in Chinese, and 1 offers 3 separate programs.

TABLE 9

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES AND CONCENTRATIONS IN CHINESE OFFERED BY RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Degree Name	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
AA in Chinese	0	0	0	0	1	1
BA (no further designation)	5	3	1	1	0	10
BA in Chinese lang/lit.	2	8	3	1	0	14
BA in Chinese/Asian/Oriental area studies	1	4	0	0	0	5
Less than major, Chinese lang.	0	1	2	0	0	3
Less than major, Chinese area studies	0	0	1	1	0	2
No major (or defined less than major) program	3	30	21	9	10	73
Total	11	46	28	12	11	108*

*Three institutions in our sample did not respond to this question.

During calendar year 1978, 134 undergraduate degrees or certificates in Chinese were conferred by the institutions in our sample (see Table 10). The largest number of these degrees (44) was awarded by institutions housing NDEA centers, though large universities without such centers were not far behind in this regard (42 degrees conferred). Although NDEA centers awarded the highest average number of undergraduate degrees per institution (slightly over 6) during 1978, the number of degrees awarded by small universities is not much lower: 5 degrees conferred per institution.

TABLE 10

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED AND NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS AWARDING DEGREES IN CALENDAR YEAR 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
Number of institutions	7	13	5	3	1	29
Number of degree recipients	44	42	25	13	10	134

Only 18 institutions in our survey award graduate degrees in Chinese. As one might guess, the great majority of these are NDEA centers and large universities (see Table 11). During calendar year 1978, a total of 29 graduate degrees was awarded by 13 institutions, 21 of which came from NDEA center institutions and other large universities (see Table 12).

TABLE 11

GRADUATE DEGREES OFFERED BY RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Degree	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	TOTAL
M.A. in Chinese	1	3	-	-	4
M.A. in Chinese Studies	1	-	-	1*	2
M.A., unspecified	3	2	1	-	6
M.A. & Ph.D. in Chinese	-	-	1	-	1
M.A. & Ph.D. in Chinese Studies	-	2	-	-	2
M.A. & Ph.D. in Linguistics	1	1	-	-	2
M.A. & Ph.D., unspecified	1	-	-	-	1
Ph.D. in Chinese	-	1	-	-	1
Ph.D., Chinese literature	1	-	-	-	1
Ph.D., Comparative literature	-	1	-	-	1
Ph.D., unspecified	1	1	-	-	2
Number of institutions offering graduate degrees					18**

*This institution is obviously miscategorized in the AAUP classification system, since the AAUP classification for 4-year colleges does not include institutions awarding graduate degrees.

**Five institutions offer two different graduate degrees, so the sum of the tallies in this column is 23, though only 18 institutions award advanced degrees.

TABLE 12

GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED AND NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS AWARDING DEGREES IN CALENDAR YEAR 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	TOTAL
Number of Institutions	5	5	2	1	13
Number of Degree Recipients	11	10	7	1	29

5.0 CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS: WHO ARE THEY?

5.1 Introduction

Academic institutions in the U.S. employ a variety of titles for instructional staff. In order to attempt to "standarize" our responses, we defined for our respondents 4 categories of teaching staff that our consultations led us to believe represented the full range of responsibilities for instruction in Chinese language teaching. The definitions that we included on our survey form are as follows:

Teaching Assistant (TA)--A graduate teaching assistant, pursuing a post-baccalaureate degree while teaching part-time. (Our questionnaire continued to state that TAs are not usually native speakers of Chinese; the data recorded below will show that this was an incorrect assumption.)

Tutor--Does not carry responsiblity for instruction; rather, works with students individually or in small groups, usually under the supervision of an instructor/professor. Likely to be part-time; likely to be a native speaker of Chinese.

Lecturer--A non-tenure-track position on a fixed-year contract, either working under the direction of an instructor/professor or working autonomously. In the former case, a lecturer carries more responsibility for instruction than does a tutor; in the latter case, a lecturer can be totally responsible for instruction. Frequently less than full-time; frequently a native speaker of Chinese.

Instructor/Professor--Usually a tenure-track position. Responsible for course development and for instruction, including the coordination of the efforts of lecturers, tutors, and TAs.

Our questionnaire requested quite detailed information about teachers of Chinese. In addition to listing the different kinds of teaching staff according to the above-cited categories, respondents were asked to list the names of instructional personnel, their sex, age, rank, number of years at present institution, tenure status, percent full-time, and highest relevant degree. With these data we anticipated being able to draw a profile of the kinds of individuals teaching Chinese and to be able to answer such questions as the following: Are Chinese language teachers (as contrasted with literature, civilization, or area studies teachers) likely to be female, to be non-tenured, to be less than full-time, and not to have received an M.A. or Ph.D.? Are a significant number of Chinese language teachers reaching retirement age, so that we might expect a greater turnover in instructional personnel than has been the case over the past decade?

Although quite a few respondents went to considerable lengths to furnish us with complete data of the type just discussed, not enough did so to make analysis of these questions possible. We did succeed, however, in obtaining good information about the number and proportion of native speakers of Chinese in the various instructional categories defined above. This information is displayed in Table 13.

Almost three-quarters of the instructional staff teaching Chinese in the U.S. today are native-speaking Chinese: 288 native Chinese out of a total of 390 teachers of Chinese language in our sample. The lower ranking instructional positions of tutor and lecturer are occupied almost exclusively by native speakers of Chinese: 27 of 31 tutors in our sample are native Chinese, as are 74 of 80 lecturers. Tenure-track positions, on the other hand, are much more likely to be held by non-native speakers of Chinese: 37% of the instructor/professor positions in our sample are held by non-native speakers of Chinese, while the respective proportions for lecturers and tutors are 7% (6 out of a total 80) and 13% (4 out of a total 31).

Table 13 underlines graphically the huge difference in staffing levels between the NDEA center institutions and all others, including the major universities. On the average, NDEA centers employ more

than 11 teachers of Chinese language per institution; the next largest language-teaching staffs (slightly over 3 teachers per institution) are found in large universities without NDEA centers. Other types of institutions average about 2 faculty members teaching Chinese (though there are many institutions with a single individual teaching Chinese). The overall average is 3.5 Chinese language instructors per institution.

TABLE 13

NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHERS, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
Teaching Assistants						
Native	28	32	6	2	0	68
Non-Native	7	11	2	2	0	22
Total	35	43	8	4	0	90
Tutors						
Native	4	9	1	6	7	27
Non-Native	1	2	0	0	1	4
Total	5	11	1	6	8	31
Lecturers						
Native	32	16	12	9	5	74
Non-Native	6	0	0	0	0	6
Total	38	16	12	9	5	80
Instructor/Professors						
Native	35	44	22	10	8	119
Non-Native	24	32	10	2	2	70
Total	59	76	32	12	10	189
Total native staff	99	101	41	27	20	288
Total non-native staff	38	45	12	4	3	102
Total staff	137	146	53	31	23	390
Average staff per institution	11.4	3.2	1.9	2.2	2.1	3.5

5.2 Instructional Responsibilities of Staff, by Category

The intent of our questions concerning staff responsibilities was to discover whether the standard mode of staff utilization in the "commonly taught" languages (i.e., TAs and lower seniority instructional personnel assigned to elementary and intermediate level classes, with senior personnel teaching more advanced courses) was also practiced in the teaching of Chinese.

The vast majority of institutions employing TAs for Chinese language teaching are either NDEA centers or large universities without NDEA centers. In these institutions, TAs are used not only to teach intensive and non-intensive first- and second-year Chinese, but also to teach third- and fourth-year Chinese.

Only about 25% of our respondents employ Chinese language teachers who fit our description of "tutor." They are most numerous in large universities where they are responsible for Chinese language instruction from the first through the third years. NDEA centers also employ a small number of such teachers; they also are responsible for first- through third-year Chinese language instruction. Small universities, four-year colleges, and two-year colleges employ very few language teachers fitting our "tutor" definition; in these institutions, tutors are chiefly responsible for first-year language instruction.

Approximately two-thirds of the NDEA centers employ Chinese language teachers fitting our definition of "lecturer." They are responsible for elementary through fourth-year language instruction. The pattern appears to be different for large universities without NDEA centers, about half of which employ lecturers who teach only first- and second-year language. In four-year colleges, approximately two-thirds of which employ such staff, they are responsible for the first through the third years of instruction.

In NDEA centers, instructor/professors teach everything from first-year through fourth-year Chinese language. Such is not the case, however, at large universities not having NDEA centers; at about 70% of these institutions, instructor/professors teach first-year Chinese language. Slightly more than 60%

teach second year; slightly more than 50% teach third- and fourth-year Chinese language. About half the smaller universities indicated that instructor/professors teach Chinese language courses from first through third year. For fourth year, the percentage is somewhat lower: slightly over 30%. Instructor/professors teach first- and second-year Chinese language at almost 70% of the four-year colleges, and they teach third- and fourth-year Chinese at about 50%. Eight out of 9 two-year colleges stated that instructor/professors teach first-year Chinese, and only 5 reported that instructor/professors teach second-year Chinese language.

We conclude from these data that staffing patterns for Chinese language instruction are somewhat different from those for the commonly taught languages, where staff with less seniority tend to teach only lower-division courses. As we have seen just above, lower-level staff frequently teach third-year and fourth-year Chinese language. This is particularly true with respect to the teaching assignments of TAs in NDEA centers and large universities. In addition, particularly in NDEA centers, we find that instructor/professors are teaching not only the more advanced classes but also the lower-level courses. These staffing patterns probably stem from the fact that Chinese language teaching tends to be done by native speakers, whether they are TAs or tenured personnel.

5.3 Hiring Practices and Prospects

Respondents were asked whether they evaluate the competence in Chinese language of potential staff members. About 71% of the respondents reported that some sort of evaluation was performed. Responding in the affirmative were 85% of the NDEA centers, 76% of the large universities, 67% of the small universitites, 64% of the four-year colleges, and 55% of the two-year colleges. There is further evidence that NDEA centers are more careful to evaluate their incoming staff than are other types of institutions. For instance, 82% of the NDEA centers responded that teaching assistants' language competence was evaluated, while for the large universities, the proportion was 67%. For the other types of institutions using teaching assistants (small universities and B.A.-granting institutions), the percentage was closer to 50%. Only 8% of the NDEA centers indicated that they do not evaluate incoming instructor/professors. For large universities, the corresponding percentage was 47%; for small universities, 26%; for four-year colleges, 43%; for two-year colleges, 27%.

A substantial proportion of institutions--42%--verifies competence in Chinese in at least 2 ways; 20% check language competence in 3 ways. It is evident from our returns that some institutions are more careful to verify Chinese language competence than are others: 75% of NDEA centers indicated that they check the competence of potential instructors by means of two measures, while only 43% of responding four-year colleges did the same. Of the NDEA centers, 50% indicated that they verified language competence 3 ways, while for small universities the corresponding percentage was 15%.

By far the most frequent type of verification--56%--is the oral interview to assure that a native Chinese has an accent that will be compatible with the existing program. The next most frequently used test--40%--is the oral interview to assure that a non-native has adequate control of oral Chinese. Only 21% of our respondents require a writing sample. Other methods of evaluation were reported by 17% of our respondents.

With respect to the possibility of Chinese language-teaching openings in tenure-track positions over the next 5 years, about 55% of our respondents foresee none; a total of 38 openings are forecast by 26 different institutions, 21 of which predict they will have 1 opening only over the next 5 years. Five such openings were forecast by NDEA centers, 5 by large universities without centers, 7 by smaller universities, 2 in four-year colleges, and 2 in two-year colleges.

Approximately 48% of our responding institutions foresee no opening over the next 5 years for Chinese language teachers on fixed-year contracts. Thirty-seven institutions indicated that they would probably be hiring at least 1 Chinese language instructor on a fixed-year contract over the next 5 years, the total number of possible openings being 12. A number of institutions appeared to be including openings for TA positions in this total. For the most part, institutions reported that only 1 fixed-year contract vacancy would occur; such was the case with 2 NDEA centers, 12 large universities, 7 smaller universities, 3 four-year colleges, and 4 two-year colleges.

5.4 Pedagogical Training and Professional Development Opportunities

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they provide new teaching staff of all types with an introduction to and training in the teaching methods of their particular program. Overall, 47% of our respondents indicated that they do provide some sort of introduction to their teaching approach and methods. By far the largest proportion of NDEA centers (83%) provides this type of training for incoming language instructors. Approximately half this proportion of large and small universities provides such training to incoming instructors: 46% for large universities, 44% for smaller ones. Thirty-six percent is the corresponding figure for both four-year and two-year colleges. While these statistics appear to underline impressively the NDEA centers' commitment to quality in Chinese language instruction, it could be that--at least in part--this training is necessary in order to coordinate the various pedagogical approaches of a large teaching staff.

Virtually all respondents who indicated that some training in their teaching methods was provided described this activity briefly. These comments reveal a wide diversity of approaches to teacher training, ranging from extremely perfunctory introductions to text and approach, to extensive course work, observation, and supervised teaching. Most frequently mentioned were (1) discussion or course work in the methodology of Chinese language teaching (although in most institutions this does not appear to be overly structured, several large departments offer courses in the methodology of teaching the Chinese language); (2) class observation of experienced instructors; (3) practice teaching supervised by experienced instructors. A very small number of institutions require new instructors to take course work to prepare them for teaching; a larger number encourage new instructors to take such course work--for example, courses in Chinese linguistics.

Respondents were asked whether Chinese language-teaching staff, regardless of level, are provided the opportunity to upgrade their pedagogical competence. Sixty-five percent responded in the affirmative. Comments received were among the most voluminous on the questionnaire. Most respondents either implied or stated explicitly that the initiative for professional development rests with the individual instructor, though some (obviously responsible for large programs employing TAs or other subordinate instructors) describe extensive professional development programs. Only one respondent mentioned specifically that one criterion of faculty evaluation on that campus is the amount of time devoted to improvement of teaching.

The most frequently mentioned professional development experiences are either informal staff meetings or more formalized seminars and workshops. Several on-campus programs sound particularly valuable; they typically involve weekly or biweekly meetings of instructional staff for the coordination of course content and discussion of instructional problems. Several such seminar programs involve the development of reading and audio-visual teaching materials.

It is a widely held opinion that many teachers of Chinese in the United States have been away from the Far East for so long that their usage of Mandarin no longer corresponds to the current idiom. Furthermore, until normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China, it was difficult--if not impossible--for a substantial proportion of Chinese language teachers in the U.S. to return to the mainland. In order to document this need we asked our respondents whether current teaching staff, regardless of level, are provided the opportunity to upgrade their knowledge of contemporary Chinese. Only 39% of our respondents were able to respond affirmatively to this question, and in their subsequent comments, it became clear that a sizable proportion of these was referring to workshops and conferences that involved no travel to the Far East. Overall, only about 25% of our respondents appear to have been either to the PRC or Taiwan recently themselves or to have colleagues who have done so. With the rapid opening up of exchanges subsequent to normalization, however, it is hoped that increasing numbers of teachers of Chinese will have the opportunity to update their knowledge of current usage through a visit to China.

As another measure of professional development, we asked for the number of language-teaching staff, at all levels, who were on leave doing research. Only 24% of our respondents (27 institutions), reported such activities. Of the 26 individuals referred to in respondents' comments on this question, 8 were involved in literary research, 6 in linguistic research, 4 in historical research, and 4 in research of an unspecified nature; another 4 were involved in materials development.

5.5 Instructor-Related Changes to Improve Chinese Language Instruction

Our respondents were given the opportunity to indicate from a list of options or to make their own suggestions regarding the changes they believed would do most to improve the quality of Chinese language teaching. Respondents were told to rank-order their choices; returns from this question are displayed in Table 14. Although not the first priority of the largest proportion of our respondents, the most frequently mentioned priority was more thorough pedagogical training before beginning teaching. The second most frequently mentioned improvement overall was the need for smaller classes in language-learning courses during the first and second years of instruction, mentioned by 31.5% of our respondents. Other priorities are listed in Table 14. The most frequently mentioned first priority of our respondents was the need for smaller classes. The most frequently mentioned responses listed under "other" were the need for more funding and more staff to accommodate the students presently enrolled and the need for more accessible study abroad.

The most interesting and perhaps revealing result from this question is the large number of non-responses; 15.3% of respondents did not indicate any response for first priority; 49.5% did not indicate any second priority; 71.2% indicated no third priority. This low response rate leads one to question whether this matter is a central concern of a substantial number of our respondents. Of course, it could also indicate that we did not phrase our question correctly.

5.6 "Outreach" Activities of Faculty Members

By "outreach," we mean activities through which university faculty take their language and cultural expertise "off-campus" to provide services to the community at large for secondary or primary education. Forty institutions responded that they engage in some form of outreach activity; 37 of these provided

TABLE 14

RANK ORDERS OF DESIRABLE CHANGES TO IMPROVE CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHING ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES, IN PERCENTS OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Possible Changes	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	Total % Rankings 1-3
Better pedagogical training before teaching	19.8%	9.0	4.5	33.3
Smaller classes	22.5	6.3	2.7	31.5
More natives as teachers	12.6	12.6	5.4	27.6
Better pedagogical training, TAs, tutors	5.4	10.8	8.1	24.3
More visiting pedagogical experts	9.0	9.0	5.4	23.4
Other	15.3	2.7	2.7	20.7
Missing	15.3	9.0	9.0	
No second/third mention		40.5	62.2	

comments on the nature of these activities. Seven out of 12 NDEA centers (68%) and 35% of large universities, small universities, and two-year colleges reported engaging in some form of outreach activity. For four-year colleges, the percentage was 14%.

The kind of outreach varies widely according to the institution's location: those located near sizable Chinese ethnic communities tend (as one would naturally expect) to have more active outreach programs than those that are not so situated. For the most part, Chinese staff members at the latter type of institution give lectures, demonstrations, and slide shows on Chinese language, culture, art, history, and current events to local high schools, elementary schools, and interested community groups. In areas where interest is high, these presentations are frequent and numerous; in other places, as one respondent pointed out, "much more could be done if the invitations were available."

In the few areas where Chinese is taught in secondary schools (for example, such urban areas as New York City, Boston, St. Louis, and various locations in California), college and university faculty not only give the kinds of presentations just referred to but also work with high school Chinese teachers by helping to coordinate programs, giving workshops, and developing materials. One respondent has taught Chinese to second- and third-graders. Five institutions reported offering Chinese outside the universities at off-campus satellite centers or in pilot Saturday schools. In a few cases, Chinese majors are sent to local schools to observe and assist teachers. Three institutions indicated that they participate in local high school contests in public speaking and composition.

The institutions located near Chinese communities are not only involved in educating the non-Chinese community about China and Chinese, but provide services for the local Chinese populace as well. For example, one institution located in New York City collaborates with a bilingual program in Chinatown. Several other institutions report that their faculty offer English classes or private tutoring for native speakers of Chinese. Outreach is not limited to the purely academic: one institution, in addition to offering classes at Chinese community schools, assists ethnic Chinese residents with their income tax returns.

6.0 MATERIALS OF INSTRUCTION

6.1 Textbooks in Current Usage

Tables 15 through 20 list the most commonly used textbook materials, as reported by our respondents, for first- through fourth-year Chinese language instruction. For first and second years, we requested that our respondents list separately materials used for the basic text and for the introduction of Chinese characters. In some cases, the textbook in question does not fit our dichotomy (e.g., DeFrancis' Character Text for Beginning Chinese), so we have consolidated responses from both the basic text and the character-learning text categories. We also consolidated tabulations for series of volumes under one title, for example, Wang and Chang's Read Chinese Books I, II, III.

Naturally, first- and second-year texts were mentioned many more times than were third- and fourth-year texts, since the latter courses are given in a smaller number of institutions to a smaller number of students. Tables 15 through 20 do not capture the wide diversity of text usage in all courses. For each of the courses involved, at least 10 different textbooks were reported in use by 1 or 2 individuals; rather than list these here, we refer the reader to the extensive list of materials for Chinese language instruction in Johnson et al.

By far the most popular text for classical Chinese is Shadick's A First Course in Literary Chinese, Volumes I, II, III; those materials were mentioned by 18 different respondents.

TABLE 15

MOST COMMONLY USED FIRST-YEAR BASIC TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
DeFrancis, John. Beginning Chinese. Rev. ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1963.	44
Elementary Chinese, Parts I, II. Peking, China: Commercial Press, 1974.	29
DeFrancis, John. Character Text for Beginning Chinese. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964.	25
Fenn, Henry C. and M. Gardner Tewksbury. Speak Mandarin: A Beginning Text in Spoken Chinese. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967.	22
Tewksbury, M. Gardner. Speak Chinese. New Haven, CT: Yale University Institute of Far Eastern Languages, 1948.	17
Inter-Agency Language Roundtable. Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach. Washington, D.C.: Inter-Agency Language Roundtable.	6

TABLE 16

MOST COMMONLY USED FIRST-YEAR CHARACTER-LEARNING TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Wang, Fred Fang-yu and Richard Chang. Read Chinese, Books I, II, or III. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1958-61.	59
DeFrancis, John. Beginning Chinese Reader: Parts I, II. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966.	26
Wang, Fred Fang-yu. The Lady in the Painting. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1957.	9

TABLE 17

MOST COMMONLY USED SECOND-YEAR BASIC TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Huang, Parker Po-fei, et al. Twenty Lectures on Chinese Culture: An Intermediate Chinese Textbook. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967.	31
Wang, Fred Fang-yu. Chinese Dialogues. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1953.	28
DeFrancis, John and Teng Chia-yee. Intermediate Chinese. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964.	12
DeFrancis, John. Character Text for Intermediate Chinese. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1965.	7
Inter-Agency Language Roundtable. Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach. Washington, D.C.: Inter-Agency Language Roundtable.	3

TABLE 18

MOST COMMONLY USED SECOND-YEAR CHARACTER-LEARNING TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Wang, Fred Fang-yu and Richard Chang. Read Chinese Books I, II, III. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1958-61.	62
Chinese Reader, Parts I and II. Peking, China: Commercial Press, 1972.	45
Lee, Pao-chen. Read about China. 2nd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1958.	17
DeFrancis, John. Intermediate Chinese Reader: Parts I and II. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967.	16
Hsia, Linda and Roger Yen, eds. Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1958.	8

TABLE 19

MOST COMMONLY USED THIRD-YEAR TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Mills, Harriet C. and P.S. Ni. Intermediate Reader in Modern Chinese. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967.	12
Liu, Wu-chi and Tien-yi Li, eds. Readings in Contemporary Chinese Literature. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1964-68.	10
Chih, Yu-Ju. A Primer of Newspaper Chinese. Rev. ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1970. (reprint of 1956 ed.)	6
Huang, Parker Po-fei, et al. Twenty Lectures on Chinese Culture: An Intermediate Chinese Textbook. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967.	6
Hsu, Vivian. Readings from the People's Daily. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1975.	5
DeFrancis, John. Advanced Chinese. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966.	4

TABLE 20

MOST COMMONLY USED FOURTH-YEAR TEXTS

Text	No. Times Mentioned
Liu, Wu-chi and Tien-yi Li, eds. Readings in Contemporary Chinese Literature. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1964-68.	10
Chi, Wen-shun, ed. Readings in Chinese Communist Documents. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1963.	3
Chih, Yu-Ju. A Primer of Newspaper Chinese. Rev. ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Far Eastern Publications, 1970. (reprint of 1956 ed.)	2

6.2 Use of Supplementary Materials

One question in our survey form attempted to discover whether teachers of Chinese in this country are using instructional materials that are not published as basic texts, but rather are used to provide variatio. and "real-life" interest in the language classroom. In the commonly taught languages, a wide variety of such materials exist--both printed and audiovisual--that can be adapted by the language teacher. This does not appear to be the case for Chinese language instruction, judging from the responses we obtained, and those supplementary materials that do exist do not seem to be widely used (e.g., videofilms produced at Princeton, Stanford, and Berkeley). We divided the responses relating to supple-

mentary materials into three parts: printed materials, tapes, and video materials. Supplementary printed materials tend to be the textbook materials listed in Johnson et al., and are used most frequently in first-year Chinese instruction. Only 10 respondents (9% of our return) said that they were using such materials. Virtually all the "supplementary" audiotapes that are used seem to be the tape programs of the standard text materials. Only 12 respondents (11% of the sample) made specific mention of audiotaped materials. It is very likely, however, that a substantially larger proportion of Chinese teachers does make use of these programs. Since we did not ask whether our respondents were using the taped materials that accompany their basic text, we cannot verify this point. Only 5 respondents indicated that they make use of supplementary video materials. One respondent is using a slide-tape presentation, "Young American Scholars Travel in the People's Republic of China," by Berninghausen and Chiang; two respondents use the Princeton videofilm Biao (The Watch); and one of these uses the Princeton film Ai Le Zhong Nian (The Sorrows of Middle Age).

6.3 Most Needed Materials of Instruction

Most of our information concerning this topic comes from a question in which our respondents were asked to rank-order a number of types of materials that they might need. The options we supplied are listed in the left-hand column of Table 21. Responses for ranks 1 through 3 are found in this table as well as an expression of overall interest (a sum of ranks 1, 2, and 3).

TABLE 21

MATERIALS OF INSTRUCTION MOST NEEDED FOR CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, BY RANK ORDER, IN PERCENT OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Type of material	Ranked First	Ranked Second	Ranked Third	Total % Rankings 1-3
Graded reading material	28	17	14	59
Graded listening comprehension materials	19	32	12	63
"Real-life" listening comprehension material from Chinese TV and films (Hong Kong and Taiwan)	12	9	22	43
Materials from the Peoples Republic of China for both listening and reading	13	13	11	37
Better materials to teach Chinese characters to Americans	12	12	12	36
Other	8	3	5	16
Missing	9	6	6	-

Graded reading material was given first priority by 28% of our respondents; 19% listed graded listening comprehension materials as most important. Listening comprehension materials were ranked second by 32% of our respondents, and "real-life" listening comprehension material from Chinese television and film was indicated as the third most important area for materials development by 22% of our respondents. The fact that the first three options listed on our question turned out to have the largest proportion of responses for ranks 1, 2, and 3, respectively, causes us some concern about the validity of any conclusions that we may make here. It could be that a significant proportion of our respondents simply rank-ordered the first three options in our questionnaire. It could also be, of course, that in constructing our questionnaire, we by chance listed our options in a way that corresponded with perceived needs.

If one adds the first, second, and third rankings in order to obtain the percentage of respondents who mentioned a particular type of material (see the right-hand column of Table 21), one obtains a slightly different picture of priorities. Overall, graded listening materials were mentioned by the largest proportion of our respondents (63%), followed closely by graded reading materials (59%). The next three categories of materials listed on our questionnaire fell well below those just mentioned, although a substantial proportion of respondents obviously feels that there is a need for these materials: "real-life" listening comprehension materials from Chinese television and film (43%), listening and reading comprehension materials from the PRC (37%), and better materials to teach Chinese characters to Americans (36%). A total of 19 respondents indicated a need for a wide variety of other materials, including audiotapes (5 respondents, which supports even further our conclusion that this is the first priority of the field), "textbooks from the Far East," "programmed (self-correcting) instruc-

tional materials," "bilingual dictionary," "second-year text," "grammar book," "dialogues," and "transparencies."

One respondent commented upon the need for textbooks "which are designed for teaching students in America with no cultural exposure to China...which...teach them to say things that Chinese say frequently...but which also teach them to say things that American students are going to want to say or talk about even if low frequency or unusual in China, i.e., 'pass the butter,' 'to hitchhike,' 'televison program,' etc." This same respondent mentioned that the materials of the Inter-Agency Language Roundtable's Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach come closest to achieving this.

6.4 Materials under Development

In response to a question asking whether anyone in the Chinese language instruction program was currently engaged in developing materials for instruction, 37 of our respondents (33%) replied in the affirmative. Most of this materials development is taking place within NDEA centers (9 of 12 respondents), large universities (16 of 46 respondents), and small universities (9 of 28 respondents). Respondents from only 3 of 14 four-year colleges reported that instructional materials were being developed; none of the 11 two-year colleges reported materials development. A listing of authors, titles, institutions, and funding sources (if any) may be found in Appendix A.

7.0 PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

7.1 Organizational "Home" of Chinese Language Study

As indicated in Table 22, Chinese language instructional programs are to be found in a wide variety of different administrative units in American colleges and universities. The largest programs tend to be situated in departments of Far Eastern language and literature. Such is the case with slightly over half the NDEA centers (7) in our sample and with almost 20% (8) of the large universities in the sample. On most campuses, however, Chinese is one of the foreign languages taught in a department of modern/foreign languages. About half the Chinese language instruction programs are thus situated in four-year colleges, small universities, and large ones. In 9 of 11 two-year colleges reporting, Chinese is taught in the department of foreign languages. A small number of institutions house their Chinese language instruction programs within an area studies program; this accounts for a small proportion of all categories of our sample, with the exception of the NDEA centers (4 institutions, 31% of the sample). The remaining Chinese instruction programs, almost 25% of the total, are housed in one of the following academic units: linguistics, Romance languages, Slavic or Germanic languages, neglected or critical languages, a social science department, other (unidentified academic unit).

Of the institutions responding to our questionnaire, slightly over 79% indicated that they house an area studies program that relates to China (see Table 23). About 19% have a program in Chinese area studies, while 25% have a Far Eastern area studies program. A large number (34%) took the opportunity to describe the type of area studies program at their institution. Virtually all the large number of write-in responses (34% of the total) may be assigned to one of our designated categories, however.

While a large proportion of institutions teaching Chinese has in addition an area studies program focusing either on China or on the Far East, it is the Chinese language instruction program that in most cases (67%) is solely responsible for determining the language curriculum at the institution. Fifteen percent of our respondents indicated that Chinese language curriculum is determined by language instructional personnel in collaboration with area studies instructors outside the Chinese language program, and 11% indicated other unspecified interdepartmental arangements.

7.2 Program Structure

7.2.1 Organization of First-Year Instruction--Non-Intensive vs. Intensive

At 28% of the institutions responding, first-year non-intensive Chinese language instruction is directed by instructor-professors and taught by them and by lower-level personnel, either lecturers, tutors, or TAs. Approximately 16% indicated that each Chinese language teacher is responsible for his or her own class; half of these respondents mentioned that coordination between these autonomous instructors is quite close, while the other half indicated that there is little or no coordination. Only 8% specified that a team-teaching approach is used, with teachers sharing the responsibility for several sections. This approach is particularly popular in the NDEA centers, however, with 4 out of 12 institutions reporting this method. A disappointing 45% of our respondents chose not to answer this question, so we cannot be extremely confident that the procedures just outlined are representative of the whole population.

TABLE 22

ORGANIZATIONAL "HOME" OF CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Academic Unit	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
Modern or Foreign Languages	1	19	16	7	9	52
Far Eastern Languages and Literature	7	8	1	0	0	16
Area Studies	4	3	5	3	1	16
Linguistics	0	5	1	0	0	6
Slavic or Germanic Languages	0	4	0	1	1	6
Chinese Language and Literature	0	2	1	1	0	4
Romance Languages	0	3	1	0	0	4
Social Studies	0	1	1	0	0	2
Neglected or Critical Languages	0	1	0	0	0	1
Other, Miscellaneous	0	0	2	2	0	4

TABLE 23

PRESENCE OF AN AREA STUDIES PROGRAM, BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AND BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
Chinese Area Studies	3	8	6	2	2	21
Far East Area Studies	3	11	7	6	1	28
Other, unspecified	1	1	1	0	0	3
Other, miscellaneous, with comments	5	17	8	5	3	38
Not applicable or missing	0	9	6	1	5	21
TOTAL	12	46	28	14	11	111

From the responses in our sample, it appears that very few institutions of higher education in this country offer intensive Chinese language instruction. In our sample, 8 of 12 NDEA centers were teaching intensive Chinese during academic year 1978-79, as were 9 of 46 large universities, 7 of 28 small universities, 2 of 14 four-year colleges, and no two-year colleges. Most commonly used by far (56% of the total 25 institutions offering intensive Chinese) is the instructional organization in which professor/instructors manage lower-level instructional personnel; team-teaching is the next most frequently used organizational pattern (20% of reporting institutions). Autonomous individual instructors were reported by 24% of the respondents.

7.2.2 Average Class Size and Number of Sections, First Year

Fifty-four percent of our respondents reported an average class size of between 11 and 20 students in first-year, non-intensive Chinese. Only 8 institutions indicated 5 or less students; 15 reported an average class size of between 6 and 10 students. Twelve of our respondents (16% of those answering this question) indicated that their class size in non-intensive first-year Chinese is 21 students or more.

As one might surmise, average reported class size is smaller for intensive first-year Chinese. Fourteen institutions (50% of those responding to this question) indicated that class size for this type of instruction is between 6 and 10 students; three institutions (11%) indicated 1-5 students, while 10 institutions (36%) indicated classes of 11-20 students. Only 1 institution indicated a class size of 21 or more students for intensive language instruction.

Half our responding institutions indicated that they had only one section of beginning non-intensive Chinese in fall 1978. (See Table 24.) Twelve institutions offered no first-year non-intensive courses during fall 1978. One sees from Table 24 that several of the NDEA-funded centers operate extremely large multisection elementary Chinese language instructional programs.

A substantial majority of institutions offering intensive first-year Chinese run only one section at a time (17 out of 27 in fall 1978). Six institutions reported 2 sections, 2 reported 3 sections, and 1 reported 4 sections.

TABLE 24

NUMBER OF NON-INTENSIVE (NI) AND INTENSIVE (I) SECTIONS OF FIRST-YEAR CHINESE, FALL 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

No. of Sections	NDEA Center		Large University		Small University		4-year College		2-year College		Total, Institutions		Total, No. of Sections		
	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	NI	I	ALL
0	1	2	5	21	5	16	1	6	0	8	12	53	0	0	
1	1	5	27	5	11	6	11	1	5	0	55	17	55	17	72
2	3	3	8	1	8	1	1	1	4	0	24	6	48	12	60
3	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	12	6	18
4	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	16	4	20
5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	5
6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	6
7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	7
Missing	1	2	4	16	3	5	0	6	1	3	9	32			
TOTAL	12	12	46	46	28	28	14	14	11	11	111	111	49	39	188

7.2.3 Emphasis on Various Aspects of Language Instruction

Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of emphasis placed on various aspects of instruction in Chinese language from the first through the fourth year. They were asked to consider not only the time spent in class, but also the time their students spend with a tutor (if available), language laboratory work, and homework. In first-year Chinese instruction, our respondents indicated that from 15% to 22% of instructional effort is placed upon pronunciation. As is the case with virtually all these estimates, averages by institution type do not vary by much more than 10%, which leads us to conclude that there is a certain degree of consensus in Chinese language teaching about what is most important. It should be noted as well that major deviations from these averages are not shown in our figures here, which are averages only.

For first-year Chinese instruction, most respondents place between 16% and 23% of the total emphasis on grammar mastery, with such mastery being least important to community college instructors and most important to respondents from small universities. With respect to developing communicative competence (i.e., the ability to use known patterns to express personal meaning), most respondents cluster around 15%, with NDEA center respondents averaging slightly over 17%. Oral comprehension (i.e., developing the ability to understand spoken Chinese) is estimated by most of our respondents to merit between 13% and 22% of instructional effort. Oral comprehension appeared to be least important to respondents from four-year colleges, and most important to community college respondents.

Respondents were asked to rate 2 activities with respect to the Chinese writing system: those designed to develop the ability to read Chinese characters, and those relating to developing students' ability to write Chinese characters. The majority of respondents indicated that the sum of these 2 activities should account for approximately 25% of the effort in a first-year Chinese language course, with approximately 15% of the effort going toward learning to read Chinese characters, and 10% going toward learning to write them.

The development of an appreciation of and a knowledge about Chinese culture is not considered an extremely important part of a beginning Chinese language course, judging from the responses to our questionnaire. Chinese culture is deemed worthy of between 4% and 7% of the instructional effort, with two-year colleges recommending the latter, and the other types of institutions recommending between 4% and 5%.

Responses to our questionnaire indicate significant changes in priorities as one goes from the elementary level to the advanced level of Chinese language instruction. For instance, most respondents indicated that in the first year, about 16% to 20% of the instructional effort is devoted to pronunciation. By the second year, most respondents had reduced this percentage to between 11% and 13%; by the third year, the percentage was further reduced to between 6% and 8%. By the fourth year, the percentage of overall effort devoted to pronunciation had dipped below 5%.

Most respondents reported that between 18% and 25% of their time in first-year Chinese was spent on grammar instruction. In second-year courses this figure dropped to 16%, and by third- and fourth-year Chinese, to below 10%.

Most respondents reported expending approximately the same percentage of effort on developing communicative competence in the second year as in the first year, i.e., approximately 15%. By the third year, however, this level of effort was down to about 12%, and for the fourth year, below 12%. For oral comprehension, respondents from all institution types reported approximately the same percentage of time for the first, second, and third years: 15%. By the fourth year, this drops to about 12%.

While the emphasis on the development of oral competence decreases from first through fourth year of Chinese language instruction, the reverse is true for instruction in the Chinese writing system. While 10-15% of instructional time is spent on reading Chinese characters in elementary Chinese, by the second year, most respondents indicate that approximately 20% of instructional time is spent in reading Chinese characters, and in third and fourth years, between 24% and 34%. A similar increase is seen in the amount of effort expended in learning to write Chinese characters. In the first year, between 7% and 12% of instructional time is spent learning the characters. By the second year, this percentage is slightly higher, averaging about 12%; by third year, the average is higher still--approximately 13%--where it remains in the fourth year.

While Chinese culture is not an important priority in first-year Chinese language instruction, it becomes increasingly important in second through fourth years. A slight increase in importance is conveyed by our respondents for second year: about 6% of overall instructional effort. By third year, the average is about 11% and remains the same in fourth year.

Chinese language teaching in two-year colleges differs significantly from that in four-year academic institutions in several respects. First, pronunciation appears to be more important at the former, both in the first and second years (20% of instructional effort). Grammar mastery is less important in two-year colleges in both first- and second-year courses, as well as reading and writing Chinese characters. Finally, instruction about Chinese culture is more important in community colleges than it is in four-year institutions. These differences in emphasis probably stem from the fact that two-year college Chinese language instruction is directed to a predominantly ethnic Chinese student body that is less "academically inclined" than that found in other institutions. In addition, this student body is likely to have some familiarity with spoken Chinese and may not wish to study its grammar or to study intensively the writing system.

7.2.4 Hours of Instruction per Year

In order to determine how much exposure a student could have to Chinese language by taking a sequence of language courses, we obtained from our respondents information about the number of hours per week the courses meet and the number of weeks of instructional time per year (see Table 25).

Our original intent was to obtain information about non-intensive courses and intensive courses, and to compare the number of instructional hours one could typically expect to receive in each of these. Since we did not receive good data to differentiate between the two types of instruction, Table 25 lists number of hours for <u>all</u> first- and second-year courses. It is interesting to note the different number of hours obtained, particularly in first and second year, across institution types. The higher number of average hours in first-year courses in NDEA centers no doubt stems, at least in part, from the fact that because some of these courses are intensive, they include a significantly higher number of hours per year. Since large universities have a fairly high percentage of intensive courses, we were surprised at the comparatively low total (465 hours) for a 4-year sequence of Chinese language. Noteworthy as well is the decrease in number of contact hours per year over the four-year span for virtually every institution type. The only exception to this is a slight rise in number of hours per year between years 2 and 3 in small universities. We will return to this topic in Section 8 during our discussion of student competence.

7.3 <u>Testing</u>

7.3.1 Use of Proficiency Tests for Placement and Promotion

In response to the question "Do you test your students' knowledge of Chinese with a proficiency test (i.e., a test <u>not</u> designed to measure student mastery of material learned in a specific course) at any

TABLE 25

EXPOSURE HOURS PER YEAR, BY COURSE LEVEL* AND INSTITUTION TYPE

Level	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College
First-year*	191	150	163	148	124
Second-year*	182	123	139	135	120
Third-year	127	100	144	109	0
Fourth-year	109	92	91	83	0
Total instructional hours after following a four-year (two-year for 2-year institutions) sequence	609	465	537	475	244

*For 1st- and 2nd-year courses, intensive and non-intensive sections are considered together with sections of unspecified intensity.

point during your sequence of language courses?", 85% of our respondents answered in the negative. Most of the 12 respondents who answered affirmatively made reference to a "homemade" test, usually used for placement at the time of enrollment. Another respondent mentioned a proficiency test administered only to students who are in a bilingual instructional-aid program. Two respondents employ the United States Department of Defense Language Proficiency Test in Chinese to evaluate listening and reading abilities. Elsewhere in our questionnaire, we posed the question "How do you evaluate the Chinese language competence of incoming students in order to place them?" Respondents were allowed to indicate as many responses as were appropriate. From our total of 111 respondents, 50 (45%) indicated that since none of their entering students possessed any significant Chinese language competence whatsoever, a placement test was not called for. Of the remaining respondents, virtually all indicated that they gave incoming students an informal oral examination, though only 3 institutions mentioned any formal oral testing (such as the oral interview examination performed by U.S. government language schools). Very few institutions appear to be using recommendations from former teachers (5.4% of the total respondents). Thirty respondents told us that they employed some sort of written test, either reading or writing or both, in order to evaluate and to place incoming students. Overall, 42% of our respondents indicated that they use at least 1 method of evaluation for incoming students, 39% use at least 2 methods, and 9% use at least 3.

7.3.2 Need for and Potential Use of Standardized Proficiency Tests

Eighty-three percent of our respondents answered "yes" to the following question: "Do you feel that a standardized test of Chinese language proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing needs to be developed?" Support was highest among respondents from the larger universities (92% positive), and least positive from the NDEA centers (72% positive) and two-year colleges (73%).

Despite the overwhelming expression of support for such a standardized test in our statistics, among those respondents who wrote a comment on our questionnaire form, opinion was split nearly equally, with 20 respondents making supportive comments, 16 respondents making negative comments, and 3 making neutral ones. The most frequently repeated negative remark was that standardized tests would be difficult, if not impossible, to write because of differences in romanization, text materials, vocabulary, methods, and standards between Chinese language instructional programs. Positive comments were that it would be useful to have a nationwide "yardstick," that the test could serve a useful purpose for placement of incoming students, and that such a test would be useful for establishing national standards for Chinese language teaching.

Eighty-four percent of our respondents indicated that they would use a standardized proficiency test of Chinese, were one available. Very few of our respondents (6%) said that they would not use such a test; it appears that some respondents of the 11% who did not answer the question would otherwise have responded negatively. Of the 93 respondents answering "yes" to the question, 37 provided comments, most of which gave conditions for the use of any such proficiency test. The greatest concerns of our respondents were first that the test be "good," and second that it be suitable for use with the students in the respondent's program. For example, would a standardized proficiency test be available for use with students (primarily linguistics majors) whose only goal might be to gain contact with a non-Indo-European language? In sum, the overwhelming majority of respondents appear positively disposed to use a test of Chinese proficiency, if such an instrument (or instruments) would provide the requisite flexibility for a wide variety of programs with many different goals.

7.4 Methods of Utilizing Taped Instructional Materials

Respondents were asked to indicate both the mode of utilization (traditional language laboratory, take-home cassette material, etc.) and the language skill (listening comprehension, pronunciation practice, etc.) most emphasized in their use of taped instructional material. For both these questions, respondents were provided a list of options, including write-ins, and were asked to rank-order their responses.

By far the most important method of tape utilization appears to be the "library system," in which students attend a language laboratory outside of class time, checking out instructional tapes as they are needed. This method of tape utilization was reported to be most commonly used by 48% of our respondents. Most institution types reported this level of usage, though NDEA centers and two-year colleges reported proportions of 38% and 36%, respectively.

Take-home cassettes are the most commonly used mode of tape utilization in 19% of our respondents' programs, with all institution types reporting very nearly this level of usage. Language laboratory use, with all students listening to one tape program, was reported to be the most common type by 18% of our respondents. This mode was most common among NDEA centers (31%--4 institutions) and in two-year colleges (36%--4 institutions). Only 7% (8 institutions) of our respondents reported that the most frequent mode of tape utilization involves the use of a tape recorder in the language classroom itself. Three institutions reported that they used dial access laboratory systems, and 1 respondent mentioned that the taping of classroom activity was the most important mode of tape utilization in the program.

Overall, 79% of our respondents (88 institutions) indicated that they made use of a tape library system, and 68% (76 institutions) told us that take-home tapes were used in their programs. Broadcast of a single program to students working in a language laboratory situation was reported by 32% (35 respondents), and a tape recorder in the language class was used by 27% (30 institutions) of our respondents.

Almost as many institutions as use the tape library system supply take-home cassette tapes to students, which also permits student control over the instructional material, but they are not considered first-priority usage by nearly as great a proportion of respondents as the former.

By far the largest proportion of respondents (52%) indicated that tape recordings were used primarily for listening comprehension in their programs. Thirty-two percent of our respondents use taped material mostly for pronunciation practice. In two-year colleges, however, 6 of 11 respondents (55%) reported that taped materials were most important for pronunciation practice, while 4 of 11 respondents (36%) told us that such materials were most important for listening comprehension. Mastery of grammatical structures is perceived by a very small percentage of our respondents (5%) as the most important usage of taped material.

With respect to overall usage of taped material, the pattern is similar to that reported above. Language tapes are used for developing listening comprehension skills by 90% of our respondents (100 institutions), for pronunciation work by 81% (90 institutions), and for grammar practice by 67% (74 respondents). Although a very small proportion of respondents consider pattern practice to be a first priority utilization of tapes (only 5%), two-thirds of our respondents report such usage.

The results just discussed indicate a high level of tape usage in Chinese language instruction. Only 1 institution (a large university) indicated that tapes were not used at all in Chinese language instruction there. However, it would seem that given the extreme difficulty of Chinese for American students and the large number of practice hours needed to develop some communicative ability in that language, any institution seriously dedicated to developing such competence would use taped instructional materials to supplement classroom time for the development of all skill areas dealing with oral production and reception.

7.5 Chinese Dialects and Romanizations

The preponderant dialect for Chinese instruction in the U.S. is Mandarin. During academic year 1978-79, our respondents reported a total of 155 students (138 undergraduates, 17 graduates) registered for courses in Cantonese. Of the 17 graduate students, 12 were enrolled in 3 different NDEA centers, and 5 were studying in a small university. Of the undergraduates, 50 were in 4 different NDEA centers, 24 were in 3 large universities, 50 were enrolled in 1 small university, and 14 were studying at 1 two-year college. Among our respondents, there were only 2 students reported to be studying other Chinese dialects.

We asked our survey respondents what forms of romanization their students were able to use after having successfully completed their sequence of Chinese language courses. Judging from our responses, there are 3 different forms of romanization currently being used in Chinese classes in this country: pin yin, Yale, and Wade-Giles. Pin yin is by far the most widely taught; 72% of our respondents reported that their students were able to use this romanization, and several individuals indicated that their instructional program was adopting this romanization over one used in the past. Second most frequently indicated was the Yale romanization; 59% of our respondents reported that their students were able to use it. The Wade-Giles romanization was indicated by 41% of our respondents. Students from 12% of the programs surveyed (13 institutions) are able to use a fourth romanization, the National Phonetic Alphabet (NPA). The NPA is particularly useful for students who plan to pursue study in Taiwan. Regarding usage

of different romanizations between institution types, our results show that pin yin is used in all 12 NDEA centers of our sample, while other institution types report a less systematic usage of this romanization (between 64% and 86% of total respondents in other categories). The Yale romanization is used in approximately 65% of all institutions, with the exception of small universities, of which only 43% (12 institutions) report usage. Wade-Giles is used by 6 of 12 NDEA centers and by only 2 of 11 two-year colleges (18%). Institutions of other types fall between these 2 percentages. The NPA is used primarily in NDEA centers and large universities.

Thirty-nine percent of our respondents indicated that only 1 romanization is learned by students at their institutions. For two-year colleges, the percentage is 55%; for NDEA centers, this is the case for only 2 of 12 institutions reporting. Twenty-nine percent of our respondents told us that their students learn 2 different romanizations; at 23% of our respondents' institutions, students learn 3 different romanizations. In 5% of responding institutions, students learn 4 or more romanizations.

7.6 Study Abroad

As we discuss in more detail later, extended experience in a Chinese-speaking environment is a virtual necessity in order for the Anglophone American to attain substantial oral and written communicative ability in Chinese. For this reason, the availability of high-quality study abroad opportunities for American students is of extreme importance. We sought in our questionnaire and in our supplemental research to determine the number of Americans studying Chinese abroad and the quality of the programs in which they were enrolled, based upon the anonymous comments of our respondents. In the time since our questionnaire data were gathered (March-April 1979), opportunities for Chinese language study have greatly increased within the PRC, making the data reported here mainly of historical interest. Several questions of critical importance that are highlighted by our data will continue to be important, however, and will need the continuing attention of those interested in assuring adequate Chinese language training for Americans. First, we must recognize the crucial importance of the study abroad experience for the development of meaningful competence in Chinese; this experience must come as early as possible (preferably during the undergraduate years), so that individuals receiving advanced training in their chosen disciplines are not hampered by the need to acquire basic facility in the Chinese language.

Second, the sources that fund American education must recognize that study abroad in the Far East is an expensive undertaking and that undergraduates and graduates seeking to obtain advanced levels of Chinese language competence are worthy of fellowship support. Currently, neither undergraduate nor graduate study of the Chinese language itself makes one eligible for fellowship support. Third, the strengths and weaknesses of the many overseas institutions offering Chinese language study to American students must be made known. This information must be provided to the various institutions in this country that send students abroad to develop their Chinese language competence. Despite the overwhelmingly positive evaluation by our respondents of the study abroad experience in general, it is clear that some programs are substantially superior to others, simply because care is taken to use appropriate materials and methods and to train instructional personnel to use these tools well. The only published list of programs we discovered appears in 2 publications of the Institute of International Education: Gail A. Cohen, ed., U.S. College-Sponsored Programs Abroad: Academic Year, 1979 and Gail A. Cohen, ed. Summer Study Abroad, 1979. Many of the programs referred to by our respondents are not mentioned in these publications.

7.6.1 Ways in Which Study Abroad Is Encouraged

The most common way our respondents' institutions encourage study abroad is by making appropriate literature available to students: 75% of our respondents indicated that such information is provided to students on their campuses. All 12 NDEA centers make such literature available, as do slightly more than three-quarters of the large and small universities responding to our questionnaire. Only slightly more than half our four-year and two-year colleges reported doing the same, however.

Fifty-nine percent of institutions responding indicated that they accept credits from courses taken abroad. While smaller universities and four-year colleges appeared to use this more than other institution types (68% and 71%, respectively), only 1 of 11 two-year colleges reported that credits from study abroad are accepted.

The third most frequently mentioned method of encouraging study abroad is that of waiving course requirements in Chinese if a student has received equivalent instruction abroad; 38% of our respondents indicated that this practice is followed on their campuses. Procedure varies widely by institutional type in this matter, however: while 58% of NDEA centers reported waiving course requirements, the practice was reported by only 29% of four-year colleges. Slightly more than 40% of large and small universities reported such course waiving. None of our 11 two-year institutions permits the waiving of course requirements for study abroad, although this may simply be because there are no course requirements.

7.6.2 Institutions and Programs in the Far East

We asked our survey respondents to list the institutions in the Far East to which they sent students, individually or in groups, between 1976 and 1979. The 10 most frequently mentioned institutions

are cited in Table 26; some 26 other institutions were mentioned by 1 survey respondent each. The vast majority of respondents indicated that students went abroad individually and made their own arrangements, rather than going in groups organized by American institutions.

TABLE 26

TEN INSTITUTIONS IN THE FAR EAST HAVING RECEIVED THE MOST AMERICAN STUDENTS OF CHINESE FROM 1976-1979

Name	No. Times Mentioned
Mandarin Language Center, Taipei	23
Inter-University Program for Chinese Language Studies, Taipei (Administered by Stanford University)	19
National Taiwan Normal University	16
Oberlin Program (Tunghai University)	10
Chinese University of Hong Kong	7
Taipei Language Institute	6
Yale-China	6
National Chengchi University	6
Mandarin Daily News Institute	4
Beijing Language Institute	2

As mentioned earlier, the majority of our respondents have an overwhelmingly positive impression of the effect of experience abroad on the Chinese language competence of their students. Only 25% (12 of 47) of our respondents' comments regarding study abroad programs had any negative element in them. Institutions receiving the most positive comments were the Taipei Language Institute, the Mandarin Daily News Institute, and the Inter-University Program in Taipei. Several critical remarks were made about each of the following institutions: The Mandarin Center in Taipei, Tunghai University in Taipei, unnamed institutions in Hong Kong, Singapore, and Beijing. The criticisms reported in our questionnaires are not susceptible to analysis and reporting here, since they are for the most part quite general, and there are not enough of them to obtain any sense that they might be representative.

One study abroad program must be singled out for special description here, since in our view it represents a national resource for the development of Chinese language competence that could disappear or seriously degenerate in quality if it does not receive appropriate levels of support. Almost without exception, in our discussions with various individuals around the country involved in Chinese language teaching, we found that Anglophone Americans who are leaders in Chinese language teaching and who do not have the advantage of having been brought up speaking Chinese have spent some time in the Inter-University Program for Chinese Language Studies in Taipei (IUP). In addition, a significant number of native Chinese language instructors currently teaching in the U.S. have spent some time teaching at IUP. Clearly, this institution has had a major impact upon Chinese language teaching in this country and upon the level of Chinese competence of several hundred of the most fluent non-native speakers of Chinese in the United States.

IUP, administered by Stanford University, was established in 1963 with substantial funding, which lasted over the first 9 years of its existence, from the Ford Foundation. Several other private foundations have also contributed to the support of IUP. Since 1970, however, principal support of IUP has come from various agencies of the U.S. government, chiefly the U.S. Education Department.

For nearly the past decade, the program has received support on a year-to-year basis, a situation that has the potential to compromise its quality. Several of the respondents to our survey say that this is already happening. In order for the IUP to continue to be at the forefront of Chinese language teaching, several important changes need to be made. First, quality of teaching needs to be monitored more carefully than in the recent past. Second, the almost exclusively individual tutoring mode that is presently utilized at the Center needs to be replaced by small-group (3-5 individuals) instruction, with a much larger portion of the classes using a fixed curriculum. It is anticipated that a considerable savings might be realized by effecting this type of change. Third, the teaching materials utilized by the IUP should be carefully evaluated and upgraded. Fourth, the language laboratory needs to be updated and better utilized. Fifth, the placement and achievement-testing program needs considerable attention and improvement. For these changes to take place, the IUP needs to have firm funding, which can probably

only come from the federal government. (For more detailed information regarding the functioning of the IUP, see the Report on the Joint Evaluation Session of Intensive Overseas Language Programs.)

7.6.3 Number of American Students Studying Chinese Language Abroad, 1978-1979

Table 27 displays the information we received from our respondents regarding study abroad during 1978-79. It is interesting to note the difference in study abroad patterns between institution types. For NDEA centers, study abroad is clearly a typically graduate rather than an undergraduate affair: a total of 28 graduate students versus 12 undergraduates went abroad from NDEA centers during 1978-79. NDEA center students also tend to spend a whole year abroad rather than a semester or summer: 30 students spent a whole year abroad, versus 10 for a semester or summer during 1978-79.

TABLE 27

NUMBER OF UNDERGRADUATE (UG) AND GRADUATE (G) STUDENTS STUDYING CHINESE ABROAD, BY INSTITUTION TYPE, 1978-79

	NDEA Center		Large University		Small University		4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL		
	UG	G	UG	G	UG	G	UG	UG	UG	G	ALL
Semester/Summer	6	4	53	5	6	0	42	25	132	9	141
Whole year	6	24	37	22	26	6	43	9	121	52	173
Total	12	28	90	27	32	6	85	34	253	61	314

In all other institution types, the pattern for study abroad is different from that just described: undergraduate students outnumber graduate students in both large and small universities, while four-year and two-year colleges, of course, send only undergraduates abroad. While NDEA centers have the largest number of students studying abroad per institution (a total of 40 students abroad from 12 NDEA centers), the majority of students traveling abroad are from institutions belonging to the other 4 categories (a total of 274 students abroad from 99 institutions). Thus, while NDEA centers appear to be sending abroad the largest number of graduate students to do extended language learning and research in Chinese, by far the largest number of individuals with some considerable contact with Chinese language and culture are coming from large and small universities, four-year and two-year colleges.

7.6.4 Institutions in U.S. Receiving the Most Transfer Students in Chinese Language

In order to gain an impression of the extent of inter-institutional referral for Chinese language study within the United States, we asked our respondents to which institutions they sent their Chinese language students. By far the most frequently mentioned was Middlebury College, which was cited by 25 different institutions. Next in order of frequency were University of California at Berkeley (mentioned 4 times), Princeton and the University of Washington-Seattle (each mentioned 3 times), Columbia University, Georgetown University, Seton Hall, and the University of Michigan (each mentioned twice). Each of the following institutions was mentioned once: San Francisco State University, Tufts University, University of British Columbia, University of Pennsylvania, University of Southern California, Wellesley College, Wittenberg University.

7.7 Self-Instructional Chinese (Self-Study Programs)

In an attempt to provide low-cost instruction for languages with low enrollments (of which Chinese is one), some institutions have implemented programs in a self-instructional mode. These programs do not involve the use of full- or part-time salaried instructors. Rather, they are guided by faculty (who may or may not know some Chinese) who organize the self-instructional process. These programs, almost all of them influenced by the model promulgated by the National Association for Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP), usually involve motivated, talented students working with materials that lend themselves to self-instruction, drill sessions with native-speaking tutors, and a final examination given by an outside examiner.

Fourteen institutions returned a special questionnaire that we developed to discover the extent and nature of self-instructional Chinese language programs. Five out of 14 programs we identified are located in New York State; the other 9 are fairly widely distributed throughout the eastern and central United States: 1 program each in Kansas, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin. The programs are usually located in institutions that can tap the Chinese language-teaching and testing expertise of a nearby university, although this is not always the case.

Self-instructional programs in Chinese do not attract large numbers of students (maximum number recorded in a year at 1 institution in our survey was 13), and a program that enrolls a half-dozen students one year may have none enrolled the next. In fall 1974, total enrollment in all 14 self-instructional programs was 38; in fall 1977, 57; in fall 1978, 39.

Despite the ephemeral nature of Chinese instruction on many of these campuses (NASILP programs are designed to accomodate such fluctuations), the programs themselves appear generally quite hardy. Six have been in existence since before 1970, 4 were established between 1971 and 1974, and the rest between 1975 and 1978.

Typically, the only self-instructional course offered in Chinese is first year, though 5 schools held an intermediate class in fall 1978, and 3 institutions also offered an advanced-level course (though the enrollment was in each case only 1 student). The most common first-year texts are DeFrancis' Beginning Chinese and Character Text for Beginning Chinese. For second-level Chinese, DeFrancis' Intermediate Chinese is cited most often.

Instructional time (hours per week) varies from school to school. Six of the 14 schools indicated that the students spend time with a responsible faculty member; this time does not usually exceed 1 hour per week. In most institutions, students spend from 1 to 5 hours a week with a native-speaking tutor. The amount of time spent in the language lab ranges from none to 10 hours a week. Time needed for self-study in the form of reading and writing homework or taped exercises ranges from 2 to 12 hours per week, the total amount of course work varying from 6 to 12 hours per week. With an average instructional year lasting 28 weeks, self-study students are receiving somewhere between 168 and 336 hours of "contact time" with Chinese over an academic year.

All the Chinese self-instructional programs have a faculty member in charge; however, he or she may not have a background in Chinese. One institution has a native Mandarin-speaking teacher and a graduate student tutor who assist the language department chairman in the management of the program. In 2 other schools, the responsible faculty member has some background in Chinese. Faculty with background in linguistics or some language other than Chinese head the self-study programs in more than half the institutions.

Formative evaluation of student progress varies: some institutions administer periodic quizzes, while others base ongoing evaluation on tutor reports. Several programs give a midterm examination. At the end of the course, a final examination determines the student's grade. Nine institutions indicated that an outside examiner, usually from a nearby institution with an established Chinese language program, administers this test. The examiner is usually not only an experienced Chinese instructor but accustomed to oral testing as well. Frequently, this person is familiar with the Chinese oral proficiency interview developed by the Foreign Service Institute of the U.S. Department of State.

According to our respondents, students enroll in a self-study course in Chinese for a variety of reasons, most of them the same as those exhibited by students in courses offered through regular faculty. (See Part 8 of this report). Many are pursuing majors in Chinese area studies and want to gain some familiarity with the language. Others are language or linguistics majors who need knowledge of a non-Indo-European language. Still others are ethnic Chinese, some of whom are "looking for an easy 'A.'" Some are merely "intellectually curious." Most students who enroll in self-study Chinese do not continue with more advanced language study at other institutions offering that instruction.

In response to our question about what lay ahead, most of our self-instructional respondents indicated that they saw no change in program structure. Several explained that they were hopeful for expansion (principally because normalization of U.S. relations with the PRC had kindled interest in Chinese language study) but that budget restrictions at their institutions would probably preclude the hiring of an instructor. It seems that our respondents view self-instructional Chinese as a cost-effective way to offer a course to students with a passing interest in a language that otherwise would not be available.

8.0 STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

8.1 Language Competence of Arriving Students

As may be seen from Table 28, a substantial proportion of entering students of Chinese in 3 out of 5 institutional categories know enough of the language to skip the first-year course. Four-year colleges and two-year colleges have only 10% and 18%, respectively, who are placed in classes beyond the first year. The question in our survey form read as follows: "Of the students registering for Chinese language instruction at your institution for the first time in fall 1978, how many arrived with enough competence in Chinese to place into second-year and above Chinese language courses?" This question was designed to explore the kinds of Chinese competence demonstrated by incoming students; the statistics discussed in this section cannot be compared meaningfully with those discussed in section 4, Enrollments, of this report.

We were surprised by the large proportion of new students of Chinese in our reporting institutions who entered second-, third-, and fourth-year language classes. For example, in NDEA centers, large universities, and small universities, the proportion of new students entering second-year Chinese was in the

neighborhood of 20%. Furthermore, in NDEA centers, 22% of incoming undergraduates went directly into third- or fourth-year classes. The percentage of third- and fourth-year placements for large and small universities was somewhat less: 12% for the former, 18% for the latter. Across all institution types, 27% of new undergraduate students of Chinese placed beyond the first year of instruction.

TABLE 28

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ENTERING AT LEVELS BEYOND FIRST YEAR IN FALL 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center		Large University		Small University		4-year College		2-year College		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total new students	184	100	525	100	451	100	577	100	240	100	1977	100
Entering at 2nd-yr. level	32	17	105	20	101	22	30	5	42	18	310	16
3rd-yr. level	24	13	43	8	55	12	15	3	-	-	137	7
4th-yr. level	17	9	22	4	27	6	12	2	-	-	78	4
Total entering beyond 1st-yr. level	73	40	170	32	183	41	57	10	42	18	525	27

As one might expect, a larger overall proportion of arriving graduate students enter courses beyond the first year of Chinese: 56% over all institution types (see Table 29). One might expect the percentages of placement into advanced Chinese language instruction to be even higher than they are in NDEA centers, for instance, unless one takes into account the fact that many of the individuals being counted here are in reality pursuing graduate work in one of the social sciences rather than in Chinese language per se.

TABLE 29

GRADUATE STUDENTS ENTERING AT LEVELS BEYOND FIRST YEAR IN FALL 1978, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center		Large University		Small University		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total new students	26	100	20	100	44	100	90	100
Entering at 2nd-yr. level	5	19	6	30	5	11	16	18
3rd-yr. level	8	31	5	25	6	14	19	21
4th-yr. level	6	23	8	40	1	2	15	17
Total entering beyond 1st-yr. level	19	73	19	95	12	27	50	56

Where do Chinese language students acquire the competence that places them in advanced language courses? For undergraduates, the largest proportion has learned Chinese at home (36%), and the next-largest group are immigrants, who have learned Chinese in the Far East (see Table 30). Only 18% of those students placing beyond first-year Chinese have acquired their competence in high school or a two-year or four-year college.

For graduate students, the story is quite different: 52% of graduate students entering at levels beyond first-year Chinese have acquired their knowledge at another institution. While not nearly as great a proportion of graduate students has acquired their knowledge of Chinese in a native-speaking environment, the percentage is still substantial: 30% (17 out of 56 students) have either learned Chinese at home in the U.S. or before coming to the U.S.

For a language that is as difficult for speakers of English as Chinese is, it is important that students be able to study it over an extended period of time. With this in mind, we asked our respondents to list institutions, both in secondary and higher education, from which they regularly received students who had some competence in Chinese. Table 31 lists this information.

TABLE 30

SOURCES OF COMPETENCE IN CHINESE OF STUDENTS PLACING BEYOND FIRST YEAR IN FALL 1978

Source of Competence	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	No.	%	No.	%
Learned at home	190	36	9	16
Native speaker immigrant	159	30	8	14
Learned Chinese in high school	42	8	2	4
Learned Chinese at a community college	22	4	5	9
Learned Chinese at another college	32	6	29	52
Miscellaneous prior exposure	57	12	-	-
Unaccounted for (no response)	23	4	3	5
TOTAL	525	100	56	100

TABLE 31

RESPONDENTS' LISTINGS OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION REGULARLY PROVIDING STUDENTS WHO KNOW SOME CHINESE*

Reporting Institution	School Providing Chinese Speakers	No. per Year
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle	Senn High School	(unreported)
Arizona State University	West High School	3
American Graduate School of International Management	Arizona State University	2-3
	University of Arizona	2
	Brigham Young University	2
Western Washington University	Unknown high school in Tacoma, Washington	1
University of Minnesota	Minneapolis Central High School	2
University of Hawaii	Roosevelt High School	2
	McKinley High School	1
	Sun Yat-sen School	3
	Mun Lun School	3
	Iolani School	1-2
	Dunahov School	1-2
Rutgers University	Hunterdon High School	1-2
Baruch College, CUNY	Seward Park High School	20
	Washington Irving High School	20
Monterey Institute of International Studies	Defense Language Institute	1-2
Washington University (Missouri)	Wittenberg University	1
Boston University	Harvard Extension	2
Ohio State University	Wittenberg University	1-2
	DiVillbis High School	occasional
University of Pittsburgh	Mt. Lebanon High School	1

* Few respondents answered this question. We would like to think that there are many more colleges and universities that receive beginning or transfer students who have some prior knowledge of Chinese.

In order to ascertain what sort of Chinese was spoken by incoming students, we asked the following question: "What sort of Chinese was spoken by those students (both undergraduate and graduate) taking a course in Chinese for the first time at your institution in fall 1978, who had acquired their Chinese in ethnic communities in the U.S. or who were immigrants?" Of the 501 students listed by our respondents, 65% spoke Cantonese, 10% Mandarin, 5% Taiwanese, and 19% other dialects. Specifically mentioned among these dialects were Hokkien, Hakka, and Shanghai. One respondent mentioned that in the past, Cantonese had been virtually the only dialect of incoming students of Chinese, whereas recently there had been as many Mandarin speakers as Cantonese.

8.2 Language Competence of Graduating Students

In an attempt to estimate the number of Americans per year who might be attaining useful competence in Chinese, we asked our respondents the following question: "In your institution, about how many students per year, both undergraduate and graduate, achieve speaking and reading proficiency which might be described as follows (include in your totals those students who achieve higher proficiency than described)?" The definitions for reading and speaking/listening were adapted from those used by the Foreign Service Institute for its "limited working proficiency" (S-2 and R-2), as described in Jones and Spolsky (1975). The definitions we used in our questionnaire made no reference to the FSI rating numbers and read as follows:

Reading: can read simple prose, in a form equivalent to typescript or printing on subjects within a familiar context.

Speaking/Listening: able to handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations including casual conversations about current events. Can also handle limited work requirements.

Table 32 displays the responses to the question just cited. It is our impression that the data appearing in Table 32 do not reflect accurately the number of American students of Chinese reaching the S-2/R-2 performance level every year. In fact, we suspect that the actual number of students achieving such performance levels is only a fraction of the number listed in this table.

TABLE 32

NUMBERS OF STUDENTS PER YEAR ACHIEVING "LIMITED WORKING COMPETENCE" (FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE S-2/R-2) AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
S-2, undergrads	153	221	239	74	113	800
S-2, grads	44	29	17	-	-	90
S-2, total	197	250	256	74	113	890
R-2, undergrads	172	349	164	79	112	876
R-2, grads	45	56	12	-	-	113
R-2, total	217	405	176	79	112	989

One reason for our lack of confidence in these totals is that they represent the responses of only a segment of our responding group. A substantial proportion of our respondents--in some cases 50% or more of an institutional category--did not choose to answer this question.

Several factors may have contributed to this low rate of response. First, respondents were asked in this question to think about student performance in an unaccustomed way. Also, in attempting to make the question as concise as possible, we may not have included enough information about the proficiency level we were attempting to define, thereby confusing respondents. Or it may simply have been that the question was located near the end of an extremely time-consuming questionnaire form, and busy respondents were tempted to skip it.

Another reason for our lack of confidence in these data is that by the end of 4 years of Chinese language study in a classroom setting, students would not have had enough hours of language training in Chinese to attain S-2 and R-2 levels. According to data gathered by the Foreign Service Institute, a student of average language-learning ability takes approximately 1,320 hours of training to attain the S-2/R-2 level in Chinese. A student studying Chinese in an academic setting would probably not spend as much as 600 hours in Chinese language training in four years. This figure is arrived at by using average number of contact hours per week for the various Chinese language courses as reported in Table 25 and by assuming an academic year of 28 weeks' duration. We feel that it is extremely unlikely that courses taken in addition to those specifically directed toward language learning would contribute significantly to filling the 700-hour gap between FSI requirements and academic language-training time.

It is widely believed that in order to achieve meaningful competence in the Chinese language, some residence in a Chinese-speaking environment is absoultely mandatory. If one assumes that all those students who spent at least 1 semester abroad attained an S-2/R-2 proficiency level (an optimistic assumption), the total number of students per year achieving this competence (if 1978-79 is a typical year) would be 314 (see Table 27).

In sum, we believe that there are enough data from other portions of our questionnaire to enable us to question the accuracy of the totals in Table 32. This impression is supported by some of the comments of our respondents. For example, several stated that they were not clear as to the proficiency level intended. Several others commented that it was their impression that a student achieved this proficiency level after having completed 2 years of Chinese study, while others said that the level described was attained by their students after 3 years of Chinese study. We conclude that the confusion generated by this question is ample testimony to the need for carefully defined levels of competence for Chinese language and tests to measure them.

Richard D. Lambert gathered self-reported assessments of language and area specialists' competence in speaking, reading, and writing (Lambert, 1973). The data on China specialists were then analyzed in detail by Elizabeth T. and Joseph A. Massey (Massey and Massey, 1974). This discussion is the only national study of Chinese language competence that we have been able to find. The data used in this analysis were obtained from questionnaire forms returned by approximately 50% of the area specialists and graduate students in area studies. The Masseys determined that approximately one-third of the professional specialists who had not learned Chinese as children had either no competence at all or very little competence in Chinese; only 25% of the specialists who were learning Chinese "from the beginning" had "full competence" in Chinese. Both Lambert and the Masseys used a scale whereby the self-reported abilities for speaking, reading, and writing were totaled to obtain a composite score. For instance, an individual reporting that he speaks, reads, and writes Chinese "easily" would be said to have full competence in Chinese. The Masseys' analysis concluded that reading was the most widely developed skill (40% of the respondents reported being able to read easily), while 34% said they were able to speak easily, and only 9% were able to write Chinese characters easily. Interestingly, graduate students reported higher competence in Chinese than did practicing professionals, which gives cause for some optimism about the trend in the quality of Chinese language instruction.

The Masseys concluded that those specialists, both practitioners and graduate students, who had studied Chinese both in the U.S. and in China claimed a larger proportion of "full competence" in Chinese. This is at least partly because those who have studied in both countries also tend to be those who have spent the longest time overall studying the language: 5 years or more. According to the Masseys' analysis, 2 years' study is needed to progress from no competence or low competence to intermediate competence, 5 years to obtain the "advanced intermediate" stage, and 7 years to obtain full competence in reading, writing, and speaking the language.

The Masseys also concluded that a "threshold" appears to exist beyond which extended residence in a Chinese-speaking environment does not significantly influence one's ability to use the Chinese language: at least 1 visit and 2 years' total residence. The Masseys point out, however, that travel to a Chinese-speaking environment is no doubt very valuable in preventing language skills from atrophying. (The above discussion is paraphrased from pages 78-84 of the Masseys' report.)

8.3 Student Motivation for Studying Chinese

Thirty-six percent of our respondents indicated that they had recently polled their students to determine their reasons for studying Chinese. In tallying the various motivations mentioned by the 38 respondents who chose to comment on this portion of the questionnaire, we made a distinction between integrative (a motivation characterized by a genuine interest in the Chinese culture and civilization) and instrumental (a motivation characterized by the desire to use knowledge of Chinese for some economic or social gain). Interestingly, instrumental and integrative totals were almost equal: 37 for the former and 36 for the latter (most respondents listed more than one reason). Under instrumental motivation, the most frequently mentioned reason was the potential usefulness in a career (20 respondents). Eight respondents mentioned tourism or study abroad; 7 made reference to a knowledge of Chinese as a research tool. Most frequently mentioned integrative motivations were a general interest in the language and culture of the Chinese people (22 respondents) and an interest in Chinese culture by those with a Chinese ethnic heritage (7 respondents).

In addition, unrelated to the integrative/instrumental opposition we have just discussed, 7 respondents mentioned that students found their way into Chinese classes because they were fulfilling the foreign language requirement at their institution.*

Certainly the motivations of undergraduate and graduate students differ to a considerable degree. Although our data analysis did not make this distinction, we surmise that graduates tend to have a more

*A particularly interesting and thorough exploration of student motivation in studying Chinese is Richard Thompson's Survey of Students Taking Chinese Language Courses, 1976-77, done at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Department of East Asian Languages. It must be noted, however, that Thompson's student population is an atypical one: over 80% of the students are Chinese or part-Chinese.

pragmatic, instrumental outlook toward the study of Chinese, since they are likely to be pursuing advanced degrees in subject areas other than Chinese language and literature for the most part, while motivations of undergraduates are more likely to be of the integrative type.

8.4 Students' Present and Future Career Plans

In order to discover whether the potential openings for Chinese language instructors in the near future might be filled by the students graduating from institutions currently teaching Chinese, we asked our respondents how many of their students who received their degrees in 1978 were planning to teach Chinese language (not literature or area studies). According to the responses we received, a total of 16 undergraduate students at 9 institutions (6 NDEA centers, 1 large university, 1 small university, and 1 four-year college) were planning to become teachers of Chinese. Fourteen graduate students at 9 institutions (4 NDEA centers, 4 large universities, and 1 small university) graduating in 1978 were also planning to teach the language. If in fact all 30 of these individuals set out to find jobs at that time, it is likely that a substantial proportion of them was not successful, since, as was mentioned in Section 5.3, only 38 openings for Chinese language instructors are foreseen over the next 5 years. Thus, it appears that Chinese language instruction is suffering from the same syndrome afflicting the more commonly taught languages: an oversupply of instructors being graduated by institutions of higher education. It will be interesting to assess the status of this situation once again after a period of several years, since it appears from evidence gathered since our survey was conducted that a number of institutions are either reestablishing or establishing for the first time Chinese language instruction programs due to the heightened interest in China in the U.S. today. Another conclusion one must reach upon looking at the potential teachers of Chinese indicated by our respondent population is that Chinese language teachers in the U.S. are coming from an extremely small group of institutions.

The individual intending to teach Chinese must receive adequate pedagogical preparation as well as be fully qualified to speak, read, and write the language; he or she must also have sufficient grammatical knowledge of Chinese and of English to explain the great differences between their structures. In response to our request for a listing of the pedagogical courses available to students who want to prepare themselves to teach Chinese, respondents from 13 different institutions (3 NDEA centers, 8 large universities, 1 small university, and 1 two-year college) indicated that at least 1 course relating to the teaching of Chinese was offered on their campus. When 1 pedagogical course is available, it is typically offered by the same academic unit that teaches Chinese language--East Asian Studies, Chinese language, linguistics, etc.--and is entitled "Methods of Teaching Chinese" or something similar. One institution offers a course entitled "Methods of Teaching Critical Languages"; another offers a combined Chinese/Japanese methods course. When a second course is available to prospective Chinese language teachers (the case at 6 institutions), its focus is either contrastive linguistic analysis of English and Chinese or continued seminar work in methodology.

At the outset of this study it was our impression from conversations with numerous individuals within the field of Chinese language teaching that most of the students who took long sequences of Chinese language instruction were not majors in the language but were seriously interested in acquiring enough Chinese to use it as a tool. In order to test this assumption, we asked our respondents to indicate how many undergraduate and graduate students taking third- and fourth-year Chinese language courses at their institutions during academic year 1978-79 were majoring in a disciplinary area other than Chinese language. Table 33 displays results of this inquiry and substantiates our preliminary impression. For both graduates and undergraduates across virtually all institutional categories the percentage of non-majors in upper division courses in Chinese lies between 70% and 87%. The only two percentages that fall outside this range are most likely to be subject to error, since the groups they represent are so small. NDEA centers have a larger proportion of non-majors in upper division Chinese courses than other institutional categories. One reason that larger numbers of students may not be Chinese language majors is that many institutions that teach Chinese do not offer a major in that language (see discussion of degrees offered by respondents' institutions in Section 7, Program Characteristics).

We were interested to discover whether or not any common patterns exist for employment and education among students of Chinese language. To do this, we asked our respondents to provide brief information for those individuals who graduated from their institutions during calendar year 1978 with some considerable competence in Chinese language. Our previous contacts with college and university departments teaching the more commonly taught languages had led us to believe that very little follow-up was done of students who had graduated. Since we were prepared to see the same situation for Chinese, we were impressed when respondents from 43 institutions were able to provide information on 135 students who had graduated during calendar year 1978. Of this total, 108 had received a bachelor's degree, 9 had received an M.A., and 8 had received a Ph.D. Ten students' degrees were not specified.

Of B.A. recipients, by far the largest proportion was continuing academic work: 64 students out of the total 108. Of these, 29 were studying some specific discipline other than Chinese language, 20 were pursuing graduate work of an unidentified nature, and 15 were engaging in further study of Chinese. A total of 9 individuals were reported to be teaching: 6 were teaching Chinese, 1 was teaching English, and 2 were teaching unspecified subjects (which could have included Chinese). Our respondents reported that 15 of the 108 B.A. recipients were employed in non-academic jobs, of which 11 were in business and

commerce. Seven were in the armed services, and 6 were in other governmental agencies. Of the M.A. recipients, all but 2 were continuing work toward a doctoral degree; these 2 were employed by the U.S. government. All Ph.D.'s were teaching or engaging in other scholarly activities such as writing books, with the exception of 1 individual who had gone into international banking.

TABLE 33

PROPORTION OF THIRD- AND FOURTH-YEAR CHINESE STUDENTS NOT MAJORING IN CHINESE

Undergraduate	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	TOTAL
Total 3rd- & 4th-yr. Chinese lang. enroll.	275	389	104	67	835
Number NOT Chinese majors	238	308	86	56	688
Percent NOT Chinese majors	87	79	83	84	82
Graduate					
Total 3rd- & 4th-yr. Chinese lang. enroll.	123	46	13	2	184
Number NOT Chinese majors	103	32	6	2	143
Percent NOT Chinese majors	84	70	46	100	78
Totals					
Total 3rd- & 4th-yr. Chinese lang. enroll.	398	435	117	69	1019
Number NOT Chinese majors	341	340	92	58	831
Percent NOT Chinese majors	86	78	79	84	82

9.0 FUNDING CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

9.1 Institutional Support during Academic Year 1978-1979

Our survey form included several questions concerning the funding of Chinese language instruction that were intended to enable us to estimate the total amounts spent, the amounts spent by individual colleges and universities, and the amount of "outside funding" (grant or contract money from either federal government or private foundation sources). Unfortunately, we received mediocre to very poor rates of response to most of our questions concerning funding. In many cases, the individuals filling out our questionnaire form may not have had easy access to finanical information. Even with access to such information, it is frequently difficult to separate salary spent for language instruction from that spent on, for instance, instruction in Chinese history, when an individual faculty member teaches in more than one area. Furthermore, our questions concerning financial matters came at the end of an extremely time-consuming questionnaire form. We believe, however, that some interesting and useful data were obtained; they are reported below.

Table 34 graphically demonstrates the wide diversity in funding for salaries for Chinese language instruction on U.S. campuses. Notice that a total of 5 institutions--2 large universities, 2 small universities, and 1 four-year college--indicated that no money at all was spent for Chinese language instruction. This means either that such instruction on these campuses was provided as an overload or that the respondents didn't understand the question. At the other end of the spectrum, 3 NDEA centers and 3 large universities report expenditures of more than $100,000 during academic year 1978-79 for Chinese language instruction.

In an attempt to estimate the total expenditures for Chinese language instruction by all colleges and universities in the country, we extrapolated by institution type, using the total dollar amounts indicated in Table 34. For instance, looking at the third column in Table 34, we discover that a total of 32 large universities spent $1,238,700 on Chinese language instruction during academic year 1978-79. Our investigations lead us to believe that there are a total of 72 institutions in this category (see Table 2 in Section 3.3). Assuming that the amount spent for the 32 institutions that responded to our questionnaire is representative of the total population of 72 institutions in this category, we concluded by extrapolation that all 72 institutions would spend $2,548,000 during academic year 1978-79 on Chinese language instruction. While this is a risky assumption to make, particularly for those institutional categories where the percentage returns are small in comparison to the total (especially two-year colleges, but also small universities), we have done so in order to obtain an order of magnitude estimate. Adding the sum of our extrapolations for personnel costs to those of extrapolations for non-personnel costs (see Table 35 for our point of departure for these costs), the grand total for direct costs is $5,614,000, of which $5,437,000 is personnel costs.

TABLE 34

LOCAL FUNDING OF CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (PERSONNEL COSTS) DURING ACADEMIC YEAR 1978-79, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

Level of Funding	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
$0	0	2	2	1	0	5
$700 - $9,999	0	9	6	3	2	20
$10,000 - $19,999	0	8	4	1	1	14
$20,000 - $29,999	0	4	5	3	0	12
$30,000 - $99,999	4	9	2	1	0	16
$100,000 +	3	3	0	0	0	6
No response	5	11	9	5	8	38
Total dollar amount	$641,200	$1,238,700	$338,200	$155,200	$20,000	$2,393,300
Average expenditure per institution	$ 91,600	$ 35,391	$ 17,800	$ 17,244	$ 6,667	$ 32,785

TABLE 35

LOCAL FUNDING OF CHINESE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (NON-PERSONNEL COSTS) BY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION DURING ACADEMIC YEAR 1978-79, BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	NDEA Center	Large University	Small University	4-year College	2-year College	TOTAL
No. institutions reporting	6	25	12	6	2	51
No. institutions reporting 0 expenditures	1	5	3	2	1	12
No. N/A or missing	5	16	13	6	8	48
Total dollar amount	$17,500	[illegible],400	$4,900	$5,300	$600	$57,700

9.2 Outside Support (Governmental and Foundation) for Institutional Programs

As mentioned above, the low rate of response to our questions concerning financial matters leads us to interpret our data with a great deal of caution. It seems safe to say, however, that expenditures by the federal government, and particularly by private foundations, are extremely small when compared to the institutional totals discussed in the previous section.

From our total of 111 respondents to the questionnaire, 11 non-military respondents (we received questionnaires from 3 of the federal military academies) indicated that they had received during academic year 1978-79 some amount of federal support. Of these 11 responses, 7 were from NDEA centers, and 4 from other sources. One of these 4, a two-year college in California, was using ESEA Title VII (bilingual education) funds for Chinese language instruction. The other 3 respondents did not describe the federal source.

Unfortunately, the number of our NDEA respondents providing a dollar figure for federal support for Chinese instruction was insufficient to enable us to arrive at an average figure here, thus making a dollar comparison between the information in Table 34 and the federal contribution impossible. For the single institution that did provide this data, federal support of Chinese language instruction was about 13% of that provided by the institution itself.

Some light is shed on this subject by the report of N.I. Schneider, "NDEA Centers: How They Use Their Federal Money." Schneider, Senior Program Specialist in the Division of International Education, U.S. Education Department, notes that expenditures in NDEA centers have increased in recent years for language instruction across all world areas. Her detailed breakdown shows that in East Asia NDEA centers,

slightly more than 19% of federal money allocated to salary is spent for language instruction. Schneider stresses that most of these funds are used for teaching assistants and native informants, and that these funds have the principal effect of maintaining at the advanced levels language course offerings that otherwise would be unavailable because they consistently fall below university cut-off points for self-supporting instruction. She further asserts that "the NDEA funds for language instruction...therefore play a very important role in pursuading university administrations to maintain this relatively expensive training source" (p. 170).

Only 4 institutions reported that they had received funding from private sources during academic year 1978-79. Three of these grants were very small; the largest by far was the $30,000 received by a four-year undergraduate institution to help launch a Chinese language instruction program. Only 1 institution reported receiving money for Chinese language instruction from a source outside the U.S. This grant of $5,000 from a private donor was used in 1978-79 to help support a study abroad program in Taiwan.

We were puzzled by the fact that 5 of the 12 institutions in our NDEA center group did not indicate that federal dollars are being spent for Chinese language instruction. These non-responses may be due to the fact that these particular centers are spending their federal money for components of their programs other than language study.

9.3 U.S. Government and Foundation Support for Chinese Instruction Not Directly Related to Programs

In addition to requesting information from our survey respondents concerning program support from governmental and foundation sources, we undertook a small survey of U.S. government agencies and selected foundations to ascertain what projects may have been funded over the past few years that relate to Chinese language instruction. We will describe briefly below 6 projects funded by the federal government (5 through the Education Department, 1 by the National Endowment for the Humanities) and 6 projects funded by 2 private foundations.

Professor Y.C. Li, University of Hawaii at Manoa, received a 1-year grant beginning 1 June 1978 to produce A Reference Dictionary of Mandarin Grammar and Usage for Students and Teachers. This work is "specifically tailored to meet the problem-solving needs of the teacher and student in a classroom situation through its extensive arrangement of topics and patterns in the table of contents and indexes." The following syntactic elements are treated: types of sentences, order of elements, function words, verb phrases, and noun phrases.

Professor Charles N. Li, University of California, Santa Barbara, and Professor Sandra A. Thompson, U.C.L.A., received a 2-year grant beginning 1 July 1977 from the U.S. Education Department to produce A Reference Grammar of Mandarin Chinese. "The grammar is focused on the semantic and syntactic patterns of Mandarin Chinese and explanations for these syntactic-semantic patterns. It is being written with a minimal use of linguistic jargon since our goal is that the grammar should be used by the teachers and students of Chinese who might not have had any linguistic training." The grammar is neither transformational nor structural in its orientation, rather "most of the explanations for the descriptive generalizations have either semantic or pragmatic bases."

Since 1974, several agencies of the federal government have been collaborating in the development of instructional materials for elementary and intermediate Chinese entitled Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach. This curriculum has been referred to several times during the course of our study (see Sections 2 and 6). The course is innovative in several ways: programmed drill material is all to be done individually with tapes so that class time with the instructor may be used exclusively for realistic communication in Chinese in practical situations; the organization of the content is "situational" in nature, which permits a certain degree of flexibility with regard to what units are covered in sequence; communication games are used extensively to simulate real-life encounters.

Professor C. P. Sobelman, Columbia University, received funds from U.S.E.D. on 1 September 1977 to perform a 21-month project entitled "A Study of Chinese Language Structures."

U.S.E.D. also funded, on 1 July 1977, a 2-year project entitled "Utilization of Videotape Recording for Intermediate Chinese Language Instruction and Advanced Language Maintenance," directed by Professor Albert Dien of Stanford University. These materials have been alluded to in Section 2.8. Fifteen videotapes adapted from Taiwanese television are available from the project director. The tapes are in Mandarin with Chinese subtitles. "They are all dramas ranging from modern plays about life in Taipei to slapstick comedy to sword fight films."

The National Endowment for the Humanities funded Professors F. W. Mote and T. T. Chen of the Chinese Linguistics Project, Princeton University, for the preparation of 10 research manuals. The project began on 1 April 1978, to run for 2 years. According to the summary description of the NEH project, "The Manuals are...on the one hand, language-training aids for seminar-level classwork or self-study, designed to assist the scholar to make the transistion from formal language study to independent research capacity. On the other hand, they simultaneously serve as guides into the intellectual and methodological problems encountered upon beginning research in a particular subfield of China studies."

During the 1960s, private foundations, most notably Ford and Rockefeller, spent large amounts of money to further the development of Chinese language instruction in the U.S., both at the secondary and at the higher education levels. This extensive effort is documented in Lindbeck's Understanding China. In more recent times, funding of Chinese language instruction has dwindled to a very small percentage of

the funding levels of the 1960s. In fact, our survey of private foundations discovered only 2 that had funded Chinese language-related projects since 1975: The International Foundation of Butler, New Jersey, and The Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, Inc., of New York.

Since 1976, the International Foundation has funded 5 projects, and at the time we gathered our information had requests pending for several others. During 1976, the International Foundation funded a Chinese-English Dictionary project with CETA, the Princeton University Language Center, and Soochow University Language Center in Taiwan. Soochow University Language Center received continuing support in 1977, and in 1978, Columbia University received funding for scholarly exchanges. According to the chairman of the grants committee, the foundation is "not likely to support Chinese language teaching as such in the forseeable future."

In 1975, the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation awarded Stanford University a grant for its "Chinese language and culture study program." Current foundation guidelines indicate that "this is not an area in which the Foundation is currently providing support."

10.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the United States, Chinese has been considered one of the "less commonly" taught languages since this nation had its eyes opened to the languages of the world in the wake of World War II. While nothing in the data that we have collected leads us to believe that enrollments in Chinese will in the near future overtake those of German, for instance, it is likely that increased commerce and travel possibilities in China will cause modest increases in enrollments in Chinese study.

According to data gathered through surveys by the Modern Language Association of America, enrollments in Chinese language grew substantially through the 1960s and the first years of the 1970s. Betweeen 1974 and 1977, however, the MLA statistics show a slight decline in Chinese language enrollments. The data gathered by our survey indicates that this enrollment decline has probably been reversed and that over the next few years we can expect modest increases in Chinese language course enrollments.

A very small proportion of those individuals studying Chinese in institutions of higher education in this country majors in Chinese language or literature, either at the undergraduate or at the graduate level. For instance, in our survey population, which reported a total enrollment of 5,382 students in fall 1978, only 132 undergraduate degrees and 29 graduate degrees were awarded in Chinese language or literature during calendar year 1978. While students enrolled in Chinese courses number in the thousands, the number of Americans attaining advanced levels of speaking and reading competence--enough to be able to communicate readily in a variety of social and professional contexts--is very small, probably not more than 200 to 300 per year at the most.

One objective of our study was to verify the accuracy of the Modern Language Association enrollment statistics, which we hypothesized to be somewhat high in their estimate of students actually studying Chinese language, since these statistics are obtained from college registrars, who may or may not be very assiduous in differentiating between courses in Chinese language and those that might treat Chinese language, culture, and literature, yet be conducted in English. Unfortunately, the rate of return of our questionnaire was not as good as that of the MLA; this means that we have to be extremely tentative in any conclusions we draw. We have estimated that the statistics of the MLA may be from 10% to 20% high because of the inclusion of courses conducted in English.

Compared to the number of students enrolled in Chinese language courses overall, the number of students studying Chinese abroad is very small: our respondents reported a total of 314 students abroad during the 1978-79 academic year, while Chinese language enrollments on the campuses of our respondents as of fall 1978 were 5,382 students. It appears, however, that such an experience--studying Chinese in the foreign environment--is absolutely imperative in order to develop a meaningful level of competence. While our respondents appear happy on the whole with the experience abroad of their students, it is clear that the quality of such programs varies widely. Since the largest number of American students traveling to the Far East do so on an individual basis, it would be very useful for them to have a description of all available Chinese language schools, including evaluative comments of former American students.

According to the results of our survey, more than three-quarters of the individuals teaching Chinese in this country today are native speakers of the language. Most of these instructors tend not to be in tenure-track positions. Over the next 5 years, it is unlikely that there will be a large number of position openings for Chinese language teachers in institutions of higher education in this country. For both tenure-track and fixed-year contracts, approximately half the institutions responding to our questionnaire foresee no positions whatsoever. Our respondents estimated that over the next 5 years, 38 tenure-track openings would open, and 72 fixed-year contract positions would become available.

Our study provides some supportive evidence for the comments heard recently from several groups of visitors from the People's Republic of China to the effect that the Chinese taught in many American classrooms tends to be somewhat dated with respect to vocabulary and structure. Our survey results show that a fairly substantial proportion of Chinese instructors in this country have been here for some decades and have not been able to return to the Far East, for whatever reasons, to renew their contact with

the language and culture. In Chinese, as in other languages, high priority is not given to the establishment of exchange programs for individuals whose primary intent is to improve their teaching. Until recently, of course, this situation has been compounded by the inaccessibility of China for such purposes.

In our survey, we have identified the most frequently used text materials in the U.S. today for first- through fourth-year Chinese language and for classical Chinese; this information is listed in Tables 15 through 20. Most materials used in first- and second-year instruction exemplify one strand or another of audiolingual methodology. The newest materials, Modern Chinese: A Modular Approach have not yet achieved wide circulation, though they are very popular on those campuses where they are now in use. They have only very recently become widely available; several more years will be required to judge their acceptance.

Other materials of great potential value, yet in very limited use today, are those available from the PRC. Perhaps the increased dialogue between American and Chinese language teachers over the coming years will cause this situation to change.

The use of audiotaped materials to supplement standard taped programs of basic textbooks is extremely rare, as is the use of video materials, either film or tape. Materials developed recently by Stanford and Princeton, though potentially very useful, were shown by our survey to be used in very few institutions. As of August 1979, the Stanford materials, developed with a grant from the U.S. Education Department, had been purchased by 24 institutions (2 of which are in Australia). This is a small percentage of the total number of schools offering intermediate and advanced Chinese classes, for which the videotapes are designed.

According to survey responses, materials for graded reading and listening comprehension are the most urgently needed at this time. (See Table 21).

The following recommendations follow from the information that we have gathered during this survey. We do not present these as the result of widespread professional consensus among Chinese language teachers, although several of them do express the opinion of the majority of our respondents.

Recommendations concerning Enrollments and Degrees

1. Institutions of higher education must recognize the amount of time needed to make significant progress in learning Chinese. It has been demonstrated that the level of absolute competence obtained by college graduates in Indo-European languages is not impressive. With the same expenditure of time, the student of Chinese is even less far along an absolute proficiency scale. The best way for colleges and universities to recognize the increased workload demanded of Chinese language students is to award larger amounts of credit for Chinese language than for the more commonly taught languages.

2. Young Americans must be provided the opportunity and encouraged to begin the study of Chinese early: in elementary or secondary school, if at all possible; in undergraduate school, if an earlier start is impossible. This means that the work in Chinese language teaching currently being done under the aegis of bilingual educators must be encouraged and should be conducted in such a way as to enable monolingual Anglophone students to develop some competence in Chinese. Linkages between secondary schools offering Chinese and undergraduate institutions with strong language programs should be strengthened so as to provide the easiest possible transition between high school and college for promising students of Chinese. Finally, institutions of higher education should be encouraged to maintain strong undergraduate programs of Chinese language instruction and should be equally encouraged to help these undergraduates find ways to undertake fairly extensive study in the Far East. In this way, by the time an individual has reached the point of graduation from college, he or she will have some meaningful competence in Chinese and will need only more advanced, special-purpose courses at the graduate level.

3. Large numbers of students should not be encouraged to major in Chinese language unless this is a second major. As with much language study today, it is imperative, given the small demand for Chinese language teachers in particular and foreign language teachers in general, that individuals be prepared in content areas other than foreign language so that they may find work after they complete their studies. This is true not only at the undergraduate level, but at the graduate level as well, and includes East Asian area studies specialists as well as specialists in Chinese. It is heartening to note that at this writing, initiatives are under way within the federal government to provide incentive grant funds to encourage students with other content area majors to study enough foreign language to achieve a reasonable level of communicative competence. It is likely that Chinese would be named a priority language in any such federal initiative.

Recommendations concerning Instructors

1. Institutions of higher education should be encouraged to reward quality language teaching with status, recognition, and financial incentives. Classroom instructors of foreign languages in general

and of Chinese in particular should not be relegated to the bottom of the academic totem pole. Those with talent and initiative should be rewarded with tenure and promotion.

2. It is likely that a significant proportion of Chinese language teachers in this country is teaching language that is somewhat out-of-date, particularly when compared to the language currently in use in the People's Republic of China. Most academic institutions and teacher exchange programs do not place a high priority on sending teachers abroad in order to update their knowledge of the target language or culture. In fact, such travel is typically derided as a "boondoggle" and a free vacation for the language teacher involved. Given the appropriate controls for (a) the quality of the individual involved, and (b) the structure of the proposed investigation, nothing could be further from the truth. This country needs a teacher exchange program that will take significant numbers of American teachers of Chinese, whether native speakers or Anglophones, to a Chinese-speaking environment so that they can bring up to date their knowledge of the language. This is particularly desirable now that larger numbers of this nation's citizens may engage in study and travel in the PRC.

3. There is a need for non-native instructors of Chinese who are well trained in both Chinese language and foreign language pedagogy. This is not to say that these individuals should replace native Chinese who are currently teaching; as with all languages, it is important for students to hear native speech and to have the opportunity to converse with native speakers of the language. However, native speakers of Chinese, like all native-speaking language instructors, have not gone through the process of learning the foreign tongue as a second language. This experience is extremely valuable--if not indispensable--for the second language teacher, and very few native speakers are able to duplicate it through classroom instructional experience alone.

Recommendations concerning Materials of Instruction

1. Graded reading materials and listening comprehension materials for elementary and intermediate Chinese language instruction are listed by our survey respondents as their first priority.

2. There is also a need for imaginatively designed audiovisual materials for use with elementary and early intermediate language students (first- and second-year Chinese). These materials would be intended as supplements only and could be used for both listening comprehension and reading comprehension, as well as for providing variety of presentation.

Recommendations concerning Other Aspects of Chinese Language Programs

1. There is a pressing need for national standards of absolute proficiency in Chinese language (as well as in all other languages taught in this country). As is amply demonstrated in the text of this report (see Section 8.2), it is not possible at present for a variety of individuals, who may be very experienced and talented language teachers, to talk with one another about levels of proficiency of students in a meaningful way. At this writing, an experimental effort is under way at the School of Language Studies of the Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State, to test the feasibility of using the FSI-developed oral interview test in the academic situation. This pilot study is being conducted for French and Spanish only, but the oral interview exists in Chinese as well and is used fairly regularly to evaluate the competence of individuals who are enrolled in self-study of Chinese, using the paradigm developed by the National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP).

2. A descriptive study should be done to provide information about all language instructional programs in the Far East in Chinese. This study should include evaluative comments in order to enable individual American students, who in large part travel to the Orient on their own rather than in student groups, to make choices based upon accurate knowledge about the quality of Chinese language instruction that they are likely to encounter.

3. The United States Education Department must recognize the importance of the Inter-University Program in Taiwan for Chinese language instruction in the United States and take appropriate action to assure its continued viability.

4. There is a need for continued emphasis on the spoken language at upper levels of Chinese instruction in U.S. institutions of higher education. (This need exists in virtually all language instruction in U.S. higher education, but particularly for Chinese, since it demands such a large expenditure of time to achieve meaningful levels of communicative competence.) Our survey results indicate a considerable drop in the number of hours per week devoted to instruction in upper-level courses. In addition, our results show that writing receives increased emphasis as students progress through four years of instruction. This emphasis is entirely appropriate, given the inherent difficulty of the Chinese writing system. What is needed is an increase in the amount of time devoted to instruction

in third- and fourth-year courses particularly, the added time being used for the continued development of both the speaking and listening skills in Chinese language.

5. A public relations effort is needed to convince the leadership of many institutions of higher education that the Chinese language is not an "exotic frill," but rather a legitimate means of communication used by one-fifth of the world's population, in a country that appears to be taking on increased importance with respect to United States foreign policy and economic development.

In conclusion, normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China has probably rendered out-of-date many of the statistics on enrollments and study/travel abroad--perhaps even textbook usage--in this survey. We hope, in fact, that this is the case, and that the next time such a study is done--perhaps in 5 to 7 years' time--the results of the present study will be utilized as baseline data. We also hope that subsequent statistics will show a growing number of Americans gaining sufficient knowledge of Chinese to be able to communicate in a language that is spoken by a significant proportion of the people inhabiting our globe.

NOTES

1. This title is modelled on my earlier report, Chinese Language Teaching in the United States: The State of the Art (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968), ED 020 525.

2. For a discussion of the employment of area studies graduates in general, see Sue E. Berryman, et al., Foreign Language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy (Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1979), FL 010 986. See also several papers on the topic in President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies: Background Papers and Studies (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979), ED 179 117.

3. Nicholas C. Bodman, "Chinese," in Conference on Critical Languages in Liberal Arts Colleges (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, 1965), pp. 18-29, ED 016 956.

4. Dora E. Johnson, et al., Languages of Eastern Asia (Survey of Materials for the Study of the Uncommonly Taught Languages, No. 5), (Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1976), pp. 1-19, ED 132 835.

5. For an extended description of these materials, see James J. Wrenn (forthcoming in the Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association).

6. Association for Asian Studies, Committee on East Asian Libraries, Library Resources on East Asia (Switzerland: Inter Documentation Company AG, 1968), pp. 92-93.

7. "Current Status of East Asian Collections in American Libraries--A Note on the Final Version," Committee on East Asian Libraries Newsletter 50 (May 1976), p. 47.

8. Ibid.

[Documents identified by an ED number may be read on microfiche at an ERIC library collection or ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210.]

APPENDIX A

List of Chinese Language Instructional Materials under Development

NOTE: The information in this list is presented as received from our respondents; some entries are not complete. The entries include the following information: author's name, institution, title of materials, and, if funded, the source of funding in parentheses. The order of the entries was determined by the date of receipt of the respondent's questionnaire.

First-year Text Materials (including supplementary materials)

Chang, Washington State U.; Essential Chinese.
Nyakken and C. Tang, Ohio U.; Speak Mandarin supplementary exercises.
Berninghausen and Chiang, Middlebury College; written exercises, vocabulary, etc.
Henry Hung-yeh Tiee, U. of Southern California; Learn Chinese.
Patrick Moran, U. of Colorado, Boulder; First Steps in Chinese.
Patrick Moran, U. of Colorado, Boulder; edited and expanded Taiwan Elementary Chinese Text.
Tsaifeng Lee, Brigham Young U.; Succeed with Standard Chinese (funded by BYU).
Gwang-Tsai Chen, U. of Wisconsin, Madison; Elementary Chinese.
Ta-tuan Chén, Princeton U.; Beginning Chinese.
(No author listed), U. of Michigan; dittoed materials.

First-Year Character Materials

(No author listed), Temple U.; Character Recognition.
G. W. Roy, U. of Virginia; Reading and Writing Chinese.
Patrick Moran, U. of Colorado, Boulder; First Steps in Chinese Character Analysis.
Henry Kuo, Connecticut College; Read Mandarin.
Pang, California State U., Chico; Introduction to Chinese Writing [Video].

First-Year Materials--Other

San-pow Li, U. of Michigan; Dictionary for Elementary and Intermediate Chinese.
Ellie Mao Mok, Baruch College, CUNY; Study Aids--Learn Patterns through Songs.
Nora Ching, Ohio State U.; Chinese for Trade and Travel (funded by state).

Second-Year Text Materials

Chung So, Colby College; Grammar Review.
(No author given), Temple U.; Sentence Patterns Review.
Ta-tuan Chen, Princeton U.; Intermediate Chinese.
Richard Chang, U. of Illinois-Urbana; A Review of Chinese Grammar.
(No author given), U. of Michigan; Cantonese course.

Second-Year Character Materials

Huang and Stimson, Yale U.; Written Standard Chinese III.
(No author given), Temple U.; Character Recognition.
G.W. Roy, U. of Virginia; Reading and Writing Chinese.

Second-Year Materials--Other

Constantine Tung, State U. of New York, Buffalo; Readings in Business Chinese.
Walton and Liu, U. of Pennsylvania; Introduction to Modern China (PRC).
Ching-Yi Dougherty, U. of California, Santa Cruz; Speeches by Chinese Officials and Foreign Visitors to China [for training interpreters].

Third-Year Materials

Yin-lien C. Chin, Vassar College; Language through Literature (funded by unspecified source).
Constantine Tung, State U. of New York, Buffalo; Readings on Contemporary China.
Wan, U. of Kansas; Readings in Modern Chinese.
Patrick Moran, U. of Colorado; Exercises for Readings in Chinese Literature.
H. T. Tang, Princeton U.; Advanced Modern Chinese.

Fourth-Year and Beyond Materials

Donald Willis, U. of Colorado, Boulder; literature and language readers.
C. Lien, Central Connecuticut State College; advanced Chinese language reading material.
H. T. Tang, Princeton U.; Readings in Modern Chinese.

Classical Chinese Materials

Ching Tu, Rutgers U.; Readings in Classical Chinese Literature.
N. Y. Tang, Princeton U.; Readings in Classical Chinese.

Other Materials

E. Kaplan, Western Washington U.; tapes for advanced Chinese.
Y. C. Li, S.H. Ho, R.L. Cheng, U. of Hawaii; Grammar Handbook (all levels) (funded by USED).
Henry Hung-yeh Tiee, U. of Southern California; An Introduction to the Structure of the Chinese Sentence.
Donald Willis, U. of Colorado, Boulder; Etymology, Translation, Structure, and Forms of Chinese for Students of Chinese and Japanese [all levels].
Cheng-Yu, California State U., Long Beach; (No title given): "A Multi-Purpose Volume" [third and fourth year].
Leung, San José State U.; videotapes for teaching Cantonese.
(No author given), George Washington U.; Vocabulary Glossary for Lei-Yu and Luo tuo Hsiang-zi Chinese.
Eugene Ching, Ohio State U.; Hsu-Chih-mo and Su Hsiasman [third year] (funded by OSU).
Dale Barnes, U. of Pittsburgh; A Short Course for the PRC.

APPENDIX B

List of Respondents to Long Survey Form

CASE NO.	INSTITUTION NAME	INSTITUTION TYPE*
1	University of Illinois at Chicago Circle	0
2	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	1
3	Washington State University	1
4	Merritt College	4
5	Occidental College	2
6	Vassar College	3
7	Pasadena Area Community College	4
8	Arizona State University	1
9	Wayne State University	1
10	California State University, Hayward	2
11	West Virginia University	1
12	University of California, Santa Cruz	1
13	Hofstra University	1
14	William Paterson College	2
15	Fairleigh Dickinson University	2
16	University of Montana	1
17	Western Michigan University	1
18	University of Iowa	1
19	Colby College	3
20	New School for Social Research	1
21	State University of New York at Buffalo	2
22	University of Texas at Austin	1
23	Yale University	0
24	Temple University	1
25	Kalamazoo College (dropped; self-instructional program)	
26	Earlham College	3
27	University of Toledo	1
28	U.S. Air Force Academy	2
29	University of Arkansas	1
30	University of New Mexico	1
31	University of Florida	1
32	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1
33	University of Virginia	0
34	State University of New York at Brockport	2
35	Wheaton College (Mass.)	3
36	American Graduate School of International Management	2
37	Ohio University	1
38	Columbia University	0
39	Queens College	2
40	Denison University	3
41	University of Alabama	1
42	University of South Carolina, Columbia	1
43	Middlebury College	3
44	Western Washington University	2
45	Long Beach City College	4
46	University of Massachusetts, Boston	2
47	Bowdoin College	3
48	University of Kansas	1
49	Cabrillo College	4
50	U.S. Naval Academy	3
51	Harvard University	0
52	University of Minnesota	1
53	University of Hawaii, Honolulu	0
54	Pomona College	3

CASE NO.	INSTITUTION NAME	INSTITUTION TYPE*
55	University of Southern California	0
56	University of Colorado, Boulder	1
57	Florida State University	1
58	Wake Forest University	2
59	University of Oregon	1
60	Wofford College	3
61	Connecticut College	2
62	De Anza Community College	4
63	Washington and Lee University	3
64	Brigham Young University	1
65	Los Angeles City College	4
66	University of California, San Diego	2
67	Wittenberg University	3
68	Rutgers University	1
69	Boston College	1
70	U.S. Military Academy	2
71	State University of New York at New Paltz	2
72	Miami University, Ohio	1
73	Central Connecticut State College	2
74	University of Wisconsin, Madison	1
75	Oklahoma State University	1
76	California State University, Los Angeles	2
77	Wellesley College	3
78	Sacramento City College	4
79	Princeton University	0
80	Vanderbilt University	1
81	Oakland University	2
82	Hawaii Loa College	2
83	University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point	2
84	Baruch College, CUNY	2
85	University of Pennsylvania	1
86	Duke University	1
87	University of Massachusetts, Amherst	0
88	Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	1
89	University of Illinois, Urbana	0
90	Swarthmore College	3
91	University of California, Berkeley	0
92	Orange Coast College	2
93	California State University, Chico	2
94	University of California, Santa Barbara	1
95	University of Michigan	0
96	Seton Hall University	2
97	Los Angeles Harbor College	4
98	California State University, Long Beach	2
99	State University of New York at Stony Brook	1
100	Santa Rosa Junior College	4
101	San Jose State University	2
102	Monterey Institute of International Studies	2
103	Foothill College	4
104	San Diego State University	2
105	Washington University, Missouri	1
106	George Washington University	1
107	University of Washington, Seattle	0
108	Boston University	1
109	Ohio State University	1
110	Tufts University	1
111	University of Pittsburgh	1
112	Brown University	1

* 0 = NDEA Center
1 = Large University
2 = Small University
3 = Four-Year College
4 = Two-Year College

Peter Eddy (Ph.D., Ohio State) is director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. James Wrenn (Ph.D., Yale) is professor of linguistics at Brown University. Sophia Behrens (M.S., Georgetown) is editor/publications coordinator at the Clearinghouse.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

To subscribe to the complete series of publications, write to:

Publications Department
Center for Applied Linguistics
3520 Prospect Street NW
Washington DC 20007

The subscription rate is $32.00 per volume. Titles may also be ordered individually; add $1.75 postage and handling. D.C. residents add 5% sales tax. ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID.

Volume 1 (1977-78)

1. Directory of Foreign Language Service Organizations, by Sophia Behrens. $3.95. ED 153 503
2. The Linguist in Speech Pathology, by Walt Wolfram. $2.95. ED 153 504
3. Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1976-77, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95. ED 153 505
4. Code Switching and the Classroom Teacher, by Guadalupe Valdés-Fallis. $2.95. ED 153 506
5. Current Approaches to the Teaching of Grammar in ESL, by David M. Davidson. $2.95. ED 154 620
6. From the Community to the Classroom: Gathering Second-Language Speech Samples, by Barbara F. Freed. $2.95. ED 157 404
7. Kinesics and Cross-Cultural Understanding, by Genelle G. Morain. $2.95. ED 157 405
8. New Perspectives on Teaching Vocabulary, by Howard H. Keller. $2.95. ED 157 406
9. Teacher Talk: Language in the Classroom, by Shirley B. Heath. $2.95. ED 158 575
10. Language and Linguistics: Bases for a Curriculum, by Julia S. Falk. $2.95. ED 158 576
11. Teaching Culture: Strategies and Techniques, by Robert C. Lafayette. $2.95. ED 157 407
12. Personality and Second Language Learning, by Virginia D. Hodge. $2.95. ED 157 408

Volume 2 (1978-79)

13. Games and Simulations in the Foreign Language Classroom, by Alice C. Omaggio. $5.95. ED 177 887
14. Problems and Teaching Strategies in ESL Composition, by Ann Raimes. $2.95. ED 175 243
15. Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1977-78, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95. ED 175 244
16. Foreign Languages, English as a Second/Foreign Language, and the U.S. Multinational Corporation, by Marianne Inman. $4.95. ED 179 089
17. Testing Oral Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom, by Walter H. Hartz. $2.95. ED 176 590
18. Intensive Foreign Language Courses, by David P. Benseler and Renate A. Schulz. $4.95. ED 176 587
19. Evaluating a Second Language Program, by Gilbert A. Jarvis and Shirley J. Adams. $2.95. ED 176 589
20. Reading a Second Language, by G. Truett Cates and Janet K. Swaffar. $2.95. ED 176 588
21. Chicano English, by Allan A. Metcalf. $2.95. ED 176 591
22. Adult Vocational ESL, by Jo Ann Crandall. $5.95. ED 176 592

Volume 3 (1979-80)

23. A Linguistic Guide to English Proficiency Testing in Schools, by Thomas G. Dieterich and Cecilia Freeman. $5.95. ED 181 746
24. Testing in Foreign Languages, ESL, and Bilingual Education, 1966-1979: A Select, Annotated ERIC Bibliography, compiled by Dale L. Lange and Ray T. Clifford. $7.95. ED 183 027
25. ACTFL 1979: Abstracts of Presented Papers. $5.95. ED 183 031
26. A Guide to Language Camps in the United States, by Lois Vines. $3.95. ED 183 030
27. Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1978-79, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95.
28. Teaching a Second Language: A Guide for the Student Teacher, by Constance K. Knop. $4.95.
29. Assessing Study Abroad Programs for Secondary School Students, by Helene Z. Loew. $2.95.
30. Chinese Language Study in American Higher Education: State of the Art, by Peter A. Eddy, James J. Wrenn and Sophia A. Behrens. $7.95.
31. Sentence Combining in Second Language Instruction, by Thomas C. Cooper, Genelle Morain, and Theodore Kalivoda. $7.95.
32. Teaching the Metric System in the Foreign Language Classroom, by Bette Le Feber Stevens. $4.95.