THE GOVERNANCE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

James S. Noblitt
Cornell University

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.

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.

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.

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,

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?

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?

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.

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 sullying 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.

THE POLITICS OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

James Redfield
The University of Chicago

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.

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 test 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 grammars 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,

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 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 physics 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 <u>is</u> 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 staffers 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.

dysutopian 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.

apropos / + elitist 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-

mendation 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

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.

In regard MA as terminal (of music), or creat PhD credential in pedagogy?

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.

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 - + Nice 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 reminder

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

ignores one point: the withering away of literary scholarship; it doesn't discuss probability 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-½ 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 Barak or Nadeau

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.

A CASE STUDY: A DEAN FOR LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION?

Barbara F. Freed
University of Pennsylvania

When Peter first asked me if I would be willing to speak today about my position as Vice Dean for Language Instruction at Penn, I politely, or at least I hope it was politely, declined. As I explained to Peter, I have an abiding distaste for autobiographical presentations. I certainly did not want to be guilty of what I have so often criticized.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, depending on one's point of view, Peter somehow persuaded me to try to separate myself from my position. He suggested that I describe how, when, and why this unique position was created, what the job description was, what the position allows and disallows, and perhaps some of my own thoughts about it.

With your indulgence, I will trace the history of this position over the last eight years, three deans, and two acting deans, in the hope that it will prove useful and instructive from the point of view of the governance of foreign language programs. As you will soon see, it is not quite possible to disassociate myself from the position, and for that I apologize.

For several years in the middle and late seventies I coordinated a training program for teaching assistants in all of Penn's foreign language departments. This involved organizing and conducting a pre-semester orientation program, providing a series of workshops and seminars on various aspects of foreign language teaching, and observing and critiqueing the classes of some 30 TA's in six different language departments. While I was at that time a Lecturer in Romance Languages, I was still very much an outsider to the basic operating structure of all language departments. My work was highly praised by TA's and faculty alike: by TA's, I suspect, because I was providing training that met their needs and by faculty because I was doing something they preferred not to do. There remained, however, a dichotomous situation. I trained foreign language TA's in the most current theory and approaches in second language teaching. Then they returned to their departments to use frequently out-of-date textbooks, to be supervised loosely by specialists in literary criticism, who had at best, and I emphasize, at best, a sincere interest in language teaching. At first the mere innovation of providing serious training for our TA's compensated for the fact that some language supervisors and I had quite different views regarding the goals, structure, and organization of a foreign language class. As time went on, however, I became increasingly frustrated by my work. I felt that the impact I was making was inconsistent with the energy and time expended. To this point the saga resembles that of many language coordinators in the country, but here the story changes.

In late 1979, Bob Dyson, then Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences (SAS), called me to discuss the renewal of my appointment. In almost as many words I said "thanks but no thanks." While I had no particular desire to talk myself out of a job, I had just completed my PhD, had numerous other opportunities, and I devoutly felt that he was wasting his money and my time.

There ensued quite a long discussion which in retrospect was really about the governance of foreign language programs. In response to this discussion, Bob Dyson created the first position of Assistant Dean for Language Instruction. The position was created with his belief, and I quote, "that by having someone specifically responsible for developing new ideas in the area of language study and more particularly to develop implementation strategies for such ideas, we may move forward more quickly to a higher level of achievement in this general area." The duties associated with this new position included:

1. Continuing to provide an orientation program at the beginning of the term for new TA's in the language departments.

2. Working with the Associate Deans to develop experimental and improved language courses, and/or to generate development proposals to help underwrite such an effort.

3. Acting as Dean's liaison with the Office of International Programs, the School of Education, the English Program for Foreign Students, and the Audio-Visual Center.

4. Serving on the SAS Advisory Committee on Language Instruction.

5. Continuing to teach one course in French.

6. Continuing an association with the Language Attrition Program.

Initially, I was to report formally to the Associate Dean for Special Projects and to remain in close contact with the Associate Dean of the College and the Dean of SAS. This description was general enough to permit great latitude and room for expansion. The major items that it provided were an implicit recognition of the need to strengthen and expand foreign language instruction and explicit and, I might add, enthusiastic support for all such projects. Note, however, that the description said nothing about budgetary control or responsibility, departmental management, hiring, or tenure decisions. Department chairs were to continue to report to the Dean. What in fact did happen, though, surpassed my own and perhaps even Bob Dyson's expectations.

The first years were a period of self-examination. Major programmatic review and research into foreign language achievement at the language

requirement level were undertaken under the auspices of this office. This was perhaps the first time in our history that the basic language learning situation had been closely examined. The history of Penn's language requirement was traced back to its origins in the late 19th century. (We found that it had really changed very little.) We looked at the relationship between the undergraduate catalogue description of the language requirement (it said students should "attain a certain competence in a foreign language") and what that really meant: sit in your seats long enough to get a passing grade in courses measured by traditional tests of grammar and/or reading. We also looked at the relationship between our criteria for exemption from the language requirement and what the students who were actually completing our courses were achieving. Again there was little relationship. This information has been reported in detail elsewhere, and I won't pursue it here.[1]

The most important fact is that as a result of widescale testing of student achievement and analyses of students' and instructors' attitudes toward the language requirement important changes were made. The long-standing credit requirement (which, as Richard Brod once wrote, measured learning much as we measure and define sentences in criminal justice, in units of time: years, semester hours, quarters) was redefined into a proficiency requirement. The details of this requirement have also been discussed at length, and I will not go into them here.[2]

As the nature of the requirement changed, curricular changes were made in several languages. Newer language texts were adopted, sometimes whole methods were replaced. The articulation between courses was clarified and improved. During these years the training of teaching assistants was intensified and required credit courses on the teaching of foreign languages at the university level were instituted in several departments. More consistent methods of student placement were devised and several new courses were introduced (Business French, Spanish, and German, Advanced Modern French, Spanish, etc.). Numerous other projects were considered, some successfully implemented, some dropped, and others are still under consideration.

As these changes took place, the responsibility for observing and critiqueing TA classes fell more and more to individual departments, where they appropriately belonged. In some instances, newer faculty appointments included those with some interest and/or experience in language teaching, even if they had not had, as Wilga Rivers stated, "proper training." Much of this happened by virtue of a close and cooperative working relationship between the Assistant Dean of Language Instruction and the Advisory Committee for Language Instruction.

In the intervening years the responsibilities of the Assistant Dean for Language Instruction were expanded to include directing a Regional Center for Language Proficiency created by a grant from FIPSE to ACTFL and chairing the first Language Committee for the newly created SAS-

Wharton School Lauder Institute for International Studies, as well as representing SAS on numerous campus committees and task forces directly or indirectly related to language study (study abroad, the audio-visual committee, the Satellite Task Force, the English Program for Foreign Students, and the Committee on Undergraduate Academic Standing). Within this period contacts also were established with regional secondary schools, and a major conference on foreign language program articulation between secondary schools and colleges was held. Training and ideas for course development remained an inherent part of the job. During this time the position was upgraded from Assistant Dean to Vice Dean for Language Instruction. The position of Associate Dean for Special Projects had been abolished, and this position now reported to the Associate Dean of the College and informally to the Dean of SAS.

With the passage of time the responsibilities associated with this position have become more clearly defined and in some respects more purely administrative. These responsibilities now include defining criteria for exemptions from the language requirement for bilingual and learning disabled students, selecting alternative courses of study for learning disabled students, working with the Office of Admissions and occasionally the Development Office, clarifying published statements regarding the language proficiency requirement, etc.

Given this set of ever-expanding responsibilities and opportunities for innovation, there is little that this position disallows. There are clear definitions as to the responsibilities of Department Chairs and language coordinators, all of which are quite language-specific. The duties of the Vice Dean for Language Instruction cut across all departments and languages and overlap in no way with the obligations and responsibilities of Departmental Chairs. However, despite the centrality of the position, there is no responsibility for languages as a whole. As mentioned earlier, the position does not control budgets, faculty lines, or tenure. By contrast, I am asked to write letters in support of tenure. In a continuing spirit of cooperation there has never been conflict as to domain of responsibility. It is interesting to note that there seem to be, however, varying perceptions as to the power or "clout" of the Vice Dean for Language Instruction. Some view her as part of the Central Administration. Others associate her with the Department of Romance Languages. There is, of course, no answer as to power or authority. This, too, reflects the attitudes of the current Dean, his (or her) commitment to language instruction and support for a unique position that a soon-to-be named fourth dean will inherit.

From a personal point of view it seems clear to me that many of the innovations made at Penn within the recent past can be traced to the daring administrative "experiment" of 1979 in creating a position of Vice Dean for Language Instruction. While many of the administrative duties associated with this position are handled on other campuses by a variety of individuals -- either faculty or administration -- the more creative

acts which may ultimately improve language instruction are sometimes left undone. It is unrealistic to expect a language faculty member to assume the burden of focusing campus-wide energy and resources into strengthening and expanding the role of second language learning on a campus. The mere fact of having one central person whose responsibility it is to seek constantly to improve foreign language instruction more or less guarantees that this will be done and that language teaching and learning will maintain a high profile and considerable visibility.

NOTES

1 Barbara Freed, "Establishing Proficiency-Based Language Requirements," ADFL Bulletin (1981), 6-12.

2 Ibid.; Barbara Freed, "Preliminary Impressions of the Effects of a Proficiency-Based Language Requirement," Foreign Language Annals (1987), 139-46; Barbara Freed, "Issues in Establishing and Maintaining a Language Proficiency Requirement," in Proceedings of the Indiana University Symposium on the Evaluation of Proficiency Testing, Albert Valdman, ed., (Bloomington: Indiana University, n.d. [1988]), 263-73.

LANGUAGE PROGRAM GOVERNANCE AT THE LARGE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY: WHEN IS BIGGER BETTER?

Gerard L. Ervin
The Ohio State University

INTRODUCTION

To begin with, allow me to set out a clear bias I share with several of my colleagues: What makes or breaks a language (or any other) program is not the size of the institution, nor whether it is public or private, but rather, the value structure of that institution and of the people who comprise its faculty and administration. It is from this value system that virtually all decisions -- including those of governance -- take shape. Thus, while consideration of the impact of size on governance, and of governance, in turn, on foreign language programs, may be helpful, more important are the values, traditions, feelings, perceptions, and individuals that make up the institution. This value system is almost certainly not shared by everyone at a given institution, and may not even be clearly acknowledged by the institution itself. One chairperson has described moving from an established Big Ten institution to a much younger, growing institution in the Sun Belt: in both cases he questions the value of an orientation for chairs prepared by an institution unsure of its own direction and mission. The Big Ten institution was trying to ensure it did not lose sight of its basic language teaching function, while the young institution, having been founded and developed as a strong teaching school, was now emphasizing a research orientation.[1] Issues and patterns of governance vary widely among large public research institutions, and within such institutions, among their departments. Indeed, the whole concept of "governance" is difficult to define; to many faculty, it is synonymous with "administration." I shall, therefore, briefly describe my own institution to establish a frame of reference, and will then suggest some of the implications of governance that I see in our being a large, public, research institution.

ORGANIZATION OF THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Ohio State University is comprised of eighteen academic colleges (Arts, Engineering, Education, Medicine, etc.) of which five are subdivisions of a "confederation" called "Arts & Sciences." Arts and Sciences, once a mega-college within the University, was split many years ago to make it more manageable. It remains, from the students' point of view, their college: it is their enrollment unit, and they view it as the counterpart of Engineering, Business, etc. From the faculty point of view, however, the counterpart of Engineering, Business, etc. is the one of the five colleges (Humanities, Math and Physical Sciences, Social and Behavioral

Sciences, Arts, and Biological Sciences) in which faculty teach, where their Dean resides; for them, Arts & Sciences is a nebulous entity that handles student affairs. For both faculty and students, the perception is fairly close to reality.

Three of the Arts & Sciences colleges -- Humanities, Math & Physical Sciences, and Social & Behavioral Sciences -- are in terms of student credit hours generated the largest in the University. The largest college, Humanities, is composed of fourteen units, three of which are larger -- again in terms of student credit hours generated -- than half of the eighteen colleges. Each unit has a chair (in the case of departments, which offer instruction and can grant tenure) or a director (in the case of centers, some of which offer courses but none of which have tenure lines). Table 1 gives some idea of the size of the instructional mission of OSU and its colleges, and of the departments within the College of Humanities. Some highlights (see Table 1):

> --OSU generated 2.32 million quarter credit hours in 1986/87, which, at 15 quarter credit hours per student FTE, translates into 49,603 students. University-wide, 78% of the instruction was at the undergraduate level, while 22% was at the graduate level.
>
> --More than half of the total credit hours (55%) were generated in Arts & Sciences, which, however, has less than half the faculty. In Arts & Sciences, 89% of the instruction is undergraduate, 11% graduate.
>
> --Humanities is the largest single college in terms of credit hours generated (17.2%); of these credit hours, 91% were undergraduate, 9% were graduate.
>
> --English, History, and Romance Languages and Literatures each generate more credit hours than any of the following colleges: Agriculture, Dentistry, Veterinary Medicine, Home Economics, Nursing, Social Work, Law, Pharmacy, or Optometry.

As at many institutions, there seems to be no single principle guiding the division of language teaching into departments at Ohio State: in some cases, the cohesion is linguistic (Germanic, Romance); in others, it is geographical (Slavic and East European, Judaic and Near Eastern, East Asian), ethnic (Swahili is in Black Studies), traditional-historical (Latin and Ancient Greek in Classics), or it may simply reflect the interest of the unit and the lack of a good rationale for any other choice (Sanskrit, the only Indian or South Asian language taught, is in Linguistics). English as a Second Language is outside the College of Humanities altogether, coming under the Vice Provost for International Affairs. Thus,

Table 1: Descriptive Numbers/Organization, Ohio State University, 1986-87

FACULTY	Full-Time Positions	AvgSal (Source: ACADEME, Mar-Apr 1987) (Columbus campus only)
Professor	729	$54,000
Associate Prof	587	$39,600
Assistant Prof	496	$33,100
Instructor	91	$23,700
TOTAL	1,903	

	Total Quarter Cr Hrs	Stu FTE @ 45 Cr Hrs per stu/yr	% UNIV	BA/BS	MA/PhD
Ohio State University	2,232,117	49,603	100.0%	78%	22%
Engineering	220,423	4,898	9.9%		
Business	181,784	4,040	8.1%		
Education	148,984	3,311	6.7%		
Medicine	118,183	2,626	5.3%		
Agriculture	52,059	1,157	2.3%		
Dentistry	33,314	740	1.5%		
Veterinary Medicine	32,318	718	1.4%		
Home Economics	28,236	627	1.3%		
Nursing	19,052	423	.9%		
Social Work	17,740	394	.8%		
Law	17,388	386	.8%		
Pharmacy	16,658	370	.7%		
Optometry	11,683	260	.5%		
Other	9,303	207	.4%		

ARTS & SCIENCES	850				% ASC	89%	11%
Humanities	266	383,629	8,525	17.2%	29.1%		
Mathematical & Physical Sciences		372,636	8,281	16.7%	28.3%		
Social & Behavorial Sciences		365,409	8,120	16.4%	27.8%		
Arts		115,613	2,569	5.2%	8.8%		
Biological Sciences		79,369	1,764	3.6%	6.0%		
TOTAL, Arts & Sciences		1,237,287	27,495	55.4%	100.0%		

HUMANITIES DEPARTMENTS					% HUMS	91%	9%
English	102,697	2,282	4.6%	8.3%	26.8%		
History	65,760	1,461	2.9%	5.3%	17.1%		
Romance	62,391	1,386	2.8%	5.0%	16.3%		
Philosophy	41,958	932	1.9%	3.4%	10.9%		
Classics	19,338	430	.9%	1.6%	5.0%		
Black Studies	14,979	333	.7%	1.2%	3.9%		
Linguistics	13,975	311	.6%	1.1%	3.6%		
German	13,075	291	.6%	1.1%	3.4%		
Slavic	12,756	283	.6%	1.0%	3.3%		
East Asian	11,788	262	.5%	1.0%	3.1%		
Women's Studies	8,582	191	.4%	.7%	2.2%		
Comparative Studies	8,534	190	.4%	.7%	2.2%		
JaNELL	7,206	160	.3%	.6%	1.9%		
Other	590	13			.2%		
TOTAL, HUMANITIES	383,629	8,525	17.2%	31.0%	100.0%		
			OSU	ASC	HUMS		

this issue of kaleidoscopic organizational patterns may be one that should be discussed and evaluated: Is there an ideal pattern?

IMPLICATIONS OF BEING A LARGE, PUBLIC, RESEARCH INSTITUTION

Some implications of being large: Comparatively speaking, language teaching is only a small, and an overwhelmingly undergraduate, service activity at an institution like Ohio State. The 21,000+ students annually passing through our language departments represent under 5% of the instruction OSU delivers (see Table 2). This is also reflected in our output of degrees: over the last three years we have averaged 55 BA majors, 45 MA's, and 6 PhD's per year in all languages combined.

Nevertheless, we teach some 900 language sections per year. Staffing these sections presents -- especially for Romance Languages, which accounts for over 500 of them -- a tremendous challenge. Obviously our graduate students provide much of the instructional person-power, but they are not enough. We also hire many lecturers and instructors, often ABD's and recent PhD's, into 3-year term, nontenure-track positions; these individuals teach nine sections per year. Recently we've also been hiring secondary school language teachers to teach our evening sections.

With so many students to serve, so many sections to teach, and so many people doing the teaching, one can usually find a way to experiment (try out a new method, new materials, or whatever) with one or two sections; but it is extremely difficult to implement any major changes. To enlarge on a metaphor suggested by one of my colleagues, it's easy to rearrange the deck chairs on an ocean liner, but hard to turn the thing around.

The administrative burdens of handling such a vast program can result in isolation of the administrators. Thus, at the top levels, people may become "professional administrators" who have not taught a class in years. Farther down the ladder, teaching coordinators may spend so much time handling and keeping up with routine paperwork that even though they are usually given a reduced teaching load, they find it extremely difficult to exercise creative leadership, much less carry on an active research program.

Finally, at a large institution it can be hard to communicate across departmental lines: a promising initiative in one department may or may not be noticed and built upon by another. Even more difficult to ensure is good communication across collegiate lines: the natural alliances that could and should form among the foreign language departments, foreign language education, international studies, international agriculture, and international business programs, for example, are very hard to establish and maintain.

Some implications of being public: To begin with, funding from one biennium to the next is indefinite: whether a "marginal" program is sustained

or a new program is funded is always subject to legislative action, and legislators vary in the extent to which they deem a given program important. There is considerable emphasis on funding "public service" programs that are perceived to serve clearly and immediately the interests of the people of the state, such as agriculture, education, medicine, and the like.

As a corollary, there is as much concern about imparting practical, basic skills as there is about producing truly "educated" individuals; this "practical" orientation can jeopardize the more esoteric fields that often characterize, in the public perception, the humanities (among other areas).

There is also an "equal access" ethic that until recently kept Ohio State from being selective about entrance: each fall we had to accept the first 6,500 Ohio high school graduates who applied for admission, regardless of their grades and SAT scores. (On the plus side of that ledger -- in my view -- are the costly recent initiatives OSU has taken to increase dramatically our recruitment and retention of minority faculty and students. A private institution might not find it as necessary to respond positively and forcefully to these kinds of public pressures.)

Some implications of being a research institution: There is a constant tug-of-war between the funding needs of undergraduate and "service" teaching vs. support for the more expensive and research-oriented graduate programs. Outreach programs to area high schools can suffer for the same reasons. Faculty are under tremendous pressure to publish and secure grants, for these are hallmarks of any major research institution. Thus, the maintenance of a renaissance, global, well-rounded perspective on undergraduate and graduate education (vs. the tendency to specialize, even at the undergraduate level) is difficult. On the other hand, the presence of good research facilities and support systems (e.g., labs, libraries, and leaves) and our ability to attract high-quality graduate students facilitates recruitment of top-level faculty with particular credentials and specializations of interest to us.

TRAINING, HIRING, AND PROMOTION OF TEACHERS

In this context, "teachers" is too broad a term to be meaningful. Graduate teaching associates (TA's), lecturers and instructors, and tenured or tenure-track faculty differ markedly in their responsibilities, contracts, expectations (and our expectations of them), salaries, and longevity within the academy. Let me therefore suggest four categories of personnel in this regard: 1) preprofessionals, meaning essentially TA's; 2) term professionals, meaning nontenure-track personnel holding the terminal degree, such as lecturers and instructors; 3) tenure-track professionals, meaning for the most part beginning assistant professors; and 4) tenured professionals, i.e., the associate and full professors.

TABLE 2: Language Department Facts and Figures from The Ohio State University

	Faculty 86/87	Instr 86/87	Lect/ GTA 86/87	Tot qtr Cr Hrs 86/87		Enrollment Estimate (QCrHrs/5)		Enrlmt/yr 101 ONLY 3yrAvg	BA(Maj) per yr 3yrAvg	MA per yr 3yrAvg	Ph.D. per yr 3yrAvg
ROMANCE LANGUAGES		14	55							15.6	2.0
Spanish(1)	13			33,133	30.8%	Spanish	6,627	1,697	13.6		
French(1)	14			24,611	22.9%	French	4,922	1,219	11.6		
Italian	3			4,374	4.1%	Italian	875	218	1.6		
Portuguese	1			245	.2%	Portuguese	49	18			
SUBTOTAL	31	14	55	62,363	58.0%	SUBT	12,473	3,152	26.8	15.6	2.0
GERMAN		1	13						9.3	5.3	2.3
German(1)	18			12,708	11.8%	German	2,542	551			
Swedish	1			304	.3%	Swedish	61	27			
Dutch						Dutch					
SUBTOTAL	19	1	13	13,012	12.1%	SUBT	2,602	578	9.3	5.3	2.3
SLAVIC & E.EUROPEAN		1	10						4.3	6.0	.3
Russian(4)	8			10,377	9.6%	Russian	2,075	269			
Romanian	1			1,285	1.2%	Romanian	257	81			
Polish	1			307	.3%	Polish	61	27			
Serbo-Croatian	2			188	.2%	Serbo-Cro.	38	12			
Bulgarian				35		Bulgarian	7	2			
Czech				22		Czech	4	4			
SUBTOTAL	12	1	10	12,214	11.4%	SUBT	2,443	395	4.3	6.0	.3

EAST ASIAN		3	17							11.0	.3
Chinese	7			3,374	3.1%	Chinese	675	116	2.3		
Japanese	7			3,206	3.0%	Japanese	641	165	5.3		
Korean				240	.2%	Korean	48	14			
SUBTOTAL	14	3	17	6,820	6.3%	SUBT	1,364	295	7.6	11.0	.3
JUDAIC & NEAR EASTERN		2	10								
Hebrew	4			2,739	2.5%	Hebrew	548	70	1.0		
Arabic	3			2,132	2.0%	Arabic	426	76	.6		
Yiddish				1,386	1.3%	Yiddish	277	40			
Mod. Greek	1			564	.5%	Mod. Gr.	113	29			
Persian				217	.2%	Persian	43	12			
Turkish				115	.1%	Turkish	23	9			
SUBTOTAL	8	2	10	7,153	6.6%	SUBT	1,431	236	1.6	.0	.0
CLASSICS(2)	12	1	11						5.6	7.0	1.3
Latin(1)				2,804	2.6%	Latin	561	233			
Greek				884	.8%	Greek	177	39			
SUBTOTAL	12	1	11	3,688	3.4%	SUBT	738	272	5.6	7.0	1.3
BLACK STUDIES(2)											
Swahili(3)			4	2,330	2.2%	Swah	466	177			
SUBTOTAL			4	2,330	2.2%	SUBT	466	177	.0	.0	.0
LANGUAGES TOTALS	96	22	120	107,580	100.0%		21,516	5,105	55.2	44.9	6.2
LANGUAGE CREDIT HOURS AS A % OF HUMANITIES					28.0%						
LANGUAGE CREDIT HOURS AS A % OF ARTS & SCIENCES					8.2%						
LANGUAGE CREDIT HOURS AS A % OF UNIVERSITY					4.8%						

NOTES:

(1) Substantial numbers of students in these languages skip 101.
(2) Much of the enrollment in this department is not in language studies.
(3) At present no faculty teach Swahili; no language major/minor is offered.
(4) A popular "Russian Culture" course in English accounts for ca. 3,000 of total credit hours (Col. H).

Within this schema, I suggest that the category of "training" at present applies mostly to the preprofessionals. In this connection, a large institution has a tremendous opportunity (as well as an obligation and necessity) to train future teachers: since we are forced to employ large numbers of beginning-level teachers (in the form of graduate students), training is of great importance to us. At OSU our large numbers mean we must formally structure the training, which in fact at Ohio State (and many other schools) has been done.[2]

For example, at OSU we train 80-100 new graduate teaching associates each fall. The TA trainer must have the support structure needed to provide the training, and must also have encouragement to be innovative, lest structure become a straightjacket: the impulse to "stick with a program that works" when the program is large and complex can be very great.

I would be remiss if I left the topic of training without making mention of one more serious governance implication. We neither train our chairs to chair, nor do we train our deans to dean. One language professor-turned-dean has put it this way:

> The academic world may be unique in its mania for taking people who are good at one sort of activity -- namely, teaching and scholarship -- and appointing them to something quite different -- management.[3]

Thus, while we should perhaps remain mindful of the Platonic admonition that those who desire power should not be trusted with it, we should find ways to facilitate the transition from professor to chair or dean for those whom we thrust into those roles.

"Hiring" presents a different set of challenges. It may be the single most important function any unit in the university performs. A large institution has the flexibility to hire specialists for research and graduate teaching who may not, however, be well-suited to the broader demands of undergraduate advising and instruction. Thus, at a large graduate institution we may seem to recruit and hire on a double standard: we look for good teachers to fill the (often) undergraduate-contact nontenure-track jobs, and we hire scholars for the (usually) graduate-contact tenure-track positions.

A decade ago,[4] I doubted we would ever see precisely what is now happening in the job market: top professional language pedagogs with specific preparation and experience in language program development, supervision, testing, and materials selection and development, have in the past decade have become sought-after. They have been getting tenure, and more recently, promotion to full rank in some of the most staid and traditional of our humanities-based language departments. In fact, finding "qualified" language coordinators is now the hardest recruitment job some

department chairs face. It's a seller's market, with the unfortunate result that too often we must hire younger people with traditional literature training whom we put into a no-win situation: we give them jobs that are top-heavy with labor-intensive supervisory-administrative duties, and yet we still expect them to publish (preferably in some traditional field). It is worth noting that the MLA Commission on Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics has recently taken note of this problem.[5]

When we turn to promotion, we again encounter clear and wrenching cases of the traditional value system victimizing our youngest colleagues: we promote those who succeed within that value system (research and publication), while expecting day-to-day performance of an entirely different nature (good teaching and program supervision and management). There are two possible resolutions to this difficulty: one would be to change the value system so that our language pedagogs can, in fact, be recognized for research they do in language pedagogy. They should have the opportunity to achieve full rank within the modified value system. The other possibility is to adjust our demands and expectations (rather than the value system) so that these younger scholars can progress along the traditional paths of scholarship in the humanities while doing the jobs we so badly need them to do. Drastically reduced teaching loads for these people would be one way to recognize our duality of purpose in hiring them. (A third possibility would be to create an entirely separate route for advancement for these people, a subject I shall leave for discussion by those from institutions where this has been tried. My principal concern about such adjustments is the danger of creating "second-class citizens" within the academy.)

In any case, we must recognize and reward the people who build and run our beginning and intermediate language programs, for without them at the base of our pyramid, the enterprise is on a shaky foundation. At OSU we have addressed this issue by including in the College promotion and tenure guidelines language that permits the language pedagogue who carries out original research in the area of language pedagogy to rise to the rank of full professor while plying his or her trade. I am pleased to note here that of the fifteen people in our language departments principally engaged in language program supervision, fourteen are tenured or in tenure-track positions, and the fifteenth is likely to be converted soon. Moreover, of those fifteen people:

-- three are full professors with tenure;
-- five are associate professors with tenure;
-- six, including one at full rank and several at the associate rank, hold the PhD in foreign language education rather than in language and literature.

ALLOCATION OF PERSONNEL, RESOURCES, AND MONEY

We in foreign language should not be hesitant to ask the central administration for money. Humanities fields have traditionally been cheap to teach, in terms of cost per student FTE: we have been a low-tech field of books and blackboards, and our use of graduate students and term professionals to do much of our teaching has given us manageable personnel costs.

need more equipment

That, of course, is changing. With the advent of technology, language training is becoming costly -- perhaps the first time in history that humanities has become expensive instruction. A large department has an advantage here: it calls attention to this change and makes the administration respond, perhaps by finding funding under the rubric of research.

The growing need for equipment and materials development funds in language instruction is but one of the financial issues of governance we are now facing. There are others, such as the following:

1. The chair wields little direct financial leverage, but there are subtle things s/he can provide: supplementary research quarters, travel, operating expenses or materials (e.g., new tapes for a language program), student assistants, clerical help.

2. There is a perennial problem of allocating resources so that both the graduate and undergraduate programs stay afloat. (A large budget gives one flexibility, but balancing the needs of the undergraduate vs. graduate program is a constant problem. When money is tight, do you cut seminars or increase the size of sections of 101?)

3. Support (travel funds, graduate research associates, secretarial help) may be given to senior people out of respect or tradition. These may not be people who are required to be part of lower level instruction or who need the research support most.

4. Because large institutions can afford to hire specialists, we risk not hiring the well-rounded teacher-scholars who might be, in reality, what our programs actually need.

5. Consortial arrangements may not work too well among large departments and institutions (due to institutional pride?); many of us think they work better at smaller institutions (out of necessity?)

It is a truism that the jazzy job gets the juice, and French 101, standard classrooms, and offices aren't, for the most part, jazzy. Thus, when scarce funds are allocated, the needs of language programs may suffer. Maybe that's our own fault: to many administrative observers we are still using classrooms and offices as we did in the fifties. Most foreign language teachers want more of what they have now, i.e., classroom space, maps, films, blackboards, office space, and overhead projectors. Perhaps instead we should be developing teaching methods and materials, and asking for facilities, that will carry us into the 21st century: fiber optics, cabling for linked computer labs, live satellite video feeds, and so on.

There is a subtle danger in asking for these kinds of things, however: we have to enter such a developmental-experimental phase in an objective frame of mind. To be "accountable" does not mean being "successful" with each new project. Thus, if we do get new funds to try out a new method, we must be prepared to call a failure a failure. To suggest a parallel, when a new vaccine does not work or a new bridge design turns out to be unsafe, no one considers the money spent establishing those facts to have been wasted. But when a language teaching experiment is proposed and funded, there seems to be a reluctance to analyze its results dispassionately. Yet we must not allow advocacy to replace objectivity for fear that if we could not make the new method succeed, the funding agency -- whether internal or external -- will not provide any more funds for experimentation with other ideas.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS AND MATERIALS

One strength of the large institution is its flexibility to assign someone to a special development project. In so doing, we must protect that person's promotion and tenure prospects, perhaps getting signed agreements from the senior faculty in the department that they will consider the project work the equivalent of original articles (again, the value system). And even when we launch such development projects, we may encounter problems of the following kinds:

1. We may find it difficult to cooperate across departments as well as we should, perhaps due to pride and the tradition of "we are a strong department."

2. Language teachers often seem reluctant to use others' materials. We seem to feel -- more so than historians, for example -- that we have to create or adapt a text to our own style.

3. Most of us are not really trained to teach language or develop materials, though we all like to think we can do it superbly.

4. Often we look at only the surface of our programs and materials, rather than at their fundamentals. For example, at OSU we have a 1-hour/day, 5-day/week format for foreign language instruction. Is that format optimal, or just traditional? Why don't we try some bold innovations, such as concentrating the instruction in one half of the quarter; or requiring overseas study for our majors; or lengthening the calendar time of the sequence (while holding the in-class hours the same); or insisting on performance/proficiency tests of our graduating students? Perhaps at a small institution these kinds of patterns are easier to experiment with than at a large institution.

On the positive side, at a large institution we can take advantage of having a College of Education nearby, because both we and they look at language and literature from partially-shared goals: we provide them a laboratory, while they provide us with a reminder of the importance of "how to do it" concerns.

EVALUATION OF FACULTY, COURSES, AND PROGRAMS

Presumably we evaluate in order to make decisions. If this is so, how do we know when to make the positive vs. the negative decision? According to McGlone, McClendon, and Olson, "Decision making at American institutions of higher learning is increasingly characterized by dependence on standardized procedures rather than on individual judgments."[6] Gitlitz suggests that "The most common mistake departments fall into is to define their success exclusively in terms of resources: additional faculty, more TA's, an increased travel budget, a new set of widgets."[7] This outlook, however, places the chair in the position of perennial mendicant before the dean, and hinges department morale on something totally beyond its power to control. Instead, recommends Gitlitz, we should define success programmatically:

> [S]uccess is refining and coordinating the first-year language sequence so that students perform better in the second year...adjusting your advising procedures so that you have a better carryover rate between the third and fourth semesters...getting three people trained in oral proficiency testing...helping...Mary White return to publishing.[8]

Personally, I can never think of evaluation without thinking of the convenient bifurcation of evaluation into the two principal purposes: FORMATIVE and SUMMATIVE. Formative evaluation is characterized by feedback to the institution, program, or individual that helps make chan-

ges in its development, while summative evaluation is essentially a "report card" of how well certain goals have been achieved.

If we apply that bifurcation to the present issues, we get six distinct types of evaluation: formative or summative evaluations of courses, of programs, and of faculty. I shall not be so bold as to suggest how much of each type of evaluation we do -- or should do -- for each area, but rather will simply note that we should seriously consider where the emphasis should be on formative evaluation, and where it should be on summative evaluation.

In discussion with my OSU colleagues, I find much support for the position that in only one of the three areas (faculty/personnel) is evaluation of either sort regularly forced on us with any frequency. Thus it is not surprising that this is the evaluative area in which we've become most efficient: we are reasonably competent without knowing very well how or why. That is, the teachers we say are tops, generally speaking are. And those we say are weak, usually are. But in between the two extremes, our evaluative instruments are dull. Specifically, here are some problems a large institution faces in evaluation:

> 1. There is a tendency to let people whose profession is supposed to be evaluation/administration do the evaluation, rather than have faculty take an active part. Deans and chairs may tend to be or become administrators, rather than rotating out of and back into the faculty ranks.
>
> 2. Our senior administrators are so busy being corporate officers, making the enterprise run, that they may tend to become divorced from its substance.
>
> 3. Most departments know astoundingly little about what other departments do, so cross-college course/program evaluation does not take place.

How can we improve on our evaluation? Student evaluations are important, but they need supplementation to be really effective: suggestions might include study of syllabi, exams, and grading processes. I agree with those who suggest we may place far too much emphasis on publication: "Many of the chairs in many of the arts and sciences disciplines were taught to believe that scholarly knowledge and substantive competence translates automatically into quality teaching."[9]

NO - but their absence tends to produce poor teaching

Rosbottom suggests a mentoring program that would help in our personnel evaluation.[10] I believe that the discussions that would accompany such a mentoring program also would lead to improved evaluation of courses and programs. The establishment of a mentoring program presupposes, however, that persons selected as "mentors" would be favorably disposed

to functioning in this role and that they would be able to give good guidance in a tactful, supportive manner.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Size gives a large institution diversity, and diversity gives us flexibility. Some of my colleagues think that teaching is perhaps more satisfying at a smaller institution while program development and research are more likely to flourish at a larger place. In any case, I think it is clear that language departments and professors feel they're being asked to be all things to all people: providers of basic instruction on a mammoth scale, as well as centers of traditional research. These new and expanded expectations may require new responses, and the new responses in turn may require new response mechanisms and structures. Thus, I shall close by summarizing the activities of one such new structure that the Ohio State University has recently established: the Foreign Language Center.

Ohio State University has a history of large, strong language departments with the traditional mission of language departments at a Big Ten research institution. Faced with an increasing customer orientation to develop language proficiency and a veritable onslaught of technological innovation, there was a need to provide those departments a way to address their shared and changing, expanding roles while still retaining their posture as leaders among language departments in the traditional sense of research and scholarship in foreign literatures and linguistics. After a four-year incubation period, OSU established on July 1, 1987, a Foreign Language Center with the following goals and functions:

A. To apply advances in technology (e.g., computer-assisted instruction, computer-based research in language acquisition and applied linguistics, satellite communications, interactive videodiscs) to the teaching of foreign languages.

B. To promote interdisciplinary cooperation in teaching and research among language departments in the College of Humanities and with the language teacher training programs in the College of Education.

C. To coordinate and facilitate outreach to language programs in school systems in the state, and especially in the immediate area of the Ohio State University.

D. To adapt developments and theoretical advances in studies of languages, applied linguistics, and education to teaching, materials development, testing, and program evaluation.

E. To coordinate and concentrate technical support facilities for research in language acquisition and applied linguistics.

Very quickly, an action program has developed that includes, for example, the following:

note the focus on technology

A. RESEARCH: New technologies provide new research opportunities. The uses of computers for text-based research (e.g., to establish concordances in languages such as Chinese and Japanese) is in its infancy. Developing scanners that will digitize non-alphabetic languages would be a very fruitful project. Finally, plans are already underway to establish at Ohio State an annual conference on research in adult language learning and acquisition.

B. INSTRUCTIONAL PROJECTS: Tied to specific instructional needs, projects such as satellite signal exploitation, computer-assisted instruction in the less commonly taught languages, and instruction augmented by interactive videodisc all seem to be areas of broad interest among our departments.

C. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: Our departments are likely to benefit from having the Foreign Language Center explore ways to establish and administer on a cooperative basis such programs as foreign language residence halls, computerized record-keeping in the individualized instruction programs, and proficiency testing of seniors graduating with foreign language majors.

D. OUTREACH: Both new and traditional approaches to cooperation with other colleges and area secondary schools are in process. For example, we will offer in the Spring of 1988 a course, "Languages & Cultures of Black Africa," at and in cooperation with a local magnet school; we have established a series of meetings with leaders in area school foreign language programs; we plan to offer Arabic in one or more secondary schools next year; and we will undertake to coordinate visits to campus by secondary school foreign language students and their teachers.

E. SERVICE AND SUPPORT to the University: The Center already coordinates our training course for new graduate teaching associates; we are working with the

Office for Disability Services and the Student Counseling Service to offer "foreign language anxiety" workshops; we operate a foreign language information booth for incoming freshmen during summer orientation; and we are building a grants library to assist language faculty to locate and apply for extramural funding.

F. LIAISON: The Center has established and is maintaining close ties with organizations and offices such as the Ohio Foreign Language Association, the Ohio Department of Education, the National Center for Foreign Language and International Studies, the Joint National Committee on Languages, and other national and regional language associations.

We are hopeful that the Foreign Language Center will allow us to capitalize on the size, strength, and diversity of our foreign language departments for the shared benefit of all. Through the Foreign Language Center we hope to improve our language programs' teaching, research, and service, and at the same time to experiment within them while maintaining the high quality of instruction and development that has characterized them to date.

Governance of language programs at a large, public, research institution is problematic. Perhaps at Ohio State our size facilitates our handling of some problems; but it just as surely begets others. Through open discussion and sharing at forums such as this one, we all may find new ways to address issues of governance.

NOTES

1 Richard A. Preto-Rodas, "The Role of the Foreign Language Chair: Money Raiser, Manager...or sui generis?" ADFL Bulletin 17, 2 (1986), 23.

2 See Gerard Ervin, "Ohio State University, Basic Foreign Language Programs," in Joseph Gibaldi and James Mirollo, eds., The Teaching Apprentice Program in Language and Literature (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1981), 100-106.

3 David M. Gitlitz, "Chairing a Language Department: The View from a Dean's Office," ADFL Bulletin 17, 2 (1986), 14.

4 See Gerard Ervin, "The Role of the Language Teaching Specialist in the College Foreign Language Department." ADFL Bulletin 7, 2 (1975), 15-16.

5 MLA Commission on Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, "Resolutions and Recommendations of the National Conference on Graduate Education in the Foreign Language Fields," ADFL Bulletin 17, 3 (1986), 1-4.

6 Edward L. McGlone, Carmen Chaves McClendon, and Nadine Olson, "The Major Research Journals in Foreign Languages: A Survey of Heads of the Doctoral Degree Granting Departments," Modern Language Journal 69, 1 (1985), 1.

7 Gitlitz, 16.

8 Ibid.

9 Hans O. Mauksch, "Managing a Department to Enhance Instructional Effectiveness," ADFL Bulletin 17, 2 (1986), 29.

10 Ronald C. Rosbottom, "The Supportive Chair," ADFL Bulletin 18, 2 (1987), 5.

THE TRAINING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS IN MAJOR RESEARCH-ORIENTED FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENTS

Albert Valdman and Cathy Pons
Indiana University

1. Introduction

1.1 Objectives of university-level foreign language instruction

One cannot discuss issues of governance of basic language instruction in large foreign language departments without first making a clear and unequivocal statement about the goals of such instruction at the university level. Governance includes decisions about the selection, the training, and the career development of those professionals intimately concerned with teaching, research, and development activities that will not only deliver effective instruction to undergraduates, but which will also contribute to a better understanding of language learning and to knowledge about all aspects of the language and cultures of target communities. Clearly, the types of skills to be acquired by learners and the nature of the knowledge that will be imparted to them centrally determine the type of training instructors must receive in order to perform effectively, as well as the type of professional activities -- research and development -- that are most compatible with their instructional responsibilities. For example, although unquestionably a valid area of inquiry, it is unlikely that research on the development of metathesis in the Sursalvan dialect of Romansch is likely to provide insights on the structuring of an undergraduate course sequence designed to impart communicative ability in French equivalent to the ILR 1+ level (ACTFL/ETS Intermediate High).

In her foreword to the collective volume Foreign Language Learning: A Research Perspective, C. Kramsch states:

> ...the main purpose of learning a foreign language in an institutional setting is to become communicatively proficient in the language, to gain insights into the symbolic and the communicative functions of language and to develop cultural awareness and cross-cultural understanding....[1]

We agree with Kramsch's three main goals, for reasons that A. Valdman (1982) has enumerated, namely: 1) the limited contact hours available in an institutional setting; 2) the lack of opportunities for communicative use of the target language; and 3) the role that particular foreign languages play in American society.[2] In addition, we suggest that imparting even a minimal communicative ability cannot be the central objective of

liberal arts, education-oriented foreign language programs. Rather, the central function of such programs must be to acquaint students with the phenomenon of language and its multifarious links with mind, culture, and society, and to introduce them to cultures different from that of their own community.

1.2 Qualifications of foreign language instructional staff

In view of the objectives listed above, faculty who are centrally involved in the planning, delivery, and supervision of foreign language instruction must exhibit competence in several areas:

a) Near-native mastery of the target language. In some respects, the instructor's level of mastery over the target language must exceed that of the average native speaker. The instructor must, for example, exhibit productive control of the most prestigious variety, where one exists, as well as demonstrating receptive control of a broader linguistic repertoire, including sociolinguistic and dialectal variants.

b) Intimate knowledge of the sociocultural context(s). For the most commonly taught foreign languages which are spoken as vernaculars in several countries and which serve as languages of wider communication, a certain level of familiarity with several cultures is required. For example, an instructor of French must display a level of knowledge about France, Belgium, Switzerland, Quebec, the Caribbean, the Maghreb, and Subsaharan African countries which far exceeds that of the average educated French person and which includes knowledge of the history and literature of these communities.

c) Broad training in linguistics. Training in the language sciences serves to impart general metalinguistic and metacommunicative awareness. This training goes far beyond that which was offered in the NDEA institutes in the early sixties. It should include socio- and psycholinguistics as well as descriptive study of the target language. Attention should be devoted to structure beyond the sentence level, that is, to discourse structure and pragmatics.

d) Knowledge of didactics. By this we mean an interdisciplinary approach to problems of instruction, including principles of educational psychology and research on learning. The instructor must be aware of issues and research in the area of foreign language learning and teaching methodology, and must be familiar with current-

ly available instructional materials, including technological aids.

2. Governance patterns

Neither of the two patterns of governance most widely distributed in major foreign language departments in this country will ensure that the professionals meeting all these qualifications can be induced to devote their main attention to language instruction and can be guaranteed a type of academic advancement comparable to that of the more traditional career profiles in literary studies, area studies, linguistics, or foreign language teacher education.

a) The caste system is typical of private universities. Tenure-track appointments are made for specialists in literature or linguistics, who must attain distinction in research; professional excellence in the area of language instruction is attained at one's risques et périls and, to use a Louisiana French expression, is mere lagniappe. Nontenured status is given to language teaching specialists. Some institutions reserve a special title for such appointments -- such as "preceptor" -- and grant de facto tenure. The fact remains that such positions are not equivalent to appointments at the professorial rank, in terms of prestige or actual teaching responsibilities, and thereby create a group of second-class citizens.

b) The transitional appointment is typical of large state universities. This involves tenure-track appointments but short-term assumption of responsibilities in supervision and coordination of language instruction. Usually, these persons have no specialized training or expertise in areas directly related to their initial teaching, supervisory, and training responsibilities. Illustrating this point, a recent survey undertaken by R. Teschner and reported in The Modern Language Journal (1987) indicated that just over 50% of responding program directors held the rank of assistant professor or below (lecturer, instructor, etc.); of the total number of respondents, including faculty at higher ranks, only 14% had completed dissertations in the area of applied linguistics or foreign language education (taken as an indication of professional preparation).[3]

New governance patterns must be sought if rigor and continuity are to be characteristic of language programs and if universities are to meet both professional needs in foreign languages (that is, the functional goals of majors and students of international business programs) and provide undergraduate nonmajors with a sound liberal-arts-oriented foreign language program which will meet the formative goal of higher education.

c) The language center represents a third pattern of governance, found extensively in the UK (e.g., at Essex, Exeter, and York). Such a center makes possible the cooperation of critical masses of specialists in all of the fields that inform foreign language instruction: applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics; area studies; semiotics; didactics; instructional technology. In larger US institutions, foreign language specialists tend to be scattered in different departments and schools, and seldom have the opportunity to interact with and be stimulated by colleagues with similar professional interests. A language center facilitates research related to instructional problems and the development of materials, including those in new media -- in video and computer-assisted instruction, for example.

3. Professional responsibilities and research interests

Can foreign language methodology be an autonomous discipline within foreign language departments at the university level? Should foreign language teaching be added to the specializations currently accepted as academically respectable disciplines in research-oriented foreign language departments? We say no, in light of the emphasis on knowledge, rather than skill, reflected by the three objectives posited in the introductory section of these remarks. Faculty entrusted with the responsibility of planning and supervising foreign language instruction and with the training of prospective teachers may be trained in any of a variety of disciplines -- applied linguistics, applied psychology, semiotics, area studies, literary studies, or didactics. These faculty would be expected to pursue a research program that could be evaluated by specialists in the various disciplines. But, in addition to specialized training in their discipline, they would be expected to attain a degree of professional competence in all areas of qualification demanded by their specific instructional tasks and responsibilities. Most likely their research program would span disciplinary and instructional interests, and the results of their research program would inform language instruction.

A model for this relationship between professional responsibilities and disciplinary research interests is provided by the field of TESOL. Most professionals in that field have been trained as applied linguists, with specializations in linguistics, psycholinguistics, or sociolinguistics. They have contributed significantly to theory construction in the area of language learning and to the description of English and the understanding of how that language functions in various societies. There are at least a half dozen major journals that provide outlets for research related to the professional interests of specialists in second language learning and use. It is time for foreign language departments to follow the lead of ESL programs.

4. Some interim solutions

4.1 Lecturers

In the Department of French and Italian at Indiana University, two visiting lecturers assist in the planning and delivery of basic language instruction and the training of graduate teaching assistants, working under the supervision of faculty members. These two-year positions, viewed as internships, are open to PhD candidates who are ABD as well as recent PhD's. Generally, individuals holding these positions have acquired some experience through teaching in similar large programs. The lectureship affords these persons the opportunity to gain further experience in curriculum planning, in materials development, and in teacher training, and to acquire competencies in the related areas mentioned earlier as crucial to the planning and delivery of foreign language instruction.

Certain weaknesses are inherent in the lecturer system. First, individual specializations are sometimes only remotely related to problems of language instruction; at our institution, the research interests of past lecturers have ranged from 17th to 20th century French literature, and from historical linguistics to phonetics and sociolinguistics. When a dichotomy exists between research interests and professional responsibilities, the tension is great and can have serious consequences for the young faculty member. One solution to this problem is to aim for as close as possible a match between research and instructional responsibilities; lecturers whose research is in the area of applied linguistics thus have a distinct advantage.

Although in theory one goal of the lecturer system is to allow for further professional development, in practice the lecturer's workload, which encompasses the teaching of four courses, coordinating instruction for 500-800 students during a given semester, and supervising the training of 10-20 graduate teaching assistants, may preclude the allotment of a substantial amount of time for additional training in areas outside the area of primary research.

4.2 Instructional fellowships

As an alternative to the lecturer system, we propose the establishment of a program of two-year fellowships designed to afford PhD candidates and recent PhD's the opportunity to gain further experience, upgrade necessary skills, and develop a program of research related to foreign language instruction.

In the first year of such a program, recipients would devote only about 40% of their time to actual teaching and supervisory tasks. The majority of their time would be spent developing a research program and exploring

areas outside of their particular research interests, but nevertheless germane to the problems of foreign language instruction.

Summer stipends would make it further possible for fellows to focus on skill upgrading and personal research, even assisting faculty in research and development projects. In the second year of the fellowship program, the emphasis would be reversed and recipients would devote a larger portion of their time to teaching and supervisory duties.

Such a system of fellowships to new specialists who have already completed or are nearing completion of the PhD would allow the development of a cadre of professionals equipped to handle the demands of a particular discipline and to competently direct large programs of foreign language instruction.

5. A training program for graduate teaching assistants

In the foreign language programs of many large universities, graduate teaching assistants provide 60-80% of instruction at the elementary and intermediate levels. Certainly a major concern in the governance of such programs is the preparation afforded these novice instructors. A national conference held in October 1986 on the employment and education of teaching assistants -- the first ever -- reflected a growing realization that the training of these instructors has often been sorely neglected, and that the need to improve the calibre of training programs is crucial.

5.1 Objectives of a training program

The organization of a training program for foreign language instructors must reflect at any given moment both the needs of the teachers and the requirements of the institution, including the need for high quality instruction in basic language courses. New graduate students who are teaching for the first time will have very different needs from instructors who have even a year's experience, and PhD candidates nearing completion of the degree have still different concerns. A well-articulated training program is designed to meet these differing needs at various points in the graduate student's career.

says C

5.2 A cyclical training program

The training program for instructors in French at Indiana University is just such a cyclical, or spiral, program. As has been described by C. Pons (1987), the program proceeds in three phases:[4]

> a) An orientation workshop takes place during the two weeks which precede fall semester; the goal of this workshop is to meet the immediate needs of instructors who may never have taught before, as well as foreign exchange students who may have no experience of the

American university. Discussions thus focus on organization and preparation, teaching techniques, departmental and university policies, student-teacher relations, etc. Innovative features of the program include the use of assignments to review and confirm understanding of key concepts; the use of videotapes of actual classes to illustrate teaching techniques as well as typical student behavior and teacher reactions; sessions in which instructors learn an exotic language (Haitian Creole) and reflect on their language learning experience; and an opportunity to prepare a lesson under close supervision and teach the lesson to an actual class of students.

b) A practicum is required of all new instructors in the fall semester; organized as a series of focused classroom observations, it is designed to help instructors identify a variety of teaching techniques and evaluate the effectiveness of those techniques. At the same time, instructors gain experience in developing teaching and testing materials under the guidance of a course supervisor, and receive feedback on classroom teaching performance through visits from the supervisor.

c) A Methods Course is required of all candidates in French literature and linguistics; offered in the spring semester, it is a logical follow-up to the practicum and focuses on theoretical concerns and issues in foreign language instruction. It is not a course in applied French linguistics, nor in second language acquisition; instructors are, however, introduced to research in these areas and encouraged to explore additional course offerings.

The large majority of graduate programs provide no opportunities for training beyond the first year of the assistantship. It is clear, however, that more experienced instructors have need of further developing skills in evaluation of teaching performance and materials, as well as in course and curricular design. At our institution, opportunity exists for additional instructional preparation and experience.

a) Peer observation groups, using a model described by M. Barnett (1983),[5] have been used with success among self-selected groups of instructors who gain additional insight into their own and others' teaching through this procedure; these instructors have learned techniques for providing formative evaluations of teaching. Particularly effective has been the pairing of experienced instructors with novices; senior instructors thus provide guidance for new graduate students in a nonthreatening manner,

and gain useful experience in providing formative evaluations.

b) The Department's Undergraduate Curriculum Committee includes each year two members who are graduate teaching assistants. These student members participate fully in discussion and voting, thereby gaining insight into the process of curriculum planning.

c) Exchange positions provide instructors with a cultural immersion experience and the opportunity to perfect language skills while teaching in a French secondary school or in a French or Québecois university. Unfortunately, exchangees are often asked to teach a variety of English language courses, a duty for which they are ill-prepared. Much preferable would be the utilization of exchangees in new programs in France teaching French as a foreign language.

d) Assistants to course supervisors, advanced graduate students, participate in the fall workshop, teach demonstration classes -- and therefore participate in the fall practicum, assist in materials development, and consult individually with novice instructors. Working in close concert with a lecturer/course supervisor, assistants serve an apprenticeship which can prepare them eventually to assume the duties of a lecturer.

It is our eventual goal that additional training opportunities be provided senior TA's through a system of mentoring, in which the individual TA helps to plan a course with a faculty member willing to take on the role of mentor. The two would meet to discuss course objectives, the TA having some input into the design of the course syllabus, choice of texts and other teaching materials, and test design, as well as the opportunity to guest lecture in the course.

Currently in our program only two courses directly addressing instructional problems are required of degree candidates -- the practicum and the methods course. It is our belief, however, that all PhD candidates who envisage a career in foreign language teaching should be made aware of developments in applied linguistics, second language acquisition, foreign language methodology, and instructional technology, and we strongly recommend that such requirements be made part of degree programs.

6. <u>En guise de conclusion</u>

Increased emphasis on foreign language as an integral component of a liberal arts education as well as emphasis on the development of communicative skills have led to widespread reinstatement of foreign language

requirements. The resulting burgeoning enrollments in language programs have made all the more evident the need for experienced and competent program directors and teacher trainers.

As we strive to develop new governance patterns -- in fact, struggle against established self-interests and the exploitation of language instruction programs in the interest of other disciplines -- we must make more rigorous and systematic the training of foreign language teaching professionals, training which is now effected in a diffuse and haphazard manner.

It is a fact that junior faculty are not likely to be fully engaged in their discipline; for example, a sixteenth-century French specialist will probably not teach graduate-level courses until the third or fourth year of postdoctoral teaching. In the interim, these junior faculty are frequently asked to assume responsibilities for which they are neither equipped nor motivated. Through TA training and faculty development, we must begin to change "chores" into "challenges," to make professional involvement in language instruction intellectually rewarding for all faculty.

NOTES

1 Claire J. Kramsch, "Foreword," in Bill VanPatten, et al., eds., Foreign Language Learning: A Research Perspective (1987), vii-x.

2 Albert Valdman, "Toward a Modified Structural Syllabus," Studies in Second Language Acquisition 5, 1 (1982), 34-51.

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

4 Cathy R. Pons, "A Three-Phase Approach to TA Training: The Program for Associate Instructors in French at Indiana University," in Nancy Van Note Chism, ed., Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants: Readings from a National Conference (Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987), 239-43.

5 Marva A. Barnett, "Peer Observation and Analysis: Improving Teaching and Training TA's," ADFL Bulletin 15, 1 (1983), 30-33.

LANGUAGE DEPARTMENTS AND TEACHING: AN ADMINISTRATOR'S VIEW

Ward Dennis
Columbia University

The recent letter from the University of Chicago calling for a conference on why we teach languages in college poses some challenging questions for us all, such as, do we offer (and in some cases require) languages because they introduce students to other cultures? Or to introduce students to great literature in another language? Or is it to "open before students the world of linguistic communication"? Is the purpose to instill practical skills? Or more basically, is language instruction appropriate at all at the college level, or should we require "all students to enter college with some level of proficiency" and leave it to the secondary schools to do what amounts to skill training? The conference is designed "to stimulate thought, not about methods of language instruction, but about the goals of language instruction."

As an academic administrator who has taught a foreign language, I suggest that the same type of thinking about goals needs to occur when we discuss governance, because chaos reigns. Students, teaching assistants, language instructors, and academic administrators are aware of it, but senior faculty have tended to turn a blind eye.

If our attitude is that foreign language instruction is a skill which should not be taught at the college level, then perhaps we deserve what we've got. If, however, we believe that foreign language instruction, at all its levels, is a requisite part of a liberal arts education, then the present situation in many places is clearly unacceptable.

Some issues which I think must be addressed, especially if our goal is to encourage students beyond a mere two-year language requirement, are:

a) What is the role of senior faculty in language instruction?

Should we not listen to our colleagues in the science departments who believe that it is essential to have senior faculty involved as instructional role models? They believe that future scientists are converted and shaped in the first class in the freshman year. Yet more and more I hear the case made by language faculty for a separation of language teaching from literature at the university level. If we follow this path will we not be condemned to a declining number of language majors in our institutions and to a dependence upon small liberal arts colleges who will keep all their faculty involved with instruction at all levels, if for no other reason than because they have no choice? They have small staffs and cannot rely on graduate students to work the forward trenches.

There is little doubt in my mind that places like Haverford, Middlebury, and Smith do an excellent job of teaching languages and developing majors. Yet even with the staffing realities at universities, I don't think it is too much to ask that all faculty be at least involved in supervising language instruction and in teaching advanced grammar and composition, phonetics, and literary and cultural survey courses.

b) What should be the qualifications of new faculty?

Should we not require minimum tested proficiency approaching "advanced plus" in all skills from new assistant professors so that their students are exposed to all the nuances of the language they have chosen to study?

Should we not require formal training in pedagogy so that faculty can teach well and can serve as role models to graduate student teachers and others?

Should we not require some significant amount of cultural immersion through study and residence abroad, and should we not lobby the government and foundations to support such study?

However, we must realize that the realities of the hiring marketplace may make some of these requirements difficult to impose. The academic pipeline is thin at a time when many of us will be retiring up to fifty percent of our faculty in the next few years. We are already seeing fierce competition in certain areas and a ratcheting up of salaries. On the other hand, can we afford to go into what will amount to a thirty-year stretch with new faculty accustomed to the wrong incentives and rewards?

c) What should be the qualifications of teaching assistants?

We are making progress in this area, but we have a long way to go. Should we not put additional emphasis on language proficiency for admission into graduate schools so that the pressure filters down to undergraduate programs? Should we not all make language pedagogy a required component of our graduate programs? And should we not require some form of overseas acculturation experience prior to turning TA's loose in the classroom? Above all, we should see to it that all graduate students realize that teaching will be an essential part of their careers, and we should follow through by ensuring that successful teaching receives the same recognition as publication and service.

d) What should be the use of so-called native teachers?

We need to look very closely at the pros and cons of native teachers as opposed to PhD's trained in literary studies. When the former are used, should they be allowed in all languages or only in the "exotics"? In other words should they be used in areas where there is a regular supply

of PhD's? Should their use be reserved for certain teaching areas, such as drills?

Regardless of where they are used, they should be accorded dignity and acceptance within their department and university. We have all seen shameful instances of intellectual, ethnic, and racial discrimination towards native teachers. They in return should be required to keep active in their fields, not necessarily through the publication of literary studies but rather through writing of texts, development of teaching materials, and presentation of model lessons and curricula at the appropriate professional meetings. (ESL offers us some valuable models here.) Their salaries should be in line with those of other faculty, and their responsibilities should be clearly defined.

Experience at the secondary school level tells us that there is a real problem of burnout on the part of people who are faced with the same teaching duties day in and day out. Unless we make the lives of our language teachers rewarding, once the regulations governing mandatory retirement rules in academia change, and I believe nothing is going to stop that from happening in 1991, we could have burned out 80-year-old instructors teaching our freshmen.

For these and for many other reasons we at Columbia have developed a new language teaching career track which provides for rolling renewable appointments -- only in certain "exotic" or difficult to reach languages, and in ESL -- with a review committee composed of ESL, language, pedagogical linguistics, and literary specialists, and for three ranks with salaries pegged to comparable professorial levels. This allows a department freedom to retain an excellent language teacher for as long as there is a need, subject to periodic review of teaching effectiveness. It also allows a department freedom to dismiss, with fair notice, a language teacher whose performance has deteriorated or whose enrollments cannot be academically or fiscally justified.

e) What do we know about the various models of organization?

I will leave this to others who have studied the matter. However, if the languages are grouped together with no account taken of the literature/culture element, I am not sure that we will gain very much and we will push languages further away from the academic mainstream. Either senior faculty must take full responsibility for language instruction or else we deserve a lot of the criticism we hear from our students and from our colleagues in other disciplines.

f) What about the tension pointed out by Jim Noblitt between the liberal arts and the so-called professional needs for language?

I find it hard to believe that further fragmentation into courses such as "French for Diplomats" will lead us anywhere constructive. Some of the

criticism we receive is due to our past attuning of language instruction towards reading literature. I don't blame students who say they never learned how to speak or critics who say Americans are monolingual. Fortunately there are many examples of innovative programs throughout the Consortium and around the nation which are turning out well-balanced students.

I have been asked who is going to pay for all this. Contrary to popular opinion, frequently found in the professional schools, the humanities and languages are not always the most expensive departments. Sometimes they are among the most cost efficient. If we believe that the study of languages, literatures, and cultures is important, we will find the money. The Consortium can be of great help by continuing to stimulate discussion among faculty and administrators.

It is up to us. We cannot depend on the return of foreign language requirements to provide captive audiences. We must set our goals for general education, for language majors (for therein lies the future of our professions), and for graduate instruction. If we can lead in the teaching of foreign languages at least as well as we lead in other areas, we can set the model towards which secondary and primary schools can begin to pitch their teaching. If we fail to set these goals, we will be condemned to what amounts to remedial work forever.