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Federally sponsored reports such as A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform and High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America cite the deplorable condition of US schooling. These reports have spawned reaction statements such as Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group and A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, which may be summarized succinctly: the quality of education is dependent on quality teachers; therefore, major reforms in teacher education must be initiated.

The foreign language community is all too familiar with the crisis in education. The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, the National Advisory Board on International Education, and the National Endowment for the Humanities have authored position papers calling for a renewed interest in and a revitalized perspective on foreign language learning in the United States. Yet these agencies have not addressed, in any depth, issues concerning the teaching of foreign language as they relate to teachers of foreign languages. Granted, many of these commissions have recommended that foreign language teachers be given opportunities for professional development through overseas experiences or through additional courses. The commissions have not, however, addressed the preprofessional development of these teachers. Specifically, they have failed to address the types of educational experience—both in terms of language and pedagogical content—these individuals receive as part of their teacher education programs.

THE PROBLEM

The Holmes Group, mentioned above, a consortium of deans of colleges of education throughout the United States, has cited seven obstacles to a deep and true understanding of problems in teaching and teacher education in the United States. First, the group cites (pp. 24-25) "overly simple solutions" whereby it is argued that "only the best and the brightest" should be permitted to teach; conventional wisdom indicates that if teachers were "smarter," learning would improve. Second, the group cites "naive views of teaching," whereby the general conception is that "any modestly educated person with average abilities can do it," i.e., "teach" (p. 29). Third, "institutions unfit for teacher professionals" (p. 31) are cited as an obstacle. In other words, schools in general are not pleasant, "professional" places to work. Fourth, "the pitfalls of credentialism" (p. 41), including notions of competency testing and differentiated pay scales, are considered to be problematic. The fifth obstacle, according to the Holmes Group, is "problems in undergraduate liberal education" characterized by "a lack of curricular coherence and an avoidance of a core of enduring and fundamental ideas" (p. 47). The sixth is "inadequate professional education" that tends to be "restricted to a few university courses and a brief period of supervised practice in the schools" (p. 50). The seventh obstacle is "lack of demonstration sites" (p. 56) in which prospective teachers may see "superior" professionals at work and through which field professionals can contribute to the research base in education.

Using these seven issues as a backdrop to reform in teacher education, the Holmes Group has mounted a major effort toward reform and counts major universities, federal agencies, and private foundations in its support network. The
intent of the present paper is to begin to respond to some of the issues in teacher education as outlined by the Holmes Group from a foreign language perspective.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS & METHODOLOGY

Clearly, all academic ventures commence with a review of the literature. Hence, the research question for the present paper is, quite simply: what comprises the research base on foreign language teacher education? In order to answer the question, the authors examined journals, books, monographs, and references from the 1977-78 ACTFL Annual Bibliography devoted to foreign or second language education in the United States. Publications that attempt explicitly to direct foreign language teacher development were included in the data base. While the authors acknowledge the ultimate relevance to foreign language teachers of a broad scope of foreign language and foreign language education literature, the articles that comprise the actual data base deal directly with the questions: "What should foreign language teachers know? What should they do? How should foreign language teachers be prepared?" In other words, the articles considered to be part of the data base: 1) argue for foreign language teachers to be taught; 2) identify teacher behaviors to be encouraged; and/or 3) observe teachers with intent to train them in a given model for all levels of foreign language teaching—elementary through graduate school.

After reading each article that contained one or a combination of these characteristics, we categorized each under one of seven descriptors: 1) global position statements; 2) teacher behaviors; 3) training of teaching assistants; 4) training of university professors; 5) in-service opportunities; 6) supervision; 7) methods course curricula. Below is a critical synthesis of the research on these topics. Following the synthesis is a set of recommendations stemming from it and responding to the concerns of the Holmes Group. Finally, a complete bibliographic listing is included.

GLOBAL POSITION STATEMENTS

Authors whose work may be characterized as addressing broad issues of foreign language teacher education generally either take the perspective of training vs. development, isolate specific skills which foreign language teachers should possess, or offer concrete descriptions of current or future programs. Muyskens, for example, focuses on teachers' language skills and on strategies to elicit communicative practice. Similarly, DiPietro focuses on the use of "interactive scenarios"; both argue that teacher education programs should focus on such aspects. Gritter also emphasizes the importance of target language fluency as well as skills in planning and self-assessment. Larsen-Freeman argues for teaching four steps of a decision-making process, while Alatis sees a need for added emphasis on strategies of classroom management and discipline. Another perspective is taken by Hancock, who focuses on theoretical models for teacher education programs and discusses the implications of development/humanistic vs. behavioral/competency based models. He recommends that revisions in teacher education programs take such theoretical statements into consideration while Bailey and Elling describe the competency based system optimistically. Stern sees language teaching theory as the component of teacher education most needing critical examination.

A third perspective is taken by several authors, who briefly examine the current status of foreign language teacher education. While Jarvis and Bernhardt concern themselves with an analysis of the differences and similarities between foreign language teacher education and other types of teacher education programs, DeLorenzo provides an overview of the field in 1978. Joiner offers a variety of concrete suggestions for improved foreign language teacher education programs. Finocchiaro and Herold outline long-standing problems in foreign language teacher education and aspects of curriculum development while Fanselow examines an important attempt at evaluation of teacher education effectiveness.

A fourth perspective involves a focus on the educational format of preservice coursework. The role of research is a prime concern. Jarvis calls for collaboration between university researchers and classroom teacher; Brumfit insists that researchers explicitly address classroom applications of research; and Tucker calls for a research training component in teacher education. Clarke sees a need for redefining old terms such as "approach," Celce-Murcia and Costa argue for less lecture and more active student involvement in preservice training. Stevens provides a rationale for foreign language teacher education.

In general, the above accounts of the current little direction for general teacher education programs, seem to make a wider framework of research, but seem to restrict specific matters. This, not to be directed against 60) or Wing. Both provide comprehensive statements of development. In his public, entire developmental needs of teachers. He focuses on the depth of teachers' generality of proficiency, instructional methods and/or learning as a process of development of goals—professional.

Wing, too, offers a perspective on foreign language teacher education. She emphasizes as a fundamental of education a classroom research related to the languages. She stresses the characteristics of teaching components that make up the curriculum. The overriding characteristic of 60) and Wing's statements is the awareness of the scope and the non-prescriptive nature of their recommendations.

TEACHER BEHAVIORS

Another group of authors specifically on the classroom practices of foreign language teachers. Morn frequently mentions language fluency. Muyskens, Woloshin all emphasize the importance of teacher fluency in terms of competence in the target language. Brumfit and Rosner consider student development from a different perspective, classroom management, while Brumfit and Rosner consider students' classroom practices.
involvement in preservice classes. Finally, Streuven provides a rationale for preservice foreign language teacher training.

In general, the above statements are brief accounts of the current state of the art and offer little direction for genuine reform in teacher education programs. They are not set within a wider framework of teacher education research, but seem to rely on foreign language specific matters. This complaint, however, is not to be directed against work by Lange (59, 60) or Wing. Both provide coherent and comprehensive statements regarding teacher development. In his publications, Lange provides an entire developmental model for the education of teachers. He focuses on issues of selection, depth of teachers' general education, language proficiency, instruction of culture, knowledge of methods and language acquisition, a concept of learning as a process, and abilities in the development of goals—both instructional and professional.

Wing, too, offers a model for understanding teacher education. She examines teacher competence as a fundamental component in excellence in education and outlines current classroom research related to teaching foreign languages. She stresses the decision-making characteristics of teaching and outlines the myriad components that make up teacher competence. The overriding characteristics of Lange’s (59, 60) and Wing’s statements are their depth, their awareness of the scope of teacher education, and the non-prescriptive yet practical nature of their recommendations.

TEACHER BEHAVIORS

Another group of publications focuses specifically on the classroom behaviors of foreign language teachers. Not surprisingly, the most frequently mentioned “behavior” is target language fluency. Annandale, Kalivoda, and Woloshin all emphasize language skill. Annandale and Kalivoda speak to target language proficiency in terms of coursework, while Woloshin considers the problem in terms of residency in the target culture. Brunfaut/Rossner and Nerenz/Knop consider the notion of teacher behavior from a different perspective, namely that of classroom management and lesson planning. Brunfaut and Rossner argue that the focus of teacher education programs should be on daily lesson planning and on the execution of preplanned lessons before teachers are asked to plan on their own. Nerenz and Knop, on the other hand, focus on a specific finding of teacher planning research, i.e., that teachers spend considerable time in transition from one activity to another and that they should be taught strategies to decrease that time and to increase active learning time. D’Angelo argues for the need of experiences helping language learners in non-academic settings. Finally, Altman, de Garcia/Reynolds, King, and Moskowitz focus on affective behaviors of foreign language teachers. They suggest either implicitly or explicitly that foreign language teachers should be trained in empathy, respect, and self-awareness in order to increase their classroom effectiveness. Similarly, Brown argues for encouraging the use of intuition and risk-taking.

Of concern within these articles is their failure to consider teaching as an activity which is both cognitive and affective, product- and process-based. In general, they are characterized by a behaviorist approach which focuses on discrete aspects in a day in the life of a teacher without considering the full context within which the act of teaching takes place.

TRAINING TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Since calls for TA training early in the decade (Hagiwara), the formation of training programs for teaching assistants has been a popular topic in foreign language education research. Characteristics of the assertions within this topic is that, in contrast to the statements mentioned above in which teacher educators have been fairly hesitant to outline specific programs and proposals for teacher education, no such hesitation exists among scholars who deal specifically with TA training. Barnett, DiDonato, Donahue, Franck/Samaniego, Goepper/Knorr, Henderson, Kaufman, Knop/Herron, Mansour, Russo, Schulz, Zymanz, and Toliver all outline training programs for TAs at various public universities throughout the United States.

Interestingly, TA training is the only area of foreign language teacher education extracted by the authors of this paper actually supported by an empirical data base. Studies by Ervin/Muyskens, Gibaldi/Mirrollo, Nerenz, Herron/Knop, and Schulz provide survey data on the types and content of training programs cur-
rently offered in universities throughout the US. Such data provide some foundation for the development of programs for future language teachers at the university level.

Not uncharacteristic for the foreign language teaching profession in the US and exemplified by the publications on TA training is an over-reliance on the “experiential” model—in other words, a mind-set which seems to say: “Here’s what I did. It worked in my program. It might work in yours.” This approach is unsophisticated and inefficient; it does not consider contextual factors, and it seems to treat the teacher education process in a generic fashion while ignoring educational research that has determined such a stance to be ineffective in the development of competent professionals.

TRAINING UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

The concerns that arise from the TA training literature are also present in the articles on university professors’ training. In general, few recommendations are made which are different from those for teacher preparation at other levels. DiPietro, Lantolf, and Labarca report survey results on the predominant literary focus in current graduate studies and call for greater diversity within curricula. Altman (2), DiPietro, and Rivers all focus on the issue that TA training is basically the total amount of teacher education most university professors who will spend the bulk of their time teaching basic language will ever receive. For the most part, these articles lament problems rather than provide directions for solutions.

The import of the issues mentioned in these articles is obscured by the lack of direction and recommendations offered. Not considered is that potential foreign language teachers spend the majority of their preservice education observing basically untrained foreign language teachers.

INSERVICE OPPORTUNITIES

The further development of experienced foreign language teachers is the concern of several publications. Freeman, for example, describes a methodology for observing experienced teachers and argues for different supervisory stances depending upon a teacher’s experiences while Peck, Eddy, and Spencer/Millman describe their experiences with summer institutes. The

Handcombes outline inservice coursework emphasizing the classroom teacher’s role as a leader of peers and the community, not just of students. The growth of the MAT degree as a tool in teacher development is outlined by Zdecek. Mancill warns that the growth of programs in languages for specific purposes creates a strong need for specific inservice teacher training if these courses are to successfully reach their specific goals. Candel suggests some overall principles of inservice education.

Of perhaps greatest interest is Jorstad’s set of recommendations from the ACTFL Professional Priorities Conference. She recommends inservice programs that deal with language skill renewal and development, teachers’ own foreign cultural understanding, and methodology that includes surveys of current research and its classroom applications. She suggests a variety of formats for such inservice programs, including programs abroad.

SUPERVISION

Implicit in some of the statements regarding the training of university professors is a lack of supervision. Foreign language teachers in general may suffer from a lack of meaningful and helpful supervision, since many administrators lack expertise in foreign languages. Even within foreign language supervision literature, a knowledge of differing supervision models is not widespread. Fortunately, Gebhard and KnoF acknowledge different models of supervision and describe them, and Nerenz outlines different elements within the role of supervision. In fact, KnoF points out that a philosophy or theory of supervision is lacking in the foreign language education profession and calls for the development of one. Abbott and Carter actually posit a model of supervision for foreign language teachers based on Goldhammer’s model of clinical supervision. Ironically, however, the authors of the model formulate it as a directive one with a checklist, since they claim that the original is too sophisticated for student teachers. Bailey offers a checklist alternative to the more commonly used “FLint” checklist. Compared with other areas of the foreign language teacher education literature, the area of supervision seems to be theoretically aware and sound. Unfortunately, the accompanying topic of observation systems

Research in FL Teaching has not been sufficiently guided by theoretical-type systems.

METHODS COURSE OPTIONS

Only a small number of curricula for foreign language professors are mentioned. Clifford, Jorstad, and others have pointed out the positive use of micro-courses. Horwitz and paper recommendations for identifying specific language learning approaches and courses. Few writers focus on methods courses. DiPietro’s methods course for Graduate Learning Centers is the only one of teacher training courses (Long, 64) more than one are called for which cover specific experiences. Meanings survey points to the usefulness to teachers, but find no evidence of a particular foreign language course to be recommended.

The small number of course curricula but the convenience of the only course outlined in foreign language teachers have in foreign language teachers, have adequate professors in foreign language. This most vociferously is to point to the work of the “methods course” which extend beyond.

SUMMARY: WHERE TO NEXT?

The above syntheses show that, first, only seven papers remain published on the general topic of teacher development in the past ten years. In this period, the concern has been on the monumental importance of being of foreign language in the United States. Secondly, papers which have theoretical frameworks to contain. Third, the specific effective teacher has not been an issue. And there is no genuine concern with preservice education for teachers. Consis
has not been sufficiently explored beyond categorical-type systems.

METHODS COURSE CURRICULA

Only a small number of papers exist on curricula for foreign language methods courses. Clifford, Jorstad, and Lange discuss the effective use of micro-teaching in preservice programs. Horwitz argues for introducing instruments for identifying student beliefs about language learning and teaching into methods courses. Few writers take a broad perspective on methods courses. Petrick outlines a methods course for German and Keeler calls for learning centers for individualized instruction of teacher trainees. In two cases (Krashen, Long, 64) more theory and research findings are called for while Larson argues for clinical experiences. Meanwhile, Richards and Hino's survey points to a low correlation between courses previously studied and their perceived usefulness to teachers and Benseler and Schulz find no evidence that would call for one particular foreign language teaching methodology to be recommended over others.

The small number of papers on methods course curricula belies their importance, for this is the only coursework many preservice teachers have in foreign language education. The "inadequate professional education" criticized most vociferously by the Holmes Group seems to point to the weakness in the present state of the "methods course" and the sparse offerings that extend beyond it.

SUMMARY: WHERE ARE WE?

The above synthesis indicates the following. First, only seventy-eight articles have been published on the general topic of foreign language teacher education in the United States in the past ten years. In other words, very little concern has been demonstrated for a topic of monumental importance to the health and well-being of foreign language education in the United States. Second, on the whole, the writings which have been published indicate no theoretical framework for the statements they contain. Third, essentially no data exist on effective teacher education programs. Fourth, no genuine concern has been exhibited for the preservice education of foreign language teachers. Considering that most foreign language instruction in the US takes place at the secondary level, this finding is interesting and simultaneously disturbing. Fifth, the articles indicate an unconscionable lack of awareness of the teacher education literature in general.

Figure 1 indicates that the foreign language teacher education literature draws from a relatively small pool of references. A perusal of the articles' sources indicates a reliance on "in-house, experiential" sources rather than on data-based studies. In fact, out of the seventy-eight articles in the database, only eight report the results of foreign language teacher education research. They are: Clifford, Jorstad, and Lange; DiPietro, Lantolf & Labarca; Ervin & Muyskins; Knop & Herron; Nerenz, Herron & Knop; Nerenz; Nerenz & Knop; Richards & Hino; Schulz. Notably, only the Nerenz and Schulz studies are cited frequently throughout the database.

Given that the foreign language specific database is so small, an expectation might be that foreign language teacher educators have relied on the general teacher education literature which appears in the American Educational Research Association's Handbook of Research on Teaching. However, as Figure 2 reveals, the general teacher education research has not made an impact on foreign language education. Of 129 possible sources in the last two Handbooks, only two Handbook researchers appear as references in the foreign language teacher education literature. A valuable source of information for foreign language teacher education has been ignored.

In other words, a succinct answer to the research question posed in this paper, what comprises the research base in foreign language teacher education?, is: the perceptions of experienced foreign language educators. Up until now, the field has relied on the discussions among experienced foreign language educators about the educational needs of foreign language teachers as the experts have perceived them, rather than on the principled collection of data and information.

A RESPONSE TO HOLMES

The relationship between the knowledge base in foreign language teacher education and the future of teacher education in general as exemplified by the Holmes Group movement is
Research in FL Teaching and Learning is tenuous at best. For many years, issues as defined by the FL community have been at the forefront of research. However, the present research base is small, and additional data are needed before any definitive conclusions can be forthcoming.

*Overly Simple Solution* is an effective strategy for improving teacher education in foreign language classrooms. The key to success, however, lies in the course content. What kind of content is best suited for an effective skill? Holmes notes that the model of the "brightest" should be dispelled.

In this regard, teachers must clarify notions of interest and address questions of relative distribution of skills. Foreign language teachers are interested in the kinds of abilities that students are able to exhibit? Some of these questions appear a bit heretical, but the challenge for professionals working in these areas is to provide educational programs that are effective.

The Naive Views of Teachers believe that teaching and learning is an activity in which one has control of the process. The foreign language profession has historically emphasized the role of how learning occurs, not what is learned. This brought about the development of the Holmes Report. Certainly, some students lack the motivation (e.g., Long, 63) that is needed for learning to be effective. Yet, studies in foreign language classrooms have shown that students are interested in the classroom and are capable of conducting ethnographic research. This has led to the development of the Holmes Report and the "real" issue of how students learn in foreign language classrooms.

Institutions Unfilled? The Holmes Report advocates for the development of new foreign language classrooms and for students interested in the classroom and to ask questions about what happens in foreign language classrooms. The "real" issue is not what students learn but how they learn.
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tenuous at best. Examining the seven major issues as defined by Holmes in light of the present research base reveals that numerous data are needed before a sensible response can be forthcoming.

Overly Simple Solutions. The first obstacle to improved teacher education, according to Holmes, is indeed who should be placed in classrooms. The hidden question concerns, of course, what kind of "intelligence" is required for an effective public school teacher. As Holmes notes, some argue that the "best and the brightest" should be placed in classrooms. In this regard, the foreign language profession must clarify notions of the best and the brightest and address questions such as: What is the relative distribution of skills necessary for effective foreign language teaching? To what degree must an educated teacher have fluency in the foreign language? What kinds of abilities with the language must teachers be able to exhibit? Some of these questions may appear a bit heretical, for many foreign language professionals would argue that "total" fluency is requisite. Yet the profession has acknowledged that many native speakers are not particularly effective teachers of their own language. In like manner, many excellent users of language clearly do not control a classroom register in the language. A principled needs analysis of classroom language skills would perhaps offer some answers to these questions.

Naive Views of Teaching. In like manner, many believe that teaching involves imparting subject matter knowledge to students and that if one has control of the subject matter and is "interesting," learning will occur. The foreign language profession has not yet examined the issue of how learning occurs or how learning is brought about through the teaching process. Certainly, some second language professionals (e.g., Long, 63) have begun to examine this issue. Yet, studies of traditional foreign language classrooms in traditional liberal arts college classrooms and in public schools have only recently commenced. The profession needs to conduct ethnographic analyses of how teachers and students interact in foreign language classrooms and to ask: What are the social roles involved in foreign language classrooms? To what extent is classroom "talk" "real" talk?

Institutions Unfit for Teacher Professionals. The Holmes Report argues that "conditions of work in schools have severely hindered efforts to im-
prove the quality of teaching" (p. 31). This statement conjures images of obvious societal problems which are extant in schools, ranging from drug and alcohol-related difficulties to worn out and tattered classrooms and facilities to teachers' time being spent on patrolling restrooms and cafeterias. Specifically regarding foreign language teaching, the profession must address the issue of rewards. Language teachers, in contrast to literature teachers, are frequently regarded differently within the profession. The profession therefore needs to consider questions such as what would constitute a supportive stance toward the teaching of language? Also important is what social classroom environments are most conducive to language learning?

The Pitfalls of Credentialism. Certification standards vary from state to state, and not all states have reciprocal agreements; what one state acknowledges as competence in foreign language teaching, another does not. While some institutions that offer credentials to foreign language professionals who instruct methods courses and who can certify competence in the foreign language, others do not: that is, it is possible to receive credentials in foreign language teaching without ever having been supervised by a foreign-language speaking professional or by anyone who has ever taught a foreign language in a secondary school. Questions to be addressed are: How can the foreign language profession guarantee adequate supervision? How can the foreign language profession provide guidance in supervision for non-foreign-language speaking administrators? If competency tests are adopted, will they measure what teachers need to know or what is currently taught? How can changes in time and needs be incorporated? Also, what are the unique foreign language teaching skills, and what is minimal competency in these skills?

Problems in Undergraduate Liberal Education. Our purpose here is not to discuss the ramifications of a humanities-based education. The intent is, however, to highlight the implications of the undergraduate language major for future foreign language teachers. Many teacher education candidates complete a foreign language major which consists primarily of advanced literature courses. Moreover, many authors claim (see note 1 below) that these courses tend to be taught by professors of literature who rarely have training in pedagogy. Hence, most of the time of the undergraduate major is spent in ob-
Inadequate Professional Education. Despite a belief that teacher certification in most states is characterized by a preponderance of education courses, the opposite is true. Many states require a minimal number of subject matter specific education courses. In light of recent public outcries regarding the lack of foreign language proficiency which most foreign language students exhibit, a re-analysis of the "methods" course is necessary. Research is needed which addresses questions such as: What is an optimum amount of methods study? How can clinical field experience best be integrated with methods study? What is an appropriate sequence of topics for methods courses? How can foreign language teachers best be introduced to the concept of integrated rather than skills-based instruction?

Lack of Demonstration Sites. The Holmes Group Report calls (p. 57) for the development of "exemplary school sites." In response, the foreign language profession needs to launch research which would address: What variables in

guage teaching could be considered "exemplary"? What sorts of facilities could be considered "exemplary" in providing foreign language instruction? What is the most effective means of having all foreign language teachers gain access to "exemplary" professionals and facilities?

CONCLUSION

The foreign language profession in the United States has a long and arduous task ahead to meet demands for reform in teacher education. It would be disheartening to imagine the profession still facing the same seven obstacles enumerated by the Holmes Group at the end of yet another decade. Certainly, the "proficiency movement" has highlighted deficiencies in student outcomes and has posed a testing procedure to identify these deficiencies. The future needs to hold much more than a new test, however, if the foreign language profession is genuinely to use the nomenclature "profession." If we wish to solve the problems identified by investigators such as the Holmes Group, and respond to them with solutions that are tailored to the uniqueness of foreign language education, then the time has come for subject matter specific research in teacher education.

NOTE

For references to the perceived dichotomy between language and literature teachers see DeLorenzo et al., DiPietro et al., Altman, Calvoda, Rivers, and Woloshin Language teachers' complaints of lowly status may be reflected in the background of teachers appointed to coordinate undergraduate language programs. Among these directors responsible for languages courses only fourteen percent list their research area as applied or educational linguistics while fifty-nine percent list literature (Teachmen).
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Fulbright Teacher Exchange Program

The United States Information Agency announces details of the 1988-89 Fulbright Teacher Exchange Program. The program involves a one-on-one exchange for teachers at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels with suitable teachers overseas. The 1988-89 overseas exchange programs will involve Argentina, Australia, Belgium/Luxembourg, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, South Africa, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. The number of exchanges available and the eligibility requirements vary by country.

The program also provides opportunities for teachers to participate in summer seminars from three to eight weeks in length. During the summer of 1988, seminars will be held in Italy and the Netherlands.

Applications will be available in the summer. The deadline for receipt of completed applications is 15 October 1987. For further information, write: Fulbright Teacher Exchange Program, E, ASX, United States Information Agency, 301 Fourth St., SW, Washington, DC 20547, (202) 485-2555.