

THE GOVERNANCE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

James S. Noblitt
Cornell University

*informed useful questions
& fairly well*

I. Governance Issues in Higher Education

We faculty are accustomed to analyzing educational issues in terms of learning theory, teaching methodology, or curriculum design. We are rarely analytic, in my experience at least, about how institutional governance influences the quality of an educational enterprise. This is puzzling, since the covenants or social contracts which determine what is valued and what is not exert as much influence on the character of an educational institution as its administrative organization. In theory, at least, administration supplies the means while governance supplies the vision to guide the activities of an educational institution. Both faculty and administration share interest in the guidance provided by the governance process. Benezet offers a useful distinction in his definition:

[W]e will refer to administration as the total structure and set of operations by which the organization is led and to governance as the decision-making apparatus in which various members and constituencies participate with administrators to guide the organization along its way, especially at key junctures for policy.¹

Educational philosophers view governance (along with teaching, learning, and curriculum) as a commonplace for analyzing how principles and practices are related in a given discipline. An understanding of governance is the key to the "hidden epistemology" of an institution's activities, since one cannot make sense of education without an understanding of the presuppositions that determine policy-making. As Bob Gowin puts it, "Governance controls the meaning which controls the effort."² He goes on to say (p. 59) that "Controlling the meaning of what is valid information is a powerful control over others." He arrives at the following definition (p. 153): "Governance is power in a social setting which is required to bring together teaching, curriculum, and learning." This power sets the context for what research and teaching are considered meaningful in an academic career. It has enormous influence in shaping individual productivity.

An institution's administration is, for the most part, open to public inspection. It is difficult to analyze educationally, however, as organizational structures usually reveal very little about what makes the academic side of an institution work. Cohen and March express the problem in the most quotable fashion:

The American college or university is a prototypic organized anarchy. It does not know what it is doing. Its goals are either vague or in dispute. Its technology is familiar but not understood. Its major participants wander in and out of the organization. These factors do not make a university a bad organization or a disorganized one; but they do make it a problem to describe, understand, and lead.³

The role of the faculty in governance has been traditionally minimal; as is well known, administrative posts are to be accepted grudgingly and only for a limited time. We faculty have been socialized to believe that expertise in management is either irrelevant or subversive in a scholar's career. Henry Rosovsky reflects on his career as Dean at Harvard in the following manner:

Another aspect of our special culture is the expectation of reticence. . . . With us it is the rule. It is bad form for a professor to admit the desire for administrative office. One of our clichés says: anyone who really wants these posts should be disqualified. Governance is a form of class treason, a leap from "we" to "they" and a betrayal of our primary mission -- teaching and research. It is crucial, once a decanal or similar post is attained, to give evidence of continual suffering.⁴

In less competitive times, perhaps the affectation of managerial innocence could be indulged without serious consequences for the institution. There now appear to be some important shifts in management style for higher education which should give pause to anyone concerned about how limited resources will be allocated. Keller believes that campus administrative governance is taking new forms as institutional leaders are attempting to integrate finances and academics to find solutions for the business of education. In his view, faculty senates are collapsing and no longer represent a determining force in decision-making; a kind of "cabinet government" has appeared, chaired by the chief academic officer and receiving input from trusted senior faculty and other representatives. Keller calls this new structure "the Joint Big Decisions Committee." If Keller's view is correct, and I believe it is, it helps explain why the processes of governance have become hard to understand. In his words:

The committee's work and membership are well known, but its deliberations are kept secret. It advises the president on what to do.⁵

The shift in administrative style described by Keller appears to have left many faculty members in genuine distress about their responsibilities for participation in academic governance. The issue is recognized as important, but the time and effort demanded for meaningful participation is

simply not rewarded, especially in research-oriented institutions.⁶ This may be taken to mean that the average faculty member has little sense of the educational priorities of an institution outside of what is discussed in a particular academic department. It is here we must turn our attention, if we are to understand the value system which determines the shape of the curriculum.

Members of the faculty in a given department are governed by two major forces: the external demands of the particular discipline to produce recognized scholarship, and the internal demands of the institution to serve the educational needs of the students. Since tenure has come to be granted primarily on the basis of external evaluation (i.e., publications and research grants), internal evaluation based on teaching and service has been sharply reduced in importance. A striking quote is provided by William Vandament, provost and vice-chancellor for academic affairs for the California State University system:

We all know that our faculty don't really work for us. They really work for the lords of discipline in a shadow government that is all-controlling.⁷

Many faculty members are convinced that their careers depend solely on success as defined by the research interests currently in vogue within a given discipline. This is taken to mean that time devoted to governance issues is simply not rewarding, particularly in the early stages of an academic career. The same concern effectively prevents the untenured from attempting interdisciplinary research, since such activity cannot be rewarded under existing academic structures and traditions. E. A. Friedman, a professor of management at Stevens Institute of Technology, is quoted as follows:

Higher education is organized like bands of feudal lords. Any interdisciplinary study in higher education is verboten because it crosses departmental bounds.⁸

A discipline-based reward system heavily favors research, where standards of excellence are set at the national or even international level. As a result, as many have observed, obtaining credentials for an academic career has become an extremely competitive process. Academic competition, if not balanced by other forces, tends to direct the energies of emerging professionals away from the local institution. President Bok of Harvard writes as follows:

Competition simply does not generate powerful incentives that force universities to work systematically at such tasks as searching for more effective methods of instruction, improving the quality of feedback to students, giving adequate help to those who experience special prob-

lems in their academic work, or evaluating the success of new programs....[C]ompetition does not merely fail to stimulate serious efforts to improve the effectiveness of educational programs; it may actually divert effort away from teaching toward research, since it is only natural to work hardest at activities that are most widely judged and rewarded.⁹

One result of the above is that faculty and administration have difficulty in communicating effectively, even about shared concerns. The institution's apparent service functions, such as teaching, advising, and the like, are not being addressed jointly by faculty and administration. The course catalogue, for example, represents very well what is considered important knowledge by individual scholars. It is difficult, however, to find a coherent statement representing collective wisdom about what is valued in an educated person, as expressed by President Bok:

One can examine the catalogues and brochures of many institutions and never find a detailed explanation of the common goals that the faculty wishes its students to achieve (loc.cit.).

By the mid-eighties the professoriate is being described in the press as "anxious" and "deeply troubled." President Rhodes of Cornell is quoted as follows:

We're in a period of great fragmentation. There is almost no commitment among faculty members, except to their academic discipline, and there is no agreement as to how we should shape the curriculum or explore the map of human experience. There is a great churning going on.¹⁰

Attempts to remedy the situation have focused primarily on the college curriculum, characterized as in "disarray" by the Association of American Colleges.¹¹ Secretary of Education William Bennett has led a "back-to-basics" movement for general education which is focused primarily on the curriculum.¹² Proponents of the curricular reform approach hope to find remedies for the educational shortcomings of today's college graduates. E.D. Hirsch and Allan Bloom, by attacking "cultural illiteracy"¹³ and "relativism,"¹⁴ have placed the debate before the general public and stirred controversy within the profession. At the same time there has been growing interest in developing programs of study which integrate the knowledge in a particular field within a larger frame of reference. Such a study is seen as vital (in a curriculum which is oriented toward training for critical thinking) and is figuring prominently in current proposals for the reform of general education at the college level.¹⁵

Relatively little has been said, however, about the changes in governance which must be accomplished in order to accommodate curricular change. Note that the teaching and learning events envisioned under the new curriculum will require a concerted effort by faculty members outside of the traditional disciplines. But interdisciplinary academic units do not ordinarily have control over the granting of tenure. As a result, many believe that only the tenured may venture into such activities without risk. But even the tenured seem reluctant to participate in activities outside of their own discipline. It must be remembered that scholars gain their credentials for an academic career in research-oriented departments, and there is very good evidence that attitudes toward teaching and service are shaped by the socialization process undergone during graduate study, as Katz and Hartnett have observed.

The decisive point is that the graduate school in its current form is no place for training teachers. This is so because of the compellingness of the research ideal. Students are socialized to think and feel that the only life worth living is that of research. All other activities are at most second best, if not evidence of failure. But future teachers can only be trained in an environment in which the ideal of teaching is central and in which students can through being teachers derive self-satisfaction and the esteem of others.¹⁶

Our graduate students are not just exposed to formal expositions of the theory and content of their subject matter; they also experience the attitudes, beliefs, and value judgments of their mentors. Taken collectively, these attitudes amount to a kind of covenant which governs how scholarship and teaching are to be done. There is nothing wrong with this, of course, as long as the outcomes of the socialization process are consonant with the goals of higher education. But when there is little sense of consensus about what the collective goals should be, it becomes difficult to provide a forum in which the faculty and administration can enter into rational debate over such matters. As a result, fewer faculty members are inclined, much less prepared, to address governance issues. New faculty, in particular, are left to their own devices to understand their institutional role.

If the external forces which encourage competition in research are not balanced by internal forces which encourage a cooperative approach to teaching and learning, it is likely that academic departments will gradually come to resemble research institutes. One may simply pursue expertise in one's domain of interest and never have the sense of having to say more than one knows. It has the feel of authenticity and can be defended as a kind of honesty which makes no pretensions to knowing what is good for others. The outcome of this line of reasoning is that research quickly loses its connection with general education, since the relation between research and undergraduate education is not being rationalized by

the members of the educational establishment. This shift in function of the scholar-teacher has already invited increased public scrutiny of the university's mission.¹⁷

A debate on curriculum which does not incorporate considerations of governance risks provoking a sense of futility or cynicism on the part of individual faculty members. After all, no one is opposed to excellence in undergraduate teaching and learning. Faculty members are generally eager to see believable provisions made for a rewarding career as a scholar-teacher. There is enormous goodwill and dedication to the ideals of the profession, but many find it difficult to live up to their own ambitions, as reported by Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation:

Professors are expected to function as scholars, conduct research, and communicate the results to colleagues. Promotions and tenure hang on research and publication. But undergraduate education also calls for a commitment to students and effective teaching. Faculty members are torn between these competing obligations.¹⁸

Increased competition for limited resources has encouraged individuals to become more "entrepreneurial" in seeking funds for their research, often with overt encouragement from the home institution.¹⁹ A system which relies heavily on individual initiative is inherently highly competitive, however. Certain kinds of educational events are well provided for; others are not. As President Bok points out, "competition works to reduce the amount of deliberate effort that a research-oriented faculty devotes to improving the process of learning" (loc. cit.). I would add that a sense of collegiality based on common purpose appears to have been a victim of competition for limited resources. Even worse, office hours shrink as scholars feel they must spend less time with their students in order to tend to their scholarly credentials. The business of education often has the feel of being an isolating enterprise for its professionals.

The complex vision of educational aspirations embodied in a curriculum must be supported by an adequate system of support and reward. It is in this respect that considerations of governance become extremely important. The "what" of the curriculum must be matched by the "how" of governance. In the past, a relatively simple social contract provided both a hierarchical organization for the institution and academic freedom for the individual professor. Leadership for the institution could be drawn from the ranks of the faculty as need arose. The modern research university has seen rapid changes in this model of governance. Both faculty and administration have become increasingly specialized in function, and it is more difficult to maintain structures which support social solidarity.

Educational administrators rely heavily on hierarchical forms of organization, which are efficient for transmitting decisions throughout the system

and for coordinating the activities of its members. Hierarchies are expensive to administer, however, and are very sensitive to bad leadership. They do not function well in generating fresh approaches to new problems but tend to maintain the status quo.

Faculty members rely heavily on loosely coupled forms of organization, which are efficient for creating divergent approaches and maximizing individual autonomy. Loosely coupled systems are difficult to coordinate, however, and are not effective in the absence of a cooperative agreement.²⁰

Each system has distinct advantages and makes a unique contribution to the educational enterprise. When the governance process is functioning well, presumably, the two systems of organization are well understood by both constituencies. That is, the faculty understands the functions performed under hierarchical organization by the administration, and the administration understands the functions performed under loosely coupled organization by the faculty. The relationship between the two systems is not necessarily adversary, but provision must be made for conflict resolution when resources are scarce. One of the chief functions of participation in the governance process is to insure mutual understanding and respect among the members of the academic community.

The dual system arose to maximize the autonomy of the teacher in the classroom on the one hand and to guarantee institutional stability on the other. This complex system of organization, when functioning properly, provides support for a broad range of educational initiatives by individuals in the academic community. It provides system rewards for research, teaching, and the service functions necessary for student well-being and professional satisfaction. This curious combination of competition and cooperation is kept in balance, in part, by the governance process. Responsible decision-making depends on information that flows up, down, and sideways. In the end, good governance is simply a problem of understanding how people work together to accomplish common goals.

II. Issues in Foreign Language Governance

One of the small consolations one may take in reading the literature on the state of higher education in this country is that what appears to be a private misery is actually a much larger issue. That is, one may view one's problems as individual, or localized in one's department, or limited to one's particular university, or a feature of one's discipline, and so on up the scale. I have come to learn that certain issues apply across disciplines, whereas other issues apply chiefly to the area of foreign languages. My colleagues in both faculty and administration report varying degrees of frustration in providing quality undergraduate education; most express some degree of surprise at the fact that others have experienced

the same problems. They face issues which are not so much hidden as impossible to address effectively within existing administrative structures.

Before addressing these issues, it is perhaps wise to remind ourselves that the goals we have envisioned enjoy widespread approval both within the profession and in the larger educational establishment. Students and faculty want to see the attainment of authentic language skills which are empowering in a wide variety of contexts: academic, business, and government. Educated persons, it is widely agreed, must transcend a narrow and ethnocentric world view, and foreign language study, especially abroad, facilitates this process. The ability to appreciate the literature of other cultures in the original language remains a mark of distinction of the educated person. This country is in the act of reexamining its commitment to providing language training for both general and professional education.

not to mention
urgent need
for business
(how cross?)

There is also good evidence of concern for governance issues. The ADFL Bulletin, with support from the Modern Language Association, has for years addressed problems facing departmental chairs. Two recent studies provide summaries of approaches to policy-making in foreign language training. Claire Gaudiani presents a collection of articles which concentrate on developing professionalism in existing foreign language and literature programs.²¹ The discussion centers around commonly taught languages. Richard Lambert focuses on the uncommonly taught languages and provides a valuable discussion of the "two systems of instruction" in this country, one university-based and the other in use in language programs run by the Department of Defense.²² Lambert also has been active in seeking support for a National Foreign Language Center.

not to mention
Be like etc.
putting up the
checks remaining
as how poor
d. job we do

A number of other publications and professional organizations with an interest in governance issues could be cited here, but I will be content to mention only the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning. It represents an important effort on the part of its member institutions to bring administration and faculty together to discuss the means of providing direct and effective action for the problems facing programs in foreign language study. The statement of the issues listed below owes a great deal to the wisdom and support of my colleagues in the Consortium.

factories -
Why isn't he
going 4/10/10
about the 50
orgs. like
ME conference?

What follows is an attempt to make a case for special consideration for foreign languages. It is true that some of the problems in this field are symptoms of what is transpiring generally in higher education. But the issues listed below are intended to demonstrate that the governance of foreign languages requires an understanding of difficulties which may be absent or relatively minor in other disciplines.

1. Foreign language study is inherently more interdisciplinary than other fields of inquiry. That is, diverse disciplines and programs such as literature, linguistics, psychology, education, area studies, study abroad,

1960s/70s... FL instruction is a skill course,
... of 1960s/70s...
... of 1960s/70s...

and the like all have legitimate contributions to make to a healthy foreign language program. This makes foreign languages an excellent point of departure for general education, but which of the research disciplines will take responsibility for quality language instruction? As was pointed out above, competition for research support can easily absorb resources of time and money. General education enterprises must be supported by a cooperative agreement that makes it possible and attractive for the various research scholars to participate in teaching. How shall this be administered?

2. The problem of applied versus theoretical studies is particularly acute in foreign languages. Language teaching and learning stresses the transmission of knowledge, whereas the research component for scholars in the field requires an emphasis on the creation of knowledge. As a result, teaching duties at the undergraduate level are frequently perceived as conflicting with professional development. Obvious needs, such as the development of materials or the application of new technology to teaching, are not universally viewed as professional activity.²³ What discipline sets standards of excellence for applications in foreign languages? How can research institutions cooperate with the private sector in meeting the educational needs of our students?

|| Level 1

3. Credentials for expertise in foreign language teaching and learning are not well defined. Since a number of fields have legitimate interest in foreign language instruction, it is not surprising that the specialist should be expected to have training in linguistics, psycholinguistics, and basic language as well as the literature, history, and sociology of the target culture. But such is rarely the case, even for those coordinators who are called upon to assume responsibility for designing the curriculum and training the staff.²⁴ Job descriptions for these positions have taken on a mythic quality. Graduate programs stressing discipline-oriented research are unable or unwilling to provide comprehensive training for future professionals. What provisions are there for creating leadership for this field?

|| —

4. Foreign language teaching relies heavily on nonresearch staff for undergraduate instruction. Teaching assistants are at varying stages of expertise in both language skill and research credentials. They require both training and supervision in order to fulfill their function in a professional manner.²⁵ Adjunct personnel play an important role in the profession, chiefly because they bring native or near-native language skills to the classroom. Opportunities for training and continuing education are often quite limited, however, and morale is accordingly low.²⁶ Who assumes responsibility for the professional development of nonresearch personnel in a research institution?

- the separate
to members
of the group

In addition to being special problems for the field of foreign language teaching and learning, the issues identified above also represent concerns for the conditions of excellence in the classroom. The Study Group on

the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) addressed the issue of quality control in college teaching and found effectiveness to be "directly related to that policy or practice to increase student involvement in learning." They address our concern:

What are the different effects of various patterns of governance, leadership, and organizational structures on faculty commitment to teaching, hence (ultimately) on student learning and development?²⁷

They view the implementation of their agenda as "... a great challenge to the creative talents of the Nation's research community and to the willingness of funding agencies, foundations, and associations to assist in producing this critical knowledge."²⁸

I am confident that there is abundant individual talent in our profession to produce the "critical knowledge" referred to above in the area of foreign language governance. I am less confident that there are system rewards for their labor, however. Some means must be found for facilitating exchange of information and encouraging critical thinking about the fundamental issues of organization for foreign language teaching and learning. I would like to express personal gratitude to my colleagues in the Consortium for their willingness to work on governance problems. I am particularly grateful for the foundation support for this enterprise. We simply would not have gotten to the point of creating a national forum for the expression of concerns without it.

well -
Finally, I am heartened to think that collective wisdom on governing foreign language programs will provide an enriched knowledge base for administrators and faculty members alike. A certain measure of success will consist in documenting, even partially, the way we are organized to do business. Our intent is not to prescribe a "best" model, but to discover the principles of governance which produce a healthy program in a given context. We hope to transcend local vested interests and to promote free exchange of information among professionals who are trying to do their job well. Since resources are limited, we are likely to have to spend more time reexamining our premises than creating new programs. It is encouraging to think that this effort may make a difference.

NOTES

1 L. T. Benezet, "Governance," in A.W. Chickering et al., The Modern American College (San Francisco: Dossey Bass, 1981), 707.

2 D.B. Gowin, Educating (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press: 1981), 56ff.

3 M. D. Cohen and J. G. March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President (New York, McGraw-Hill: 1974), 3.

- 4 H. Rosovsky, "Deaning," Harvard Magazine (Jan.-Feb. 1987), 35.
- 5 G. Keller, Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press), 61.
- 6 The Chronicle of Higher Education (May 21, 1986), citing C. E. Floyd's report for the Clearinghouse on Higher Education, "Faculty Participation in Decision Making," reports: "One reason professors are not involved in decision making...is that they don't receive any credit for their efforts when they are evaluated for promotion or salary increases."
- 7 The Chronicle of Higher Education (Oct. 2, 1985), 26.
- 8 The Chronicle of Higher Education (March 4, 1987), 14.
- 9 D. Bok, "Toward Education of Quality," Harvard Magazine (May--June, 1986), 54.
- 10 The New York Times (Sept. 7, 1986), 30.
- 11 See the Association of American Colleges, Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community (Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges, 1985).
- 12 See William Bennett, To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education (Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984).
- 13 E. D. Hirsch, Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987).
- 14 A. Bloom, The Closing of the American Mind (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987).
- 15 See "A New Wave of Curricular Reform: Connections Between Disciplines," The Chronicle of Higher Education (Sept. 2, 1987), A28ff.
- 16 J. Katz and R.T. Hartnett, Scholars in the Making (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976), 273.
- 17 Frank Newman, President of the Education Commission of the States and author of Choosing Quality: Reducing Conflict Between the State and the University, is quoted in the Chronicle of Higher Education (Sept. 2, 1987), A60, as saying, "Left totally to its own, the university will evolve toward self-interest rather than public interest."

18 Quoted from "College: The Undergraduate Experience in America" in an article entitled "Study Finds Colleges Torn by Divisions, Confused over Roles," The Chronicle of Higher Education (Nov. 5, 1986).

19 Entrepreneurial administration can produce negative effects, according to one study, as faculty "are likely to be dissatisfied with administrative services and such job features as challenge, variety in activities, responsibility, autonomy, and opportunity for scholarly pursuits." See A. Astin and R. Scherrei, Maximizing Leadership Effectiveness (Jossey-Bass, 1980), 105. They report (p. 11) the findings of an AAHE and NEA task force that "faculty discontent is closely related to their lacking influence in governance."

20 See K. E. Weick, "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly 21, 1 (1976), 1-19.

21 C. Gaudiani, Strategies for Development of Foreign Language & Literature Programs (New York: Modern Language Association, 1984).

22 R. D. Lambert, Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies (Washington, DC: Association of American Universities, 1984).

23 A good collection of points of view in this matter can be found in the "Dialogue" section of Hispania 69 (March 1986), 172-229.

24 See R. V. Teschner, "A Profile of the Specialization and Expertise of Lower Division Foreign Language Program Directors in American Universities," Modern Language Journal 71, 1 (1987), 28-35.

25 See J. Gibaldi and J. V. Mirollo, eds., The Teaching Apprentice Program in Language and Literature. (New York: Modern Language Association, 1981). They list seventeen proposals which raise serious questions of governance.

26 The problems associated with the use of adjunct faculty were reported in the New York Times summer survey of education, August 16, 1985. Since then the Chronicle of Higher Education has run a number of articles on the subject. The July 30, 1986 issue (p. 23) reported the AAUP's criticism of the abuse of nontenure-track appointments.

27 Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education, Report on the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education, Kenneth P. Mortimer, chairman, et al., (Washington, DC: National Institute of Education 1984), recommendation no. 27, pt. 3, n.p.

28 Ibid.

ACADEMIC ALIGNMENTS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING

Winfred P. Lehmann
University of Texas at Austin

a wise old woman

I am pleased at your invitation to participate in this symposium, which has further informed me of your excellent plans. Over the past years there have been important efforts to improve foreign language competence in this country, among them the MLA Commission on Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics followed by its current Foreign Language Advisory Committee, the National Foreign Language Center at Johns Hopkins University, and your Consortium. Your aims under your able executive director are impressive, and I give you my best wishes on carrying them out.

In inviting me here your director suggested that I devote my time rather to asking questions than suggesting solutions. After numerous decades of teaching that is what one may do best. In his generosity he, and you, must also have been aware of the dangers of extending an invitation to a retired professor. Besides questions, one also may have adopted from Socrates and other teachers of the past a proclivity towards anecdotes. And like the sly old boy, some questions may be indirect. When our current situation is discussed, we may be given the impression that it has a long background in a stable university structure supplemented by powerful professional organizations. English departments are often the largest in a university; French and Spanish may be in the next echelon. The MLA is more than a hundred years old; AAT's of various languages are flourishing. Our state legislatures and even the Congress are supporting language study, egged on by gloom-and-doom reports on failings in language and culture among our youth, our diplomats, and our businessmen.

It might be well to recall the situation a half-century or so ago to sharpen our perspective on our roles today. When I entered the graduate program of the German Department at the University of Wisconsin fifty years ago, the central course for graduate students was a survey of German literature taught by Alexander Rudolph Hohlfeld, chairman of the department. Conducted in German, the large class attracted students from various segments of the university and townspeople. The course could probably have been offered at any university in Germany. Certainly Hohlfeld's Faust course might have been, as well as most of the department's seminars. An advanced graduate student remarked that a seminar paper would require 300 hours of research. Most of the courses were literary, preparing majors for their prime roles in the future: college and university teaching. The department's program included elementary courses, possibly half taught by TA's. The text was the coordinator. A semester course on pedagogy, given by the author of the beginning text,

was recommended, buttressed by a mild requirement that TA's visit classes. By a more serious mandate, female TA's lived at the German House, where only German was spoken; males took lunch and dinner there. The strongest effort at coordination came in common finals, which we corrected on an assembly-line basis. As a last sidelight on departmental arrangements of the time, there was one secretary for probably the largest German department of the country, in contrast with the battery of administrative auxiliaries established in academic units today.

It would be fair to say that the chief goals of the large departments centered on literary scholarship at an advanced level. Even the small Scandinavian department that had been set up, as well as the eminent scholars in Polish and Irish who had been appointed, thanks to legislative provision which included substantial funding, primarily offered graduate-level courses. When some of us wanted Russian, a professor in the German Department arranged a graduate course; it attracted five students and an auditor. Linguistics as we know it did not exist, let alone contribute to training for the teaching of language; when several students pushed for a course, an obliging professor introduced one on the history of concern with language, beginning with Plato's Cratylus.

World War II brought large changes. USAFI (The United States Armed Forces Institute) placed many GI's at Wisconsin, especially in German. These had practical requirements; GI's needed to learn how to communicate in the colloquial. The old introductory text no longer seemed appropriate with its initial sentences: "Das ist der Tisch." "Dies ist der Stuhl." Strong influence on foreign language teaching now was exerted from Washington, where the LSA under auspices of the ACLS masterminded a crash program of producing a variety of texts, first-level, second-level, dictionaries, and planned higher levels, and of providing teachers for languages that had been available, if at all, in a small number of universities to classes choked with one to three students. Many of you may know how linguists were plucked from their previous activities, and assigned to handle one of the critical languages, such as the Potawatomi specialist, Charles Hockett, who was fingered for Chinese, given a few weeks lead time to get a smattering of it, and then put on a ship with military passengers bound for Burma, to teach his charges Chinese before they set out on the Burma road to Chungking. He was also to stay adequately ahead of his students to produce a text that was eventually published, first by USAFI and then by Holt and Company.

The organization coordinating production of the texts carried out research on language acquisition. They conducted tests on GI's to determine the optimum number of vocabulary items for a unit, to look into problems of transliteration, and so on. A general pattern for the texts was also developed. It included five units of five sets, each followed by a review unit. Units centered on cultural topics; unit one, called "Getting Around," included greetings, requests concerning directions and common needs, including one that now might be excluded: "I want a cigarette?"

Give me a match?" Topics of other units dealt with the family, people's names, the country, etc. Vocabularies were carefully chosen, limited to 30-40 words per unit. The essential grammar was covered. Some of the texts were superb. Einar Haugen's Spoken Norwegian equipped students with basic control of the language and of the everyday culture. In addition to such an evaluation based on my own use of it I may recall the astonishment of a dignitary I met in Bergen who told me with continued wonder of a high school student in Minneapolis; meeting him on his visit to her school, she asked about the principal department store in Bergen, which she knew only from the handbook.

Unfortunately the courses and the texts were not continued after we re-entered civilian life. Foreign language departments in universities remained under the control of scholars who for the most part had filled out their schedules during the war in related departments rather than in the programs designed to teach oral proficiency and general culture. The army handbooks may have seemed perverse to academics. They did not prepare students for reading FL texts, certainly not literary texts. And the massive increases in enrollment after the war hardly fostered training of language teachers. When upon my re-entry to academic life in February 1946 I met my expected class scheduled in a room for twenty students, I found the hall choked with close to a hundred. The chairman hurriedly assembled instructors, some of them clergymen, to handle the traditionally small classes. One who had taught throughout the war, as younger instructors were involved elsewhere, had developed strong views on language teaching methodology. After a day or so getting acquainted with his students, he announced to them that the only real difficulty with German lay in the subjunctive. The rest of the semester he lectured to them on the beauty, importance, and meaning of the subjunctive. All of us shuddered when any of his students transferred to our second semester class.

A few of the excellencies of the USAFI program began to affect academic instruction. Among these were recordings, available on records that allowed proper time for repetition of response to patterns. And as tape machines gradually replaced the infuriating wire recorders, the cumbersome records gave way to language tapes. The boom in use of these as key elements in language laboratories after Sputnik is well-known and is of direct interest here largely in that it gave some promise of coordination in language teaching programs throughout universities rather than by departments. Reference to the bust on both counts may mercifully be passed over.

The emergence of linguistics as a distinct discipline gave further hope of realignment of language teaching. Since World War II linguists had maintained strong interest in non-Western languages, some even teaching them. The powerful background of some in anthropology, and the examples of respected linguists like Edward Sapir and Leonard Bloomfield, led many linguists to insist on study, even field study, of such languages

when separate departments were established in the sixties. But other patterns prevailed. To paraphrase the often cited sage from back-country Kentucky, in their concentration on what is referred to as theory many linguists held: "if English is good enough for Noam Chomsky, it's good enough for me." The non-Western languages had to go elsewhere. In some universities separate departments were established; ours at the University of Texas is known by the straightforward title: "The Department of Oriental and African Languages and Literatures." Quechua, when offered, is given in the Anthropology Department.

The "populist" views of linguists led to other developments. What were universities to do with the large numbers of foreign students who needed attention to their English? And how were programs in research on teaching of languages to be stowed? Here the answers are less glorious. Many of the graduate students with non-native English were simply allowed to go on teaching mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other areas in which they were conducting their research. At the same time, English Departments were prevailed on to give courses for them, possibly with credit comparable to that for the standard freshman English. Instructors assigned to these often had limited results; often poorly grounded in phonetics and typically focused on teaching students to shake their clichés and develop individual styles, these instructors were not optimally equipped for instruction of students with individual styles verging on the eccentric if not the unintelligible, who might actually profit most by mastering at least the clichés characteristic of American culture, as exposed by Hirsch, Kett, and Trefil.¹ As an alternate, semi-official courses were made available for foreign students under instructors who preceded the underpaid academic proletariat exploited subsequently by universities wishing to keep their number of tenured positions low.

Devices for training teachers of languages may have met a variety of solutions. At the University of Texas at Austin a Foreign Language Education Center was set up in the Education College. Fortunate in having an excellent director, it succeeded in fending off the educators with a capital E and in attracting to its graduate committee representatives from the several language departments. But it never overcame the stigma of second-rate status, especially among students in linguistics, who even in poverty gloried in their pursuit of the latest theory.

Probably the strongest force in maintaining the traditional structure of departments came from the failure of comparative literature specialists to establish themselves much as did the linguists. At least in some universities Comp. Lit. programs and committees were established at the same time as were those in linguistics. And they flourished. When the Committee on the Assessment of Quality-Related Characteristics of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States (its results referred to under the simpler title: Jones-Lindzey Report) met to determine the "disciplines included in the assessment," there was a good bit of discussion on the language and literature departments.² By ETS figures, more

doctorates had been awarded in comparative literature during the academic years 1976-78 than in French, in Spanish, or in German. And even in the figures from the National Research Council, which defined fields differently, there were more degrees in comparative literature than in German. Nevertheless, German was included rather than comparative literature for reasons of tradition and of comparability with the previous Carter and Roose-Andersen reports. Yet specialists in comparative literature have maintained their traditional homes, even though the pertinent divisions in the MLA are larger than are those representing departmental alignments. Without trespassing even in thought on their hallowed domains I might suggest that the maintenance of language and literature departments by their principal languages, like English, French, German, Spanish, may be the dominant reason for preservation of elementary language courses in the established departments, under control of scholars who accept an elementary teaching assignment only with the greatest reluctance and generally with a similar degree of disaster. Administrators, who cheerfully support graduate students with funds generated by class loads at the elementary level, have not dashed in to establish a different arrangement. In the absence of administrative units focusing on foreign language teaching, including English, with all respect to organizations like ACTFL, TESOL, the AAT's, and others, there is no center to examine principles, aims, and innovations with the purpose of making them available for language teachers.

Proponents of newly labeled methods continue to appear, and may achieve acclaim. One wonders at the extent to which they have examined the procedures of their predecessors, Sweet in England, Jespersen in Denmark, Viëtor in Germany, and Tesnière in France among others. It may be a sign of mental weariness to remember methodologists of one's past. Or of skepticism. It may also be a strong mark of self-preservation to mention only incidents regarding methods far away and long ago. When we set about teaching English in Ankara, Turkey in 1955, we heard of strict proponents of the direct method among our few predecessors. Tales included one on the procedure of teaching the use of words like "love" without sullyng the process by citing the Turkish counterpart. The effort required twenty minutes of class time. The colorful British linguist, J. R. Firth, Yorkshireman first and paradigm of common sense throughout, told marvelous stories reflecting his sane views on language. One concerned the preparation of language teaching records for the BBC. After carefully reading the well-planned texts in the morning session, he and his colleagues took off for lunch. Involved on their return to the recording studio in a warm discussion, they quieted down after a while and indicated their readiness to continue their production of the records. At which the laboratory assistant said: "Ladies and gentlemen, you have been recording language conversations this morning. Let me illustrate to you what conversation is really like." And then he played their previous discussion for them.

We investigate the principles for our procedures under fancy names, such as psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. Psycholinguistic and comparable study presumably includes in its domain ways in which we learn languages.

We may ask whether there is any standard way. Schliemann made a fortune, and founded an academic discipline using languages he learned by reading and memorizing Bible texts. In Greece, of course, he supplemented this practice with the help of a handsome native speaker who lent splendor to the gold Mycenaean jewelry he uncovered. One of the most successful teachers during my time as chairman of Germanic Languages frayed my pedagogical tolerance by sitting stolidly behind her desk, nonetheless turning out excellent students. Another at the time with similar success was almost frenetically active. Each of us and each of our students may vibrate to a different wavelength. The computer has given language teachers a device to approximate such different attitudes and aptitudes. In the meantime I await with barely disguised skepticism discovery of an all-embracing methodology for teaching FL's, and I applaud your cautious statements on such possibilities.

Among the most important contributions of methodologists, after instruction in fundamentals, may be procedures to increase sensitivity of teachers and also their enthusiasm. It is fairly certain that children learn foreign languages readily and with enjoyment. Psycholinguists may support efforts to begin foreign language teaching for children in the early grades. When freshmen enter universities speaking one or more foreign languages, we won't need to be concerned about the role of such languages and their instructors in higher education. Their position will then parallel that in psychology, chemistry, economics, and other departments.

Sociolinguistic concerns raise many problems. We have been teaching largely the foreign languages used in societies similar to ours. Flying to Europe or to South America, we find few differences in social arrangements unless we seek out picturesque conservative communities. Even the Soviet Union, especially the centers in which most foreigners find themselves -- Moscow, Leningrad, Tashkent -- shares our pattern of activities. At least for the time being Japan does not, nor do other language-speaking areas in which a complex system of anaphoric elements takes the place of our straightforward set of pronouns, at the same time reflecting an intricate social system based on alignments often different from ours. A reading of Gilbert and Sullivan's Mikado isn't adequate for supplementing the cultural notes of an average handbook. China, Southeast and South Asia, and Africa require sociolinguistic attention. Any plan to shortchange students by teaching them a stripped-down, so-called practical command of language will turn out a generation of Calibans for our diplomatic corps, our businessmen, and others now recognizing their impotence as representatives of the English-only movement. And even the major western languages provide increasing complexities, with their

pluricentric standards.³ We hear of speakers of English failing to understand one another, such as Nigerians who in some areas have speakers of Indian English as teachers, in others teachers who consider Britain or the USA centers for their standards. Pluricentric languages besides English are Arabic, Chinese, Dutch, French, German, Portuguese, and Spanish. A generation ago Spanish instructors may have insisted on Castilian pronunciation. With increasing literary, cultural, and political prestige of countries in Latin America, other varieties of Spanish may now be taught. Yet Border Spanish is still considered substandard, with consequent effects on its native speakers. We know of the recent and tenuous position of the Received Standard for Britain, of the Bühnen-aussprache for German, and of the battles by the French Academy. Yet the use of other standards, such as Austrian German, may elicit comment. In our remarkable sensitivity to speech we react differently to rebellious teenagers attempting to demonstrate their sophistication in becoming lordly sophomores, to immigrants who mastered their new language with the help of GI's, to President Kennedy's facile use of a similar lexicon, and to laborers in tough jobs like those in steel mills. How far should we yield to our pluralistic tolerance?

Attention to social and cultural complexities is not likely to lower the costs of FL teaching, already among the most costly subjects in higher institutions. There was some hope that language laboratories would reduce costs while increasing competence, but our students weren't as well-behaved as Pavlov's dogs. TV in the classroom also was disappointing, for other reasons; even talented producers turned out programs that looked clumsy to students accustomed to commercial TV with its unlimited budgets. Will computers do better? If they are to, we can't stint our imaginations or the costs.

You have notable projects under way, and accordingly I can be brief. We need cooperating centers, such as the Consortium, the center at Johns Hopkins, and those to be established under the Education for a Competitive America Act. We need them to produce materials in accordance with pedagogical effectiveness and not with outmoded views on what will bring profits to the conglomerates that have swallowed up publishers, trickling royalties to textbook authors who pathetically subsidize the corporations. With funds that now seem assured in congressional bills we can support research on materials that will be effective and possibly more useful than yet another edition of Hemingway or Romantic verse. Besides centers we need networks throughout the country to provide such materials for language courses at all levels. Students who squander their allowance on computerized games in student unions, airports, and shopping malls aren't going to take kindly to stodgy programs. And they, like teachers, want choices. The French center assembling information on software (Centre d'Etudes des Systèmes et des Technologies Avancées) has found that teachers choose differing programs, regardless of forecasts by experts on acceptability and quality. Deken in his lively book on robotics suggests that robots like those used by airlines to train and

upgrade their pilots could be used to simulate tours in lieu of travel to foreign countries.⁴ Adapting his suggestion I have proposed that similar programs could be devised to teach foreign languages as used in their cultures.⁵ Descriptors like "interactive," though self-evident, are probably less pertinent than adjectives like "costly."

Costs must not be our main concern. It will be some time before we catch up with the rest of the university. Accepting with realism and dismay coaching staffs with at least one coach for every position on a football team, and admitting offices of presidents with their coteries of officials rivalling the courts of Chinese emperors and Louis the Fourteenth, we cannot even aspire to the technical support at the decanal level. When computers were introduced a decade and more ago, we were assured that they would reduce administrative positions -- every full-blooded instructor would have direct access to the pertinent data bases of the Main Building of the University. In the latest reorganization of our deanery of Liberal Arts, besides the numerous auxiliary posts there is a slot for a programmer; at hardly the lowest figure in our list of salaries for "classified" personnel, the appointee is to modify programs for the special needs of Liberal Arts. With our colleagues in the humanities we are as accustomed to meager support as to independence. And our reluctance to apply political pressure is matched only by our naïveté. As a result, NEH receives less funding per year than is expended on one magnificent aircraft of dubious capability. Our Secretary of Education proclaims that the 308 billion spent on education nationally almost equals funding for the Department of Defence. A few more of our citizens are involved in learning than in military affairs. Some of us hold, to better benefit. Not the least of our questions concerns our will and ability to obtain the means necessary to put into effect the plans we know will improve competence in languages.

NOTES

1 E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Cultural Literacy (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987). See esp. "Appendix," 146-215.

2 Lyle V. Jones, Gardner Lindzey, and Porter E. Coggeshall, eds., An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Humanities (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1982).

3 Michael Clyne, "The Interaction of National Identity, Class and Pluriglossia in a Pluricentric Language," in Donald C. Laycock and Werner Winter, eds., A World of Language, Pacific Linguistics, C-100 (Canberra: The Australian National University, 1987), 127-39.

4 Joseph Deken, Silico Sapiens (New York: Bantam, 1986).

5 Winfred P. Lehmann, "Four Decades with the Computer: Issues

and Developments in English and Applied Linguistics," Computers in Language Research and Language Learning (1987), 2.5-16.

*re lang - requirement
five philology, poor
understanding of*

THE POLITICS OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

James Redfield
The University of Chicago

*proficiency
pulls no punches
about attitudes*

This paper attempts to translate some intractable curricular issues into some intractable issues of governance, with the hope that both sets of issues will become at least more comprehensible when the connection between them is revealed. The making of this connection will turn out to require a shift to a level of diffused cultural values, values within the academy not less powerful for being seldom verbalized. I may add that the impetus for this inquiry was not merely speculative but arose from certain practical frustrations. This is a local report and can perhaps best be introduced autobiographically.

In 1982 I was appointed Master of the Collegiate Division of the Humanities (a post which at Chicago carries the concomitant titles of Associate Dean of the College and Associate Dean of the Humanities) with a somewhat generally expressed mandate from the Dean of the College to (among other things) "do something about language instruction." As a step toward finding a more definite intention in this charge I created a "seminar," a weekly meeting to which I invited, for discussion of mutual interests, all those known to be deeply involved in teaching language at Chicago. They talked to each other and I listened; there turned out to be a lot to talk about. These language teachers had been scattered through a score of departments, committees, and fields; now that they met each other (in many cases for the first time), they turned out to have common intellectual interests, having to do with methods of instruction, and common material interests, having to do with facilities. Out of this group came the committee that asked for and got from the Dean of the Humanities our Center for Language Instruction with its computer and its audiovisual equipment, and this is the group which will succeed, if anyone will, in upgrading our Language Laboratory. Something, in other words, was accomplished: I had invented a pressure group. On the other hand, as I sat and listened I was recurrently impressed by how little was happening; the intellectual range of the conversation seemed to me narrow and the practical ambition confined. These are not vices, I may say, one associates with the University of Chicago, where committee deliberation tends toward wild, not to say perverse, speculation and utopian grandiosity. There was something here to consider.

Much of the conversation when it was not about methods and facilities was about the language requirement, about placing students into it or excusing them from it. This conversation, it seemed to me, remained superficial because it took for granted most of the problem: there was discontent with the one-year requirement to which most students were held but no willingness to talk about the content of that requirement or

its place in a wider curriculum. Everyone there (except me, it seemed) assumed that to teach a modern language meant the teaching of broad-gauge, quasi-native-speaker capacities, and everyone assumed that the value of such instruction is self-evident and generally understood.

The seminar, as such groups do, started with a relatively large and shifting attendance and then settled down to a smaller group of regulars. The teachers of dead languages disappeared; Modern Chinese continued to be represented, but Classical Chinese was not. Those who teach languages as an aspect of linguistics also dropped out: this meant that we lost Modern Greek, which at Chicago is taught primarily for its ethnolinguistic interest, and Georgian, in which we offer a three-year coordinated program -- Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced. These were of course the very people who might have been expected to widen the intellectual preconceptions of the group; instead they decided that the conversation was not for them and went away.

We were left with teachers of major modern languages. Looking at them as an Associate Dean, I could not fail to be struck by the diversity of their appointments. There were tenured faculty, including a Full Professor or two, Assistant Professors (all, I happened to know, with poor prospects of promotion), Senior Lecturers (predominantly women), and graduate student Lecturers (usually on two-year appointments but occasionally extended indefinitely). At Chicago, which has always proclaimed that its "real" faculty do its teaching, this quasi-faculty demanded explanation; no other aspect of humanistic teaching was organized this way. As I got to thinking about this point my attention shifted from substance to procedure and to problems of governance.

Academic governance may be divided into two branches: curriculum and personnel, or (more informally) What shall we do? and Who is going to do it? (Curriculum really should be curriculum-and-research, but in the humanities -- with rare exceptions, such as the Assyrian Dictionary -- research is left for individual faculty to fit into their unadministered time and becomes an administrative problem only in terms of the granting of leaves.) Obviously the first conditions the second: we have jobs because there are things for us to do. Yet it is striking that most faculty want to be included in personnel discussions, even those remote from their own areas, while we get into curricular discussions mostly out of a sense of duty; many do not even think of the curriculum as an aspect of governance. Perhaps this is because we do not really view the academy as a purposeful agency but as a self-justified society; the right people (people like ourselves) should be admitted and then left to do what they want. Or it may be because, while personnel discussions are conducted in a tone of tough realism ("I like so-and-so as a person" is a sure sign of a negative vote coming up), curricular discussions tend to idealism in the bad sense. There is a recurrent gap between high sentence and low motives; a roomful of professors talk of The Knowledge Most Worth Having and What Every Educated Person Should Know, while all of them know that

each of them is evaluating every suggestion in terms of its impact on teaching loads and the labor of the class preparations, on recruitment, on the fortunes of their own proteges and the prestige of their own fields.

No doubt this is all as it should be. Academics are paid to talk, and we had better find something more interesting to say than: "I want this because I want it, and I'm going to get it because I've found some other powerful people who want it too." We are professionally committed to defending our interests in terms of higher cultural values -- and in this respect academic politics, for all its wordy inconsequence, perhaps sets a model for all politics (if we mean by politics something other than the test of force). Nor should we be dismayed that curricula are political documents; if the process of reasoning, even if it is little more than rationalization, requires us to state the meaning of our work, so also the process of negotiation, even if it is little more than logrolling, requires us to respect our colleagues as persons with whom we share a common institutional loyalty and fate. The two processes, taken together, keep the college in touch with the realities of power and current culture, both within the college and outside it.

The academy is self-perpetuating, self-evaluating, and self-accrediting. It defines its relations with the wider society -- which to a large extent is ready to be told what it should value. We, in turn, know that these things (whatever they are) are valuable because we and others like us value them. Certainly these things change over time, but it is something of a mystery why, for instance, Latin declines and Calculus advances. Always a curriculum is an attempt to make concrete our current values. Certainly the shape of the faculty changes in response to curricular changes, but the reverse is also true; it is unclear whether there are now fewer Latin teachers because Latin is less taught, or vice versa. If we hire enough computer people, Computer Science will become an integral part of the core curriculum. Always the curriculum is an attempt at self-definition by those at that time established in academic power.

It follows that curricular discussions can never be fully "rational" -- in terms of student demand, faculty interest, and available funding; all those things are subject to change, and can be changed by the ways we talk about them. Nor is the "useful" nor the "needed" a sufficient criterion of what is proper to higher education. On the other hand, the discussion does not helpfully proceed on an "ideal" plane either; we must be respectful of the conditions in which we find ourselves, and we must recognize that the statement of an ideal is never disinterested, and often intends the seduction of the innocent.

All this is prologue to a discussion of the language requirement, which I intend to discuss in terms of the sociology of the academy and to use as a case study for inquiry into the way academic values are negotiated and legitimated. Let me begin by noting that from the ideal point of view languages are strangely unproblematic. Everyone seems to agree that it

is good to learn them. One might say the same of mathematics, but in this case I would go further: everyone actually desires to know more languages -- if it could be done without effort we would like to know them all. That "row that downed every hod on Babel" is one of the emblems of our Fall, and by partially repairing it we come one small step back toward some primal unity. So languages should not be a curricular problem.

Nevertheless language is a problem -- because, while we seem to know what we want, we seem completely unprepared to insist on it. It is generally agreed that second-language acquisition should come early, yet foreign language is no longer required for college admission; the controversy now turns on the college language requirement. It is generally agreed that languages are retained only by those who bring them to some usable level, either for conversation or reading, also that for most American students this level can be reached only in two years, and also only in a few languages (Romance and to some extent Germanic) -- yet the general liberal arts requirement is not uncommonly set at one year of any available language. It is generally agreed that language learning requires commitment and a certain level of intensity, yet we permit students to meet the requirements with C's and D's. It is generally agreed that languages are learned by those who have a use for them; the language requirement does not, however, require students to use the language or even to learn it, but merely to study it. I have heard the language requirement debated many times, but I have never heard a faculty debate a real language requirement. Such a requirement would insist on two years' college work (or equivalent) at an A or B level in a language in which such work can reasonably be expected to bring the student to a reasonable proficiency; it would be enforced by a tough proficiency exam at the end -- no proficiency, no diploma. Such a requirement would demand the kind of commitment demanded by pre-med chemistry; no one seems to think it reasonable to ask this of students in general. Instead, the debate is conducted between those who think that in the absence of a real requirement it is better to have no requirement at all and those who think something better than nothing. The debate seems to be a leading indicator of faculty attitudes toward requirements in general; when requirements are out, the language requirement is eliminated; when, as at the present time, requirements are again in fashion, the language requirement, in that tepid form which satisfies its proponents, is reintroduced. Of course if we gave languages, in the schools and on the SAT's, the kind of weight we give mathematics, every American would arrive in college with some smattering of a foreign tongue, and the colleges would have a real requirement.

1 year's
workable

Americans as a nation are not much good at foreign languages. This is one of the places where we become aware that our pedagogy is embedded in the wider culture. The Dutch and the Danes learn foreign languages; the French, who are phonologically isolated, learn to read but not to speak or understand them -- except for those few who learn many,

having observed that while an accent in French is vulgar, a French accent is charming. Americans are more like the Italians; it is not unusual to meet in Italy young people who have had six or seven years of English in school and cannot form a sentence in it. Perhaps the similarity is accounted for by the fact that both nations are in their different ways linguistic melting pots; Italian is after all a second language for most Italians, a foreign language learned at school (and from television) to supplement the Piemontese or Calabrian they speak at home. By the time they arrive at formal foreign language instruction they have already suffered years of language anxiety. Similarly Americans often seem blocked off from language acquisition by their ethnic contact with languages other than English; many a college language teacher complains of the obstacle of church-basement Modern Greek or barrio Spanish. The student's previous efforts to communicate are thus academically categorized as a disadvantage; it is better to know nothing than to know something "incorrect." However, the French Canadians of New England do seem well placed to learn French. It is a puzzle.

but they often get out at 2+

In any event it is clear that foreign languages are one of the places where the nation's reach exceeds its grasp; they are a Good Thing, but Just Too Hard. We are not willing to put into them the necessary level of resources in the schools, in the colleges, or at any level. (I well remember the graduate student who said: "Oh, I took the German reading exam two years ago, I couldn't possibly read it now.") In this contradictory condition the language requirement is our compromise; it does not insist that students learn a language, but it does transmit to them the message that we very much wish that they would. Perhaps this message is important enough to be worth a yearlong college course -- even though it does mean that our teachers have to teach two kinds of students: those who are learning the language, and those who are meeting the requirement.

Language teaching has been adapted to our ideology of "exposure" (as in the expression "exposure to the Humanities"). For most modern European languages we now have beautifully crafted teaching programs, comprising textbooks, workbooks, tapes, and even interactive video tapes; we expose the students to the program, and in some cases it is effective, in some cases not. No doubt this is generally the case with exposure; it is only that in this case the exposed student is likely in another sense later to be exposed. The inability to see the point of a poem is a failing which in ordinary life can usually be concealed, but an inability to speak or read French becomes at certain moments painfully obvious -- and is not made less painful by the mumbled admission: "I had some French in college." Given the requirement, we then proceed to rationalize it. Much of the well-rehearsed debate about the requirement consists of the rediscovery of these rationalizations. It is said that foreign language study at any level improves the understanding of language in general -- that, for instance, most Americans learn English grammar for the first time in the course of studying some other language. It is said that even a very

*well -- We have all high-level acquired grammar in E.
If the FL course emphasizes analytic grammar in such a way,
there will be less proficiency acquired.*

modest command of a foreign language is some use -- one can learn enough to "get around," or to pick through technical articles in a specific field, getting the good of their formulae or footnotes. It is said that an introduction to the language is really an introduction to the culture. It is said that language study encourages good study habits, trains the memory, and encourages the habit of precision.

I call these rationalizations not because they are untrue, but because we do not take them seriously enough to shape our instruction in accordance with them. The last rationalization applies to a great variety of intellectual fields -- for instance, the mastery of baseball statistics. It does not justify language per se. The other three would imply forms of instruction very different from those now in use. A focus on language (rather than a language) would stress those aspects, structural and semantic, which most differ from English; that is the way the linguists teach, for instance, Georgian and Greenland Eskimo -- not for any prospective use, but as objects of study with an intrinsic intellectual interest. A focus on culture would stress those aspects of the language most culturally specific -- euphemisms and obscenities, exclamations and gestures, proverbs and low idioms, the language spoken to children, such formal subrhetorics as police reports, prayer, and patriotic speeches. A focus on particular uses would adapt itself to those uses, would teach, for instance, Broken Spanish for Travellers, with the kind of simplified structure and large vocabulary which would enable one to function effectively as a comic foreigner, to shop, deal with the civil service, and read the weather reports. German for Chemists does exist, and my colleague James McCawley has designed a course in how to read the wall signs in Chinese restaurants, but those models have not been generalized.

It would seem that if we are going to have a large number of students who will be taking one year of a language in college, and no more, we would be designing courses for those students. There exist, for instance, reduced languages which, because they are no one's mother tongue, can be mastered quite quickly. Pidgin (also known as Neo-Melanesian) is one such; Esperanto is another. A different sort of example is Homeric Greek, to which one might add Old Norse. It is possible, as I know from experience, to teach students to read Homer accurately and sensitively in a year of ordinary course work -- indeed by the end of this time a good graduate student is ready to write publishable articles on the Homeric language, proof against the most exacting professional criticism. Alternatively one could teach Reading Scholarly French -- although as French rhetoric becomes more baroque this reaches a narrower range of scholarship than it used to. Or we could teach not language but the history of language; we could teach Latin and its Derivatives (including Sardinian and Rumanian) with attention to underlying structures and patterns of historical transformation. There is an indefinite number of opportunities in this and other directions. None of them are being pursued. We continue to offer virtually all our students broad courses intended to begin to establish the full range of native-speaker competences: phonetics,

JCC3
we should
not adopt
them all

NO!
NO!

good here

phonemics, morphology, syntax, vocabulary, idiom, and stylistics. And we then observe that it is not possible to do much in a year.

The students who really want to learn a modern language generally travel. (This poses a special problem for Russian, since few find it easy to spend much time in the Soviet Union.) Total immersion, as we know, is the one proven effective pedagogy, since it punishes refusal to function in the language by embarrassment, loneliness, and even actual hunger. We could provide artificial conditions of total immersion on our own campuses, but it is understood that the expense is too great -- not only the material expense, but the expense in moral wear and tear. It is understood that precisely because these sanctions are real they are not to be imposed on those who do not specially choose them.

Conversely the language requirement, because it is for everyone, functions without real sanctions. My objection to the requirement (and I do generally object to it) is to the fact that it makes obvious to the world -- and even worse, to ourselves -- our failure of nerve. It is a curricular expression, not of our determination, but of our hopes and wishes. It is my impression, further, that while most requirements are defended by those who teach them -- the physicists insist on physics, the English teachers on English -- the language requirement is generally unpopular with those who teach languages. It is, rather, insisted upon by those who hope that someone else will teach their students what, in many cases, they wish they had learned themselves.

I may add that the physicists, having insisted on a physics requirement, do set themselves (however ineptly) to the creation of courses tailored to the requirement; these are the well-known courses in Science for Non-scientists. We do not, however, have (as I have said) Language Courses for Those Who Will Not Learn Languages. Our language teachers go doggedly on dragging all through a curriculum intended only for some.

All this suggests that the place of language teaching in the curriculum merits further investigation. This is an area which absorbs a large chunk of our resources and has benefited very little from our creativity. Language instruction is a poor relation; we all know we have to find it a houseroom and feed it, but we seldom ask if it is happy.

All this has to do, I think, with a confusing fact about natural language: it is a symbolic capacity which is acquired, in most cases, without study. Every natural language is someone's mother tongue, and the intellectual efforts we exert on mother's knee, while undoubtedly intense, are not of the sort we undertake in college. To put this another way: modern languages (I shall come to dead languages later) are an odd element of higher education because they are known to be known by many who are hardly educated at all. In France even the little children speak French -- in certain districts, with a remarkably good accent. In language study we repair a partiality in our upbringing -- that we were brought up in

comparison to fine arts or sports classes would yield different results

one language community rather than another. In this sense all modern language study is remedial. The process of learning the language, furthermore, puts us back into a kind of childlike state: we don't know the simplest things, like the words for bread and water. Languages, further, cannot be learned by intellectual effort; the process requires drill and other forms of repetitive practice. The necessary redundancy of the process is frustrating; languages come slowly, and we have always the feeling that we should already know these things; they are so simple, and yet so frustratingly difficult. To know many languages is, of course, an extraordinary thing, but each modern language is in itself ordinary, and on its own home ground taken for granted.

It follows that language instruction is, within the academy, a relatively low-status operation. Good language teachers are hard to find, and we might expect them to be valued -- but it is a fundamental sociological rule of the academy that prestige attaches, not to the ability to teach, but to the thing taught. All remedial instruction is low-status. Modern language teaching lacks that initiatory quality, that sense of being admitted to a circle of the instructed elect, which confers on the teacher a magic aura. We are grateful to good language teachers, as we are grateful to those who cook our meals and cut our hair, but we do not, except in a few cases of rare virtuosity, find them impressive. Language teaching is a service occupation within the academy.

*Why, then,
is beginning
why is also
a low-status
course*

||

This diagnosis is confirmed by the fact that the situation is completely different with the dead languages. In Greek and Latin, not to speak of Hittite and Akkadian, the tenured faculty routinely teach at the elementary level; indeed there is a not unfounded belief that few assistant professors know these languages well enough to teach them. These languages can be acquired only by study, and are thus quite differently evaluated in relation to college work; the mass of unsystematic detail which must be mastered is not seen as a banality, as in a modern language, but admired as a philology, a secret code known only to the few. In the dead languages the language is the field, and prestige attaches primarily to philological competence itself, rather than to any use to which it is put.

A somewhat paradoxical corollary of this situation is that in the dead languages there is very little language teaching as such. At Chicago we teach Greek grammar for three or four months -- a quick trot through some standard textbook -- and then settle down with the students to sentence-by-sentence review of texts. For most of them, this is all the language teaching they will ever get, even if they go on to the PhD. In the review-of-text format, the student works out a translation of the assigned passage, looking up words in the dictionary and puzzling out their construction; he then presents this in class for correction. There is little or no attention to the language as a system, except as some particular example may lead the teacher to remind the student of a general rule or to impart some bit of syntactic lore. Students use commentaries,

but these seldom distinguish between unique uses of words -- in freshly coined metaphors, for example -- and specialized but generally used meanings; neither do they distinguish between interpretations of particular phrases and the identification of idioms, or between the interpretation of a particular construction and the discernment of a syntactic pattern. Students thus do not study the Greek language; if they are clever they pick it up while studying texts -- which they in turn go on to teach in the same unsystematic fashion. Few, of course, reach this level. They do, however, have the satisfaction, if they major in Classics, of having read in the original some ancient works. They are unlikely, unless they enter the profession, to retain much knowledge of the language in later life -- except that, for reasons stated earlier, they may retain the ability to read Homer.

True also of conventional modern language undergrads.

The classical languages are not conceived of as productive usable systems, but as a body of texts available for study. Classical philology is the detailed knowledge of these texts, and the philologist is admired not so much for the ability to state a rule as to cite a parallel. For the same reason that the beautifully designed teaching programs of the modern languages have had so little influence on the teaching of Classics, the teaching of classical language does not provide a useful intellectual model for the teaching of modern languages. Neither does Classics provide a useful sociological model. The ancient texts have themselves a high prestige, and study of them confers prestige on the scholar. The language of Racine and Goethe cannot confer the same prestige, since it is basically the same as the language of Le Figaro and Der Stern.

But it has served as such.

The relatively low status of modern language teaching is structural, and we are stuck with it. No use saying it is difficult important work; so is nursing, so is high school teaching, but this does not make nurses the equals of doctors, or high school teachers the equals of college teachers. No doubt things should be otherwise, but they're not going to be. In all these cases there is a correlation between prestige and length of training -- although it is hard to be sure that the difference in training is a cause of the difference in status, rather than its consequence. The primary qualification for modern language teaching is knowledge of the language, and the preferred teachers are native speakers -- who of course get no credit for knowing their own language. There is something to learn about how to teach a language, but evidently not much; two years' supervised practice is more than most receive. Otherwise language teaching is assumed to be a gift -- which we are delighted to come upon, but unwilling to reward. The administration of modern language teaching within the university thus poses problems of equity, problems which are likely to be insoluble, in the sense that each solution will generate specific dissatisfactions. *until lack of demand leads to the demise of the large corps of literary scholars*

No, we are not. see 44

So stiffen No training

One solution is to have a separate language-teaching staff. This solution was in effect tried at Chicago during the period of the independent College; the College French and Russian staffs taught language, while the

graduate departments taught literature. The relationship (often one of hostility) between the two was then entangled in the generally difficult relations between College and Divisions -- which to some extent brought into the University the tensions, centering on prestige differential, which exist nationally between the high schools and the colleges. (Indeed the College of that period, which admitted students at 16 or even 15, was partly a high school, and recruited some of its faculty, including some of its most gifted language teachers, directly from the Laboratory School.) The faculty in modern language areas at Chicago who remember that time generally refer to it as the Bad Old Days, and look on it as an achievement that the College staffs were brought into the Departments. Yet the University continues to be under pressure to hire specialized language teachers -- mostly, now, in the form of Senior Lecturers. Senior Lecturer, significantly enough, is not a faculty position (does not bring with it voting powers in the Senate) although Senior Lecturers have de facto tenure. (Two years' notice is required to terminate a Senior Lecturer, and since the post was invented there has not been one termination, at least not in the Humanities.) Senior Lecturers enjoy full faculty benefits, but there is an informal salary cap on the position, equivalent to a good Assistant Professorial salary. Senior Lecturers currently teach or have recently taught French, German, Swedish, Russian, and Japanese at Chicago.

Senior Lecturers are explicitly, i.e., by statute, second-class citizens. Their relations with departments are unclear; generally they are invited to meetings, but expected to stay out of questions of policy and recruitment except in relation to their own language area. Nor are they the least advantaged language teachers. One of our professional schools had for many years on its staff as a Lecturer a man, by all reports a gifted language teacher, who was ABD and made no progress toward a degree, and whose work was unrecognized by the relevant department; he eventually died at his post, virtually unnoticed except by his students. Elsewhere we find a teacher of an oriental language: his teaching load is 50% higher than that of the faculty, his salary is low -- and is funded on soft money, so that his year-by-year renewal is uncertain. He stays in this job because his only realistic alternative is to go back to Cairo. He is, in fact, a kind of "guest worker."

As language teaching is relatively low-status, language teachers tend to become an underclass. It is not clear why we find this troubling. We easily tolerate such status differentials in other areas, for instance Physical Education. (The staff at Chicago hold faculty titles and are members of the College faculty, but are supervised not by the Dean of the College but by the Dean of Students of the University.) Perhaps it is because language teachers, for all their marginal status, are centrally involved in the academic program of the Humanities; the courses that they teach, further, become part of the major concentration of students who become majors in the language area -- and good language teaching is the primary recruiter to the major, which is to say, the work of the department. All

I wonder what the status of literary scholars was in ancient China, when knowledge of literature was a vocational necessity for bureaucrats, officers, etc.

this suggests that they should somehow be full members of the faculty, and of the department. Certainly the issues here, constitutional and sociological, deserve further exploration. But for my present purposes it is enough to observe that most faculty consider the second-class status of language teachers as generally unsatisfactory. Each such appointment is somewhat apologetically proposed as an ad hoc solution to a special case. Yet as there are many special cases these appointments, even when resisted as a matter of policy, tend to accumulate.

The alternative is a language staff which is an integral part of the faculty. One subsolution here is to make of language teaching an intellectual career in its own right; it is after all a research area, there are professional organizations, journals, meetings, and so on, and one can acquire a solid professional reputation in the field. (Such a reputation outside the University is the only reliable foundation for full academic citizenship, at least at a university like ours.) For some individuals this has been an effective solution. If it is not generally effective it is only partly because the intellectual field is relatively low-status, like the activity it studies; language instruction is a problem in applied linguistics, and suffers all the disabilities of the "applied" as against the "pure," as well as the special disabilities proper to all those applications known as Education. More important: most of those qualified to teach languages do not want to make a career of language teaching and its theory; they are literary and historical scholars, and want to develop their careers in that direction. The utopian solution proposes that all qualified persons take their turn at language teaching as a contribution to the community. This would spread the work around, so that it would not be a major distraction to anyone. I call this solution "utopian" because it involves the unreasonable expectation that the more powerful will cooperate on equal terms with the less powerful. We had for ten years a Dean of the Humanities at Chicago who believed in this solution; he is a master of the art of exhortation, but ten years of exhortation had in this sphere only marginal effect upon faculty behavior. And in any case there does seem to be something irrational about taking Professors earning over fifty thousand a year away from work only they can do, and assigning them tasks which could be equally competently performed by adjunct personnel making less than twenty.

depression
for the student
& the society

The egalitarian solution to low-status activities is to assign them to an age-grade -- as the Mormons assigned stoop-work to their children. Thus the work gets done, but its status does not characterize anybody; it is something everybody survives. This has been the most popular solution for language teaching; it has been done by the young. Actually this is two different solutions, since it involves two different groups of young people: assistant professors and graduate students.

Assistant professors are of course far more administrable than tenured faculty; they can be assigned language teaching. They are unlikely, however, to receive much credit for it at tenure review time -- if only

because it will be assumed that they will not do much of it after getting tenure. So the usual tension between teaching and research is exacerbated in the case of the language staff; their teaching is not even much connected with the research areas in which they will be reviewed. At institutions which do not normally promote their assistant professors this may seem less of a problem -- the problem is felt by the individual candidate, who must find time while language-teaching to produce the kind of publications which will impress the next employer, but the professors may feel quite comfortable hiring young people, getting six years or so of language teaching out of them, and then replacing them with a new crop. At the University of Chicago, which as a matter of policy prefers to promote its assistant professors, there has been constant tension on this issue between the Deans, who feel a responsibility for the career development of the young faculty, and the professors, whose power is obviously increased by a policy of hiring new young people rather than promoting those we now have.

Graduate students, especially ABD's, may seem to be the ideal language instructors, and in fact Chicago now relies on them heavily in Romance, and to some extent also in German and Russian. They are after all being trained as teachers as well as being supported in their studies, and they can be paid the low rate typical of apprentices. And if they are properly selected and supervised, the quality of instruction can be good. On the other hand, there are tensions: it is not the best situation for students to be the employees of their teachers, and faculty, pleased to have found a low-priced, deferential subordinate, may be tempted to stretch out the years of service well beyond anything justifiable as an apprenticeship. Furthermore if they are to be trained as teachers, they will have to be supervised, which means finding a supervisor; this person will usually be either a Senior Lecturer or an Assistant Professor who will then find no time for research.

In any case graduate students have the same problem as assistant professors; they are sent a double message by the senior faculty. They are assigned to teach languages, and at the same time warned not to let this work distract them from the one thing that is of any importance: their research. Probably graduate students can tolerate this somewhat better than assistant professors, since they are not under the same up-or-out time constraints, and their expectations of happiness are in any case relatively low. Probably the best solution is to have a staff of ABD's supervised by a tenured member of the faculty -- either one of those rare professors with a professional interest in language teaching, or else through some kind of rotation among competent members of the department. But such a solution can only be kept going by Deans who are exceptionally tough in confronting requests and demands that the burden of language teaching be taken away from the senior faculty -- and at the same time the Deans will have the next-to-impossible task of seeing to it that appointments to the language staffs are made on merit, and not as a matter of patronage. The senior faculty's policy on language teaching

will, most of the time, reduce to a quite understandable quest for power without responsibility -- "the privilege of the harlot throughout the ages," as Stanley Baldwin once said.

All this is quite familiar. My only original proposition in this paper -- at least I think it is original -- is this: our curricular problem with modern languages has a political source, namely, that these languages are taught by the powerless. In the academy power follows prestige (rather than the other way around, as elsewhere) and where prestige is denied, thought is inhibited. To consign an academic task to the powerless is to ensure that its practitioners will be as intellectually limited as practically unambitious.

If I were a cultural dictator I would get the universities out of the language-teaching business. I would like a tough proficiency requirement as a condition of entrance and a tougher one as a condition of graduation, and I would leave it to the students to figure out how to meet it. The result, I predict, would be a rapid expansion of the existing private-sector language-teaching business to meet the need, and its transformation in the direction of university requirements. Our graduate students could work for them instead of us, and our students could prepare for our exams without course credit. Instructor and students alike could be focused on linguistic competence and nothing else. This solution at the very least would solve some of the problems of Associate Deans -- and the problems of Associate Deans, after all, are, one way or another, the problems of us all.

aprobare
+ elect
as well

or rather, something like this is happening in a certain way:
outside suppliers emerge to try to satisfy the
need we fall short of meeting

PERCEPTIONS OF GOVERNANCE IN A SMALLER UNIVERSITY

James J. Wrenn
Brown University

*peripheral
center for lang. & studies*

In this presentation I will take Brown as a representative of what the small university can do and will explore the freedom enjoyed and the limitations imposed.

Brown has most of the familiar ranks, and a few that may not be so familiar: Professors of the Full, Associate, and Assistant varieties, Instructors, Lecturers (most of which may be qualified as "Visiting" or "Adjunct"), and Senior Lecturers and Preceptors, two new ranks instituted in September of 1986 (of which more later), as well as Teaching Associates and a number of carefully differentiated graduate student appointments, which include Teaching Fellow, Senior Teaching Assistant, Teaching Assistant, Assistant, and Research Assistant.

With suitable negotiation between faculty and chairmen, it is relatively easy to develop and maintain interdisciplinary courses. Loosely coupled systems have their advantages. The disadvantage is that the various teaching responsibilities are not specifically defined, since these features of the "contract" are based on an oral agreement and may assume expectations of teaching loads and other duties that are never made specific, and are sometimes even matters of polite expectation. To the extent that goodwill is a commodity in the academy, these issues are related to governance. They have a strong influence on the morale of all teachers, but especially on language teachers, who believe that they are generally undervalued as teachers and humanists.

Roles in department, center, or program are all different at Brown, and all have precise definitions. For example, the Faculty Rules define a center as "an academic unit designed to conduct a major scholarly interdisciplinary effort which includes educational and research components." A center has a formal administrative structure within the university and may include several programs.

As in most similar institutions, some appointments are tenurable-- Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor-- while all others are specifically not tenurable. Titles for this second group include a wide range: Lecturer, Teaching Associate, and various titles which include the terms Visiting, Adjunct, Research, Clinical, Investigator.

Tenured members of the faculty are by definition voting members of the faculty, and Lecturers with longer-term appointments are often recommended by their departments to become voting members. No such recom-

mentation has, in my memory, been rejected. Emeriti, and visiting and adjunct faculty may not vote. Named chairs are available, but usually not to those who perceive themselves as language teachers.

Extra pay for extra jobs is sometimes available, but it is limited and except for the small stipends at the disposal of departmental chairmen, obtainable only through negotiation. Summer salary is limited to two tenths of annual salary. Through special negotiations summer research stipends are possible, but are paid monthly so that most of the stipend is withheld and becomes available only after 15 April of the next year. Sabbatic leaves with pay, as a matter of university regulation, are not extended to those without tenure, but in practice departmental chairmen may recommend such leaves, and they are often granted. (More evidence of a loosely coupled system?)

Course loads are usually unspecified but are often heavier in terms of contact hours for language teachers than for others at similar ranks in the university. I am prepared to accept that an hour of language instruction may take less preparation than an hour of lecture, but would note that language instruction is likely to be more energy consuming, and note that the difference in the nature of preparations may reflect a lower expectation for intellectual activity for language teachers.

The reputation of individual language teachers develops from The Critical Review, an informal student publication, and from various review systems which are designed by the departments but which require approval of the Provost before adoption.

As to publication, there is the expectation that language teachers will continue to provide evidence of professionalism in their work, and publication is one of the ways in which this is done. Some departments still require conventional scholarship from language teachers and give them professional rank, but this is by no means uniform for all languages at Brown. For some departments, publication is of a kind that is not usually comparable with the production of other colleagues, since it is likely to take the form of text materials, audio tapes, and the adaptation of videotapes and videodiscs. These kinds of credentials when presented as evidence for scholarly production must be judged differently from those presented by others. Here we as language teachers invite and even insist on a double, or at least a different, standard. Accepting the transition between theory and practice is important for judging our product, which is rarely scholarly in the traditional sense, but is nearly always an application of scholarship, and is always ephemeral. We pose problems of comparability that are disquieting for some; we seldom assert eternal truths, but are in pursuit of the most effective presentation of the language of a changing culture. We welcome the assumption that our best efforts will be out of date in a few months or years. This assumption affects our choice of presentation so that many of our best efforts may not make print except as ephemeral xerox-copied handouts for students or

just what is ephemeral -
a text book that is used for a decade
by several thousand students a year,
or a literary study, printed in one
edition of 1500 copies, bought by
500 libraries, & read by 100 people
a year until it
is obsolete?

assemblages of descriptive notes on the vocabulary of current events, nothing that is likely to warrant more formal publication. For some departments, tapes and discs do not constitute suitable evidence of academic credentials.

We suffer because of the expectation that the PhD degree will have been completed. While many language teachers do not have the terminal degree in their special field of competence, many have a higher level of language competence and more immediate familiarity with the culture of the country than their senior colleagues. The gradual shift toward emphasis on spoken language competence for our students is likely to increase the emphasis on the level of language competence expected from us as language teachers, and will have an influence on how we define credentials for language teachers.

For Brown there are internal tensions and departmental differences, and not many of us who see ourselves primarily as language teachers are tenured, although some have contracts with terms of three years or more.

During the 1950's there existed a Division of Modern Languages, administratively similar to the Division of Engineering, with a chair of the division; but with the growth of the university in the late 1950's, and the development of new and expanded programs, it became more convenient to administer the various languages as independent departments, a Department of French, of Hispanic Languages, Linguistics, German, and Slavic. The wisdom of this choice became apparent when from core members of the faculty in these departments, there developed Departments of Comparative Literature and of Portuguese and Brazilian Studies; when departments changed their designations to Department of French Studies, Department of Hispanic Studies, and later Department of Hispanic and Italian Studies; and when the Department of Linguistics began to incorporate teachers of Chinese, Arabic (later dropped, of which more later), and Japanese.

During the year 1980, an Interdepartmental Committee on Language was established by the Modern Language Board to examine language instruction at Brown, with representatives from French, German, Hispanic and Italian, Portuguese and Brazilian Studies, the Language Laboratory, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics. The report of this Committee recommended the creation of a Center for Foreign Language Studies "to encourage the study of languages at all levels, languages used both for communication and for the transmission of cultural values through spoken and written texts." The recommended Center was to "create a context in which collaboration and exchange among language instructors can be encouraged, ... provide an administrative structure to focus on the importance of language studies within the University, and... serve as a channel for relations with groups outside the University." The report was submitted to the Provost on 4 June 1980 and was acknowledged, but no other action was taken at the time.

*is, regard
MA as terminal
(if music), or
create PhD
credential in
pedagogy*

In the mid-1980's the Provost established several committees to do a "Realignment Study"; one, chaired by Prof. Sheila Blumstein, examined the roles and responsibilities of academic departments in the Humanities. One recommendation of this study was for the establishment of a Center for Languages. This period of self-examination had stimulated a sense of common interest, and by 1985 the same small group of language teachers of various ranks, including the Director of the Language Laboratory, who is also an active teacher of ESL, had begun to meet informally to discuss their shared needs and goals.

During this period, the Dean of the College, Harriet Sheridan, was active in developing and shaping the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning, which had been formed but had not yet appointed an Executive Director. Part of this development was the establishment of Consortium Committees on each campus. Therefore, in late 1985 the nucleus of language teachers was co-opted as the Consortium Committee, to report to the Dean. At about this time the University was planning for a new Center for Information Technology (CIT), which would include a Language Laboratory, to be housed in a new building adjacent to that which houses most of the modern language faculty. The governing body for modern languages, composed of the chairs of the modern language departments, established a Language Laboratory Committee, but with almost complete overlap in membership with the existing Consortium Committee. For a while the two met separately, but the issues dealt with were so inextricably mixed that we began to meet conjointly, simply by including an additional person at each meeting. We finally clarified this by informing the administrators concerned that we had conflated the committees. During this period when we were meeting together as a small group of language teachers with common interests, we also considered the possibility that we should formalize the relationship we had begun to develop as an administrative entity, and at about the same time we sounded out the Provost to determine whether this would be a welcome activity. With the characteristic patience of Brown administrators, he suggested we present a plan. Our initial plan for a Center for Language Studies went through many hours of discussion and many drafts over a period of more than a year, and was finally brought to the Academic Council, only to be initially refused, and then after more adjustment of the plan, was finally accepted to begin in March of 1987.

TEXT OF THE CHARGE OF THE CENTER FOR LANGUAGE STUDIES

A Center for the Study of Languages shall be established at Brown University, the purpose and goals as described, following: 1. To serve as the intellectual center for language-related research and knowledge by providing an academic "home" for those faculty with scholarly interests in the teaching of language qua language and in interdisciplinary research that is pertinent to language studies. 2. To give the teaching of language

How can a language be primarily modern

security and stability. 3. To provide an academic base for the teaching of languages which are primarily (but not exclusively) modern and which are not tied to departments of language/literature and/or area studies, and provide training in pedagogical methods.

The administrative responsibilities of the Center will be to: 1. Develop courses in such areas as language pedagogy, philology, linguistics (applied, socio-, and anthropological), and dialectology, for specific languages. 2. Sponsor research in language teaching and learning. 3. Have administrative responsibility for the Language Laboratory, and develop materials for the Language Laboratory. 4. Facilitate outreach and develop relationships with other language teaching and learning resources at Brown such as Bilingual Education, English as a Second Language, and service courses for physicians and other personnel.

Although primary responsibility for the teaching of their languages resides within the already established departments/centers, faculty in the traditional departments/centers whose responsibilities are in various areas of language studies may, with departmental approval, choose to have joint appointments with the Center for the Study of Languages. This would serve to formalize and acknowledge a role these faculty already fulfill, rather than to change the degree of their obligation or commitment to their home department(s). Affiliated faculty would have responsibility for ensuring that: 1. Graduate teaching assistants and fellows are trained to teach language effectively. 2. Faculty appointed for the specific purpose of teaching a language which is offered only occasionally or irregularly are competent in the teaching of that language. 3. Resources for regular faculty who might wish to update or enhance their language teaching methods would be available. Responsibility for graduate student teaching assistants and fellows will continue to reside in the already established departments and centers, and funding for graduate assistants and fellows will not be diverted from departments/centers in order to support faculty positions in the Center. The membership of the Center shall be affiliated faculty and staff. A Director, appointed by the Provost on the recommendation of the Dean of the Faculty, shall be responsible for administration of the Center. The administrative structure of the Center shall be developed by the Director in conjunction with the affiliated faculty. The Center shall be established effective 1 March 1987 through 30 June 1992.

Note that the charge states that "responsibility for graduate student teaching assistants and fellows will continue to reside in the already established departments and centers" and that "funding for graduate assistants and fellows will not be diverted from existing departments and centers in order to support faculty positions in the Center." The Center for Language Studies has plenty of responsibility, but the control, as well as the reward, elements in the governance link are weak. Further, faculty members affiliate themselves to the Center voluntarily and as a matter of intellectual, professional, and personal interest; it is a system

heavily dependent on the goodwill and the spirit of cooperation between colleagues with common interests. There are few carrots and no sticks. A loosely coupled system indeed!

The creation of the Center for Language Studies takes place at a time when there are other, related changes going on in the University. The linguists in the Department of Linguistics, with which all of us in Chinese and Japanese had been affiliated, have been increasingly working on problems common to those of our colleagues in Psychology who have interests in cognition, and have swung toward each other to recouple as a Department of Cognitive and Linguistic Science(s). We in East Asian Languages (along with a teacher of Hindi-Urdu) now constitute the core faculty in a new Department of East Asian Studies (1987) with a similar loose coupling in its affiliations. Although we do have two or three appointments which are shared with other departments, they are temporary, and faculty members in other departments with interests in East Asia may join us if they choose. We offer a concentration involving a number of departments, with an executive committee composed of two language teachers, both tenured; two comparatists, both untenured; two historians, and one political scientist, all tenured. But association is voluntary and there are many individual options for collaboration. It is interesting to note that we have chosen to include on the departmental executive committee four faculty members whose salary lines are from the budgets of other departments. Another example of a loosely coupled system!

The adoption and later abandonment of Arabic in the early 1960's and the contrasting successful introduction of Chinese taught us some lessons. We had introduced Arabic in a department that was sympathetic, but in a university in which there were no other commitments to the Middle East, to the Muslim world, or to Islamic culture, literature, and art. The language program was operating in a cultural vacuum. Chinese, however, was introduced at a time when there was already a popular course taught by a tenured professor in Political Science, the nucleus of a Chinese Collection in the library, and when the university administration had already committed itself to other appointments, all possibly tenurable, in the History and Political Science areas. A key difference in the structure was that for Chinese there were other, related courses, which provided the "critical mass" necessary for success. Another, perhaps more characteristic of the times, was the fact that these positions were opened with the possibility of permanence and of professorial status.

Institutionally, certainly in a small university, and perhaps in larger institutions as well, there is a need to go beyond a sympathetic and supportive department for success of a language program. This lesson, once learned, has made it possible for Brown to develop a successful program in Japanese language, for which support in other departments is growing, and the beginnings of ones in Korean and in Hindi-Urdu, for which support in other programs is lower.

We have had some success in shaping the programs so that they are more permanent, too. The Chinese program, now incorporated into a Department of East Asian Studies, has two tenured members, and one who we expect will hold the longer-term position of Senior Lecturer; Japanese has one tenured member and one who will soon be eligible for a Senior Lectureship, but tenurable positions are coming harder now, and so is tenure in them. Many of our other positions in these languages were opened only after hard argument and with firm evidence of increasing and stable enrollments; and we now have two positions that are filled by graduate teaching assistants -- one in Chinese, and one in Japanese-- and two at the Teaching Associate level in Japanese, both untenurable, short-term positions with limited possibility for advancement. We believe that the model we have been developing both in the Center for Language Studies and in East Asian Studies is one that is appropriate for our colleagues in South Asian Studies, who are beginning to recouple -- but still loosely, and again across departmental lines -- into what may develop into a Department or Center for South Asian Studies.

More generally, most of us are comfortable with the level of openness in the system that Brown provides, but it does require a tolerance for the ambiguity that seems to characterize loosely coupled systems. As the charge for the new Center for Language Studies should indicate, the opportunities for impact on the curriculum and for helping our colleagues and our students to new ways of becoming more effective language teachers are many.

Not only is the spirit of our language teaching faculty strong, but now, with the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning, we also have the tangible support of our colleagues throughout the country.

LANGUAGE TEACHING IN LITERATURE DEPARTMENTS:
NATURAL PARTNERSHIP OR SHOTGUN MARRIAGE?

Nicolas Shumway
Yale University

*lots of good stuff -
& then a strange
conclusion*

In the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Yale, we currently have enrollments approaching 700 students. Of these, some 125 are enrolled in literature and civilization courses. The rest -- nearly 600 students -- are studying Spanish language. Since language instruction is the department's greatest pedagogical responsibility, it would seem logical that appointments would be made accordingly. Such, however, is not the case. In a given year, eight out of some forty language sections would be taught by assistant professors; this year, however, because of three sabbatical leaves, only two language sections will be taught by a tenure-track faculty member. All other language sections are staffed and directed by either lecturers on short-term appointments or graduate students. Moreover, with the exception of my appointment, which is half in literature and half in language teaching, all tenured and tenure-track appointments in the department are defined according to literature specialization.

Now lest anyone think I am going to amuse you with twenty minutes of Yale-bashing, let me quickly add that this situation differs little from that of most major departments teaching "commonly taught" modern languages, both at Yale and elsewhere. Moreover, in many ways the Yale Spanish Department is in better shape than most. For example, it is the only large language department at Yale with a tenured faculty member in charge of the language program. Further, our graduate students are the only graduate students in any Yale literature program to receive credit for taking a required course in foreign language teaching, and in recent years the senior faculty has shown strong support for the language program. Also, in this age of fashionable discontent, I happen to have the effrontery to enjoy my job and like my institution.

And yet...the evidence clearly shows that language teaching does not receive the same benefits nor offer the same rewards as literature. Why is this so? Why is language teaching not placed on an equal basis with other disciplines on campus and given adequate tenured or tenurable positions to cover the courses? Why does the university confer such an obviously large responsibility on migrants and part-timers? It seems obvious that we cannot demand academic rigor or continuity in programs with constantly shifting personnel. And rigor and continuity are the first victims of a governance structure that does not give language teachers a more secure place in the academy.

There are several answers to these questions, none completely satisfying and some just plain wrongheaded. For the most part, the wrongheaded

ones constitute a branch of demonology which pits the powerless but righteous language pedagogue against an iniquitous army of ignorant administrators, stingy provosts, and arrogant literary scholars who gather in spacious rooms to scoff at our poor pedagogical virtues. Promoters of such devil theories live in perpetual high dudgeon, always railing at the establishment but never managing to change things.

good
remainder

Now I certainly don't want to suggest that the reverse is true, that in fact all administrators are enlightened, that all provosts are openhanded, and that literary scholars are free of arrogance. But I do want to explore briefly a concern that, in my view, explains best our second-class status in academe, namely the notion that language teaching really is not a discipline like philosophy, biology, or physics. Of course we have all the apparatus of a discipline: we hold conferences, write books, publish journals, and hold academic appointments of some sort or other, even if they aren't the most prestigious. Yet despite such activity, the suspicion lingers that our work is not really a discipline, that language teaching does not deserve much intellectual respect. Today, for a few moments, I am going to risk friendships by suggesting reasons that we in fact are not a discipline like any other. But then, in hopes of regaining those lost friendships, I will argue that the study of literature is also on tenuous theoretical ground and may therefore be our most natural ally. And finally, I will outline some ideas on how greater awareness of this unspoken but natural alliance might improve the governance of foreign languages.

The most immediate evidence against our status as a discipline is the embarrassing fact that we don't really have a name. The term language teaching methodologist is much too cumbersome and vague to stand beside terms like microbiologist, philosopher, or economist. But more important, rather than resolving the conceptual problem that undermines our academic status, it draws attention to it. Calling ourselves methodologists merely restates the case of our accusers who hold that we teach a skill and are not really concerned with intellectual substance. Philosophy, literature, chemistry, mathematics, or any one of the traditional disciplines can point to a corpus of texts or a specific type of natural phenomena which are their object of study.

What, in contrast, do we as language teaching methodologists study? If we say we study language, then we are linguists. If we say we study the nature of human discourse and persuasion, then we are rhetoricians. If we say we study communication through symbols within a specific cultural context, then we are anthropologists. If we say we study the mental processes by which language is acquired and used as a vehicle of thought, then we are psychologists. If we say we are all of the above, then we are half-educated generalists who cover so much ground that we cover none of it well. In view of this problem, there has been no lack of attempts to give us a new name. Some have suggested applied linguist, but that begs the question of "applied to what?" Linguistics could in

principle be applied to anything involving language. Moreover, the term applied undermines any discipline; the opposite of applied is pure, and who wants to be associated with something impure? Others have suggested even less fortunate terms, the most evocative being pedalinguist-- which in its way is no more suggestive than natural approach or total physical response, but I stray from my topic.

Although nomenclature isn't everything, the difficulty in finding an adequate name for ourselves brings us to the crucial issue concerning our work: we do not really have a field that can easily be claimed as ours and no one else's. But at the same time we cannot perform well as language teachers without a broad knowledge of several fields. How, for example, can we claim expertise in language teaching and learning without some understanding of linguistics, discourse analysis, cultural contexts of communication, and learning psychology? In some sense, we suffer a dilemma common to all fields oriented towards performance, whether they be music, theater, writing, or, for that matter, surgery. As language teachers, we must be able to perform a skill illuminated by light from many disciplines. At the same time, just as understanding and knowing has never produced a good pianist or a good surgeon, our field is replete with linguists, psychologists, and literature experts who cannot teach language. In short, talent and performance aptitudes are essential gifts in a good language teacher, and, like all gifts, these can be enhanced but not really taught. We are therefore caught in a triple bind. First, we are justly accused of borrowing from too many fields to claim any one as exclusively ours. Second, we cannot do our job well without being borrowers and usurpers. And finally, the best language teachers are performers who in some sense are born and not made; of course their performance can be improved through study and practice, but ultimately the best teachers must have the talent for it -- just like musicians and neurosurgeons.

This being our predicament, we have several alternatives. The one most taken -- and in my view the one least promising -- is to continue insisting that ours is a discipline like any other. This is not a good alternative because, no matter how shrilly proclaimed, it has not gained us a more secure place in the academy; we are still for the most part the poor relation of literature departments, welcome at the back door and necessary in the kitchen, but never allowed in the front rooms where the children of privilege receive party favors like tenure, sabbatical leaves, and voting rights. Another alternative has been to marry language teaching to other departments, linguistics and education being the most frequent new partners. But these arrangements have not, as far as I can tell, resolved the problems mentioned earlier; rather, they have merely rearranged the configuration of subordination and suspicion. Moreover, even if education and linguistics departments accept the additional responsibility of language teaching, they still rely on graduate students, mostly in literature, for teachers, just as literature departments still need language teaching to support their graduate students. Furthermore, from

127 problems in
No old
S-T method
performance
fields

WMM

*ignores one point: the withering away
of literary scholarship; it doesn't discuss
possibility that pedagogy will gradually
outlive lit.*

a financial point of view, moving foreign language teaching from one department to another does not make it cheaper; as a result, in order to keep costs down, most of the actual teaching of language remains in the hands of lectors, preceptors, teaching assistants, and the like -- regardless of who is in charge. And finally, removing language teaching from literature departments is an option available in few universities; at Yale, and at most similar institutions, there is simply no better place for language instruction. Whether by shotgun wedding or not, the union of foreign literature study and language teaching is a structural fact that is not likely to change. I would therefore suggest that rather than exorcising uncertain demons, we should try to enhance a de facto relationship that is not going to vanish. Towards accomplishing these ends, I will outline two propositions, one conceptual and one practical.

First the conceptual argument. As I stated earlier, we are justly accused of borrowing from other fields to such a degree that we cannot really claim any field as our own. But the more interesting question is not whether we borrow, but whether our borrowing is legitimate. If for example it can be demonstrated that our borrowings from linguistics, psychology, literature, anthropology, or whatever, are legitimate branches of those fields, then it follows that those fields are not complete unless they take into account language teaching and learning. It also follows that any one of these fields could serve as areas of primary specialization for language teachers, although in practice language teachers will in all likelihood continue to come primarily from graduate programs in literature or linguistics.

Curiously enough, the study of literature is conceptually in much the same condition as language pedagogy -- but for quite different reasons. Whereas language teaching is accused of being heavy on methods while having no real object of study, the study of literature is accused of having an authentic corpus but no real methods for studying and defining it. Indeed, literary critics borrow from other disciplines just as shamelessly as language teachers; history, philosophy, psychology, discourse analysis, linguistics, anthropology, and the like play such a dominant role in literary analysis that students of literature are just as obsessed as any language pedagogue with the search for a discipline that in some sense is exclusively literary. To date, that search has yielded much dense prose and many tenured appointments, but it has not resolved the debate on what literary studies are all about. If you don't believe me, ask the most distinguished literary critic you know for a usable definition of literature and literary criticism. The most common response is tautological: literary criticism is what literary critics do; in short, literary criticism is ultimately defined as performance rather than substance -- just like language teaching. Moreover, when we realize that the study of literature borrows from most of the same disciplines as we do, it becomes clear that ours is not conceptually such a different enterprise. Whether it be psychology, language, cultural inquiry, semiotics, or discourse analysis-- we share a common list of creditors. It is also true that literature

neat!

scholars have no good term for themselves; just as methodologist calls attention to our conceptual vulnerability, the term critic evokes theirs, namely that they are parasites on literary creativity, and therefore essential to no one but themselves. Similarly, the search for an alternate to critic has produced many uneasy expressions -- literary theorist, literary historian, semiotician, and even that monstrum Yalense, deconstructionist. In view of our common dependency and insecurity, it is, perhaps, entirely fitting, poetically just if you will, that literature and language teaching are almost always housed in the same departments. We deserve each other. We need each other. And on parting we both might die.

And this brings me to the practical dimension of governance within existing structures which I promised you earlier. The practical question, in my view, is not how to make language teaching independent of literature departments, but how to produce literature PhD's who are also competent in language teaching. And to make my point, I return to where I started, to the Spanish Department at Yale.

When I arrived at Yale ten years ago, training for graduate student teachers in the Spanish Department was all but nonexistent. The person I replaced, a man of much goodwill but little training in language teaching, had begun a training course of sorts. But nothing was being done systematically; for the most part, untrained TA's were teaching less trained TA's what neither knew. With the considerable support of the senior faculty at that time, I was able to create a course for training graduate student teachers; this course is required for the PhD in Hispanic literature and carries graduate credit. The course includes theoretical information on comparative methods, phonetics, and advanced grammar; but it is primarily conceived as a practicum which includes practice teaching and an extensive apprenticeship program. It is, in short, a course in both theory and performance. For the practice teaching, I have received a budget to pay Yale students enrolled in beginning Spanish also to be students in a laboratory classroom where they are taught by trainees under my direction; at the same time, each trainee is apprenticed to an experienced teacher in a regular beginning Spanish section. Trainees teach with and occasionally for their trainer teacher throughout the semester, and at least once under my observation. As a result of this program, all Yale PhD's in Hispanic literature are conversant with language teaching methods and usually have three to four years of teaching experience before they go on the job market. With few exceptions, they are also sympathetic to the demands of a language program and in my view will be much more informed administrators and colleagues than the generation they replace. In short, we feel that no PhD should leave our department without a firm grounding in both literature and language teaching. Since our responsibilities include both, we do both.

But how about the other half of the problem? A training program will certainly give rigor to language instruction, but such rigor can vanish

so in a department of X people, $X - \frac{1}{2}$ people are
still lit. specialists

overnight if there is not some continuity in the supervision of the language program. To provide such continuity, last year the university approved a new kind of tenured position for someone with acceptable credentials in both literature and language. The argument was quite simply that a department that does both should have at least one tenured faculty member doing both. Once the case was made for a dual position of this nature, and an acceptable person was found, the appointment was approved with virtually no opposition. A similarly mixed position in literature and writing has now been created and filled in the English Department, and I predict that in a few years, all large modern language departments at Yale will be directed by similar people.

//
well!

The Yale model is most significant when compared with the type of position that it explicitly rejects, to wit, a position that offers permanent employment but confines that appointment exclusively to language teaching and language course supervision; such positions are common in our profession, often under the rubric of senior lecturer or senior preceptor. The Yale model is different, and in my view superior, in four specific ways. First, a dual position recognizes that language teaching is not in itself a field of intellectual specialization sufficient to merit tenure at a research university. Rather, it expects someone in such a position to have a primary specialization with publications and ongoing research interests in a traditional discipline. In the case of the Spanish Department at Yale, the field of primary specialization was literature; it could just as easily have been linguistics, psychology, or any other area related to language teaching. Second, by allowing regular sabbatical leaves and other research opportunities attendant to a tenured position, the Yale appointment encourages the appointee to continue her or his professional development and militates against the "second-class citizen" status that attends titles of lecturer or senior lecturer. Moreover, such research expectations and opportunities guard against burnout, a phenomenon much too familiar among college lecturers and secondary teachers who are provided little incentive for change and development. Third, since the position in question is a tenured appointment, the appointee has full voting rights and discussion privileges in the department; in contrast, senior lecturers are often dependent on tenured faculty, who may or may not be sympathetic and informed, to make decisions affecting the language program. And fourth, while the Yale model is specifically not just a teaching appointment, it does allow for an orderly review during the promotion process of materials prepared for language teaching, such as textbooks, videodiscs, and the like. One of the oddities of our profession is that a textbook in Spanish or French receives little intellectual respect whereas a similar textbook in an "exotic" language, say Arabic or Chinese, is often viewed as grounds for tenure. This disparity might be defended by the relative difficulty or unfamiliarity of the languages in question; the Yale model avoids the question simply by saying that teaching materials in commonly taught languages can be considered towards tenure -- but only in addition to publications in a traditional discipline. By recognizing language teaching materials as important, albeit

| dead
wrong -
ask Rank
or Neobers

weird world
out there

-horrible

not sufficient, for promotion, the Yale model provides a mechanism by which such materials can be evaluated.

Now obviously Nirvana has not been achieved on the banks of the Long Island Sound. We all know there remains much to be done. But I think it fair to say that the governance of some language instruction at Yale is on much sounder footing now than before. This is so because, rather than being dissolved, the marriage of language teaching and literature, whether natural or shotgun, was accepted as a fact of the profession; in short, whatever governance progress has been made at Yale resulted from asking for the possible rather than the ideal. Ours is obviously not the only solution for a difficult problem; moreover, it is clearly not a solution for language programs teaching less commonly taught languages where governance structures are entirely different. It is, however, a model that I recommend for your consideration in large language departments at research universities facing problems similar to ours.