

70-14,412

BAMBAS, Frieda Derdeyn, 1910-  
AN EVALUATION OF THE BENEFITS DERIVED BY  
OKLAHOMA TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE  
FROM PARTICIPATION IN NDEA FOREIGN LANGUAGE  
INSTITUTES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1970  
Education, teacher training

**University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan**

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN EVALUATION OF THE BENEFITS DERIVED BY OKLAHOMA  
TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE FROM  
PARTICIPATION IN NDEA FOREIGN  
LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY  
FRIEDA DERDEYN BAMBAS  
Norman, Oklahoma

1970

AN EVALUATION OF THE BENEFITS DERIVED BY OKLAHOMA  
TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE FROM  
PARTICIPATION IN NDEA FOREIGN  
LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

APPROVED BY

Ellen R. Snider

Jan P. Artman

Louise Lyman

Leah P. Williams

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe many thanks to the director of my dissertation, Dr. Glenn R. Snider, for his advice and assistance. I wish also to thank the members of my committee: Dr. Jim P. Artman, Dr. Lowell Dunham, and Dr. Lloyd P. Williams.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENT . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I.    INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Purposes of the Study . . . . .	6
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	6
Limitations of the Problem. . . . .	7
Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
Procedure . . . . .	10
Related Research. . . . .	14
Organization of the Study . . . . .	15
II.   A REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE. . . . .	16
Background Influences and Related Research	16
III.  PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	40
The Respondents to the Questionnaire. . . . .	40
Teaching Experience . . . . .	44
Academic Training . . . . .	46
Evaluation of Academic Training . . . . .	54
Evaluation of the NDEA Institute Training .	60
IV.   SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	76
Summary . . . . .	76
Conclusions . . . . .	84
Recommendations . . . . .	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	88
APPENDICES . . . . .	98
Appendix A. . . . .	98
Appendix B. . . . .	100
Appendix C. . . . .	104
Appendix D. . . . .	106

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Sex and Age Distribution of Respondents . . . .	41
II. Total Years of Teaching Experience . . . . .	44
III. Years Respondents Taught Foreign Language. . .	45
IV. Years Taught Other Than Foreign Language . . .	45
V. Undergraduate Majors and Minors. . . . .	47
VI. Master's Degrees Reported by Respondents . . .	49
VII. Average Credit Hours in the Target Language. .	50
VIII. Percentage of Respondents Who Had a Methods Course . . . . .	51
IX. Travel in a "Target" Country . . . . .	52
X. Study in a "Target" Country. . . . .	53
XI. Quality of College or University Training. . .	55
XII. Skills Most Stressed in University Training. .	56
XIII. Dissatisfaction with Preparation in Individual Skills. . . . .	57
XIV. Items Contributing to Deficiencies in Preparation. . . . .	58
XV. Self-Evaluation of Proficiency <u>Before</u> NDEA Institute(s) . . . . .	59
XVI. Self-Evaluation of Proficiency <u>After</u> NDEA Institute(s) . . . . .	61
XVII. Quantitative Estimate of Benefit (and Totals by Area) of Those Respondents Who Indicated Improvement. . . . .	63
XVIII. Numerical Interpretation of Quantitative Benefits Shown in Table XVII . . . . .	65

Table	Page
XIX. Topics that Respondents Rated Most Helpful in Teaching--First, Second, and Third Preferences. . . . .	67
XX. Order of Helpfulness in Teaching (From Table XIX) . . . . .	68
XXI. Was Part of Institute Schedule Found Not Useful?. . . . .	70
XXII. Did Institute(s) Provide the Training Most Needed?. . . . .	71
XXIII. Institute Upgraded Self-Confidence as Teacher.	72
XXIV. Institute Upgraded Appreciation of Value of Contribution . . . . .	73
XXV. Institute Inspired Further Study in FL . . . .	74
XXVI. Estimate of Effectiveness of the Institute(s).	74

AN EVALUATION OF THE BENEFITS DERIVED BY OKLAHOMA  
TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE FROM  
PARTICIPATION IN NDEA FOREIGN  
LANGUAGE INSTITUTES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The state and status of the teaching of modern foreign languages in the schools of this nation which prompted the Congress of the United States to give a place to these languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 had, of course, been brought about by a number of events and circumstances.

In the history of education in the United States, the inclusion of modern foreign languages in the curricula has had pendulum range. Harvard, back in 1720, licensed several individuals to teach French as a semi-official college course.<sup>1</sup> Doubtless this teaching was of the grammar-translation type since Latin and Greek had for centuries

---

<sup>1</sup>Melvin I. Urofsky, "Reforms and Response: The Yale Report of 1828," History of Education Quarterly, V, No. 1 (March, 1965), pp. 53-68.

been taught in that manner and French was also a language. That there was a feeling, however, that something was lacking was evidenced by the fact that in the year 1728-1729 a French Club was formed to stimulate interest in French conversation. In 1784 the College of William and Mary added to the curriculum French, Spanish, Italian and German--to be taught by one professor, it appears.<sup>1</sup> In 1787 Harvard appointed its first salaried instructor in French. From this hesitant beginning has developed a now-thriving subject in our curricula. But the road was not smooth.

For several decades the matter of the teaching and learning of modern foreign languages in our schools has held a fluctuating interest. Those persons responsible for deciding what to include in our ever-expanding curriculum were subject to many pressures. Of these pressures the ones desiring the inclusion of modern foreign languages were not the strongest. If we glance back at the now-distant period about the turn of the century we find that foreign languages were prominent in the curricula of the schools. It would not seem unreasonable to attribute this situation to the pressure of tradition. The hold of conservatism on our school system was strong.

World War I affected the foreign language position adversely. German ceased being widely accepted as a very

---

<sup>1</sup>Joe E. Kraus, "The Development of a Curriculum in the Early American Colleges," History of Education Quarterly, Vol. I, No. 2 (June, 1961), pp. 64-67.

worthwhile, honorable language, the study of which might lead to a deep appreciation of a remarkable literature and culture. German ceased somehow to be the name of a language in the minds of many; it was the name of the political enemy and upon it fell the unthinking hatred of large groups of citizens, influential citizens. Out with German! And while German was being ousted from the school curricula, other language holds were weakened.

World War II, on the other hand, had a quite different effect. Where were the people trained in language? What army personnel had we available that could show competence in the languages of the involved nations? There were some available whose colleges and universities had considered competent, but the military organizations had a different interpretation for "competence"--they meant aural-oral competence! This type of competence had never been a major aim of our language instruction--though undoubtedly many of the best-qualified and most dedicated teachers had long incorporated what they could of these skills in their simple, non-electronic classrooms.<sup>1</sup> The critical need of the armed forces inspired the famous language programs known as the A.S.T.P. (Army Specialized Training Program[s]) which purported to teach these aural-oral skills to selected, talented and motivated adults in highly intensive, specially-designed

---

<sup>1</sup>Max Zeldner, "The Bewildered Modern Language Teacher," The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLVII (October, 1963), pp. 245-253.

courses of limited duration--usually nine months.<sup>1</sup> The results were gratifying, some even spectacular. Few candidates failed. The language specialists were impressed--and pensive.

The major journals and other publications dealing with education offered an increasing number of articles on languages, the importance of languages, the values--political and other--of language learning, the need for new goals in language teaching and, necessarily, the need for new methods in language teaching. These contributions following upon the recently-demonstrated national need had a considerable effect on the enrollment in foreign languages in the public schools and also in the institutions of higher learning. Enrollments increased greatly and there are considered predictions that they will continue to increase.<sup>2</sup> In our educational circles people of prominence outside of the language field were themselves convinced of the importance and the need for language study. Their voices were persuasive.<sup>3</sup>

Finally, on September 2, 1958, Congress passed Public Law 85-864, known as the National Defense Education Act of

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert J. Matthew, Language Area Studies in the Armed Services (Washington: American Council on Education, 1947).

<sup>2</sup>Elton Hocking, "The Decade Ahead," The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLVIII (January, 1964), 3-6.

<sup>3</sup>William Riley Parker, The National Interest and Foreign Language. U.S. Department of State Publication No. 7324 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962).

1958. This now famous Act was designed to have, and did have, a tremendous effect on education in the United States. It provided the catalyst and the money to improve many lagging areas in the American educational system--most especially the areas of mathematics, sciences and modern foreign languages. The Act had ten "Titles":

- Title I--General Provisions
- Title II--Loans to Students in Institutions of Higher Education
- Title III--Financial Assistance for Strengthening Science, Mathematics, and Modern Foreign Language Instruction
- Title IV--National Defense Fellowships
- Title V--Guidance, Counseling, and Testing; Identification and Encouragement of Able Students
  - Part A--State Programs
  - Part B--Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes
- Title VI--Language Development
  - Part A--Centers and Research and Studies
  - Part B--Language Institutes
- Title VII--Research and Experimentation in More Effective Utilization of Television, Radio, Motion Pictures, and Related Media for Educational Purposes
  - Part A--Research and Experimentation
  - Part B--Dissemination of Information on New Educational Media
  - Part C--General Provisions
- Title VIII--Area Vocational Education Programs
- Title IX--Science Information Services
- Title X--Miscellaneous Provisions

The preliminary words of Public Law 85-864 stated that this was "AN ACT To strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of

educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes."<sup>1</sup>

#### Purposes of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the benefits that Oklahoma teachers derived from attendance at one or more of the NDEA Language Institutes. From such data an indication of what these teachers lacked in their preparation and what may still be lacking in teacher preparation programs may be discovered.

Frequent, perhaps continuous research and evaluation is vital to progress in the field of education, as elsewhere. It appears justifiably useful and valuable to study just what benefits Oklahoma teachers derived specifically from their attendance at the Institutes. From this study may be discovered areas still weak or needing improvement in teacher preparation programs.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem of this investigation was to evaluate the effectiveness of modern foreign language instruction provided by NDEA Language Institutes as determined by the opinions of Oklahoma foreign language teachers who attended these Institutes. More specifically it was intended to discover what improvements in the qualifications of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Public Law 85-864, in United States Statutes at Large, Vol. 72, Part I (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 1580.

foreign language teachers may have resulted from the NDEA programs. For the purpose of this study this research focused on the benefits resulting to an identified segment of Oklahoma public school teachers of modern foreign languages who participated in one or more of the National Defense Education Act Foreign Language Institutes.

#### Limitations of the Problem

This study was limited to the investigation of benefits Oklahoma Public School Foreign Language Teachers felt they derived specifically from attendance at one or more of the government-sponsored NDEA Language Institutes provided under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and its subsequent amendments. It was not intended to identify or evaluate any one Institute, nor was it intended to identify or evaluate any specific college or university teacher preparation program.

#### Definition of Terms

The terms used in the study were in general those used in the professional literature dealing with the study and the teaching of modern foreign languages. Certain terms are defined as follows:

Audio-lingual method. This term refers to that method of language teaching which lays stress on teaching the student listening comprehension and speaking skills.

Audio-oral method. This is a different term for the same method as the "audio-lingual."

Audio-lingual-visual method. This term incorporates the three approaches used in the classroom presentations of the modern method of teaching foreign languages.

Culture. This term is used in its broad, general sense. It would include in its scope the customs, habits, generally accepted values, philosophical attitudes prevalent, etc., peculiar to or characteristic of the national or ethnic group speaking the language being studied.

Extra-class activities. This term is at times used interchangeably with the term "related FL experiences" but more specifically implies programmed foreign films, lectures and group activities aimed at providing extra-class contacts with the target language.

FL. These initials, standing for "Foreign Language," have become sufficiently well known in the field of education to be used without further identification. They were so used in this study.

FLES. These initials, standing for "Foreign Language in the Elementary School," were likewise freely used in the profession.

Informants. This term in NDEA literature referred to student native speakers used in the Institutes to conduct conversation sessions, lead table conversations, etc., to add

opportunity and practice to improve the aural-oral skills of the participants.

Language laboratory. This is the electro-mechanical device now provided in most of the high schools in Oklahoma and in many of the junior high schools which enables a simultaneous multiple audio-lingual training in the classroom. The proper and full use of this equipment is considered to result from special teacher training and specialized methods.

Linguistics. This term used in connection with the Institute programs is understood to refer to applied linguistics, not to historical linguistics.

Modern Foreign Languages. This term was defined for the purpose of this study as those languages, other than English, which are used today in communication among identifiable peoples.

Modern Language Association of America. (The). This organization, founded in 1883 in protest against the dominance of ancient languages within the American Philological Association, represents the interests of all language teachers and has as its official publication the well-known journal: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, (PMLA).

Modern method. This term is here defined as that method of teaching foreign languages which stresses the understanding and the speaking skills.

National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations. (The). This organization comprises eleven Associations of modern foreign language teachers, among them The American Association of Teachers of French, The American Association of Teachers of German, the other "AAT'S" (of Spanish and Portuguese, of Italian, of Slavic and East European Languages) and other organizations of similar interests. This organization was founded in 1916. Its official publication is The Modern Language Journal, (MLJ).

#### Procedure

Essential to this study was a reasonably representative list of names of Oklahoma teachers of foreign languages who had secured and taken advantage of the opportunity to attend an NDEA Language Institute. At the time of the beginning of this study no such list was available at the State Department of Education of Oklahoma. A letter to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, D.C., requesting such information remained unanswered. Such a list was not available from any other source. This investigator was obliged to find a way to secure such a list.

A short information form was devised which requested the names and home addresses of those teachers who had attended one or more NDEA Language Institutes, the location and time of such attendance, and the language studied. With the permission of Mrs. Patricia Hammond, State Coordinator of Foreign Languages, her name was added to this request form

with that of this investigator in the expectation that this might bring a better response.<sup>1</sup> These short forms were distributed at the registration desk at the state meeting of the Foreign Language Teachers Section of the fall meeting of the Oklahoma Education Association on October 17, 1968. Conspicuously-labeled boxes were placed at all exit points for the deposit of these filled-in forms, and, in addition, a person was in charge of each of these boxes during the major times of exit. Furthermore, this investigator requested and was granted the permission of the chairman of this meeting to make an announcement regarding these requests for information. After the announcement was made, the chairman kindly corroborated, and added stress to, the need to have such information available.

After the above-mentioned general meeting there were sectional meetings attended by teachers of individual languages, such as French, German, Spanish and Russian. At the request of this investigator a person at each of these meetings again made an announcement concerning the need for this information. The same blank forms were made available and were collected.

At a regional workshop for teachers of foreign languages held on the campus of Central State College in December, 1968, information forms were again announced, distributed and collected. At regional workshops in other

---

<sup>1</sup>Appendix A.

areas of the state, the State Coordinator of Foreign Languages, Mrs. Patricia Hammond, secured some additional names which were later mailed to the writer.

From all these appeals resulted a representative list of names of Oklahoma teachers who had attended NDEA Foreign Language Institutes.

Since the ultimate purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the modern foreign language instruction provided by NDEA Language Institutes as determined by the opinions of Oklahoma foreign language teachers who had attended such Institutes, it was necessary to devise an instrument which might permit these teachers to note their opinions in a manner permitting comparisons and contrasts.

After due study of what Koos, Norton, Good<sup>1</sup> and other research experts in the field of education both advised and warned against in the formation of a questionnaire, it was decided that a questionnaire would be the proper means of eliciting from those teachers who had participated a personal evaluation of the benefits each derived specifically from his attendance at one or more NDEA Language Institutes. This

---

<sup>1</sup>Leonard Vincent Koos, The Questionnaire in Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928); John Kelley Norton, The Questionnaire, Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, Vol. VIII, No. 1, January, 1930 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1930); Carter V. Good, A. S. Barr, Douglas E. Scates, The Methodology of Educational Research (New York: D. Appleton Century Company, Incorporated, 1936), pp. 324-343; Carter V. Good, Essentials of Educational Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), pp. 213-227.

writer, therefore, constructed a questionnaire to be used in this investigation. The major aim of this document was to make possible a comparison between the self-evaluation of the teachers' professional competence prior to the participation in the NDEA Institute(s) and that subsequent to such participation.

At a regional meeting of Oklahoma teachers of foreign languages held in March, 1969, this questionnaire was distributed to those teachers present who had attended Institutes. The questionnaire was discussed and suggestions were solicited for its improvement. From this sample distribution and the discussion, substantial revisions were made. The revised questionnaire is attached hereto as Appendix B, and the covering letter as Appendix C.

The questionnaire, after some introductory items for identification, was divided into three parts and was designed to obtain data concerning: 1) the respondent's teaching experience, 2) his academic training and his own estimate of his language proficiency prior to his attendance at the NDEA Institute(s), and 3) his own estimate of his language proficiency after such attendance and his evaluation of the specific benefits derived from such attendance. In the third section it was deemed essential to list individually each of the areas of the basic curriculum of the Institutes since it was in these areas that the major benefits of the Institute study would be expected.

Related Research

There has been much research done on teacher preparatory programs leading to certification to teach modern foreign languages. The Modern Language Association has sponsored, has financed and has secured grants to finance numerous such studies. The results of these studies were admittedly influential in the final plans for the curriculum of the NDEA Language Institutes. Repeatedly the research indicated that the teaching of modern foreign languages in the United States was not what it should be, that teacher preparatory programs were inadequate and poor and that many teachers of foreign language were not adequately qualified.

Research was also done to evaluate the effectiveness of the NDEA Language Institutes. Some of this research was conducted by teams of investigators at the Institutes themselves. The Modern Language Association was also concerned with such evaluation.

A study conducted by Donald D. Walsh, reported in the article: "NDEA Institutes, Summer 1961: A Survey"<sup>1</sup> had as its purpose the securing of data relating to opinions and evaluations of participants of 1961 Summer Institutes.

To the knowledge of this writer no research had been published dealing significantly with the evaluation of

---

<sup>1</sup> Donald D. Walsh, "NDEA Institutes, Summer 1961: A Survey," The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLVIII (April, 1964), pp. 210-212.

benefits of attendance at Institutes from the opinions of the participating teachers of a particular state. Since states individually take a great interest in and are responsible for the quality of education offered within their domain, they are necessarily concerned with the competence of their teachers.

#### Organization of the Study

The first chapter of the study contains an introduction. This introduction comprises a background of and need for the study, the purposes of the study, the statement of the problem and the limitations thereof, a definition of terms, a brief sketch of the procedure, a general reference to related research and an organizational arrangement of the study. Chapter II is devoted to an extensive review of pertinent literature. Chapter III is devoted to the presentation and analysis of the data. Chapter IV contains a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### A REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

#### Background Influences and Related Research

The national need for the training and re-training of teachers of modern foreign languages that caused Congress to include foreign languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was but too evident. Congress was obviously convinced of that need. It seemed relevant to this study to look back to the situation in the education of teachers of modern foreign languages that effected or failed to obviate this need.

A very extensive study of the training of teachers of modern languages was made in the late twenties under the supervision of Professor Charles M. Purin. The funds for this study did not come from the Federal Government. The Carnegie Corporation of New York was persuaded, in 1924, to promise adequate financial support over a period of approximately three years for an investigation of the training of secondary school teachers of modern language. The American Council on Education, which had sponsored this request, was to appoint a Committee on Direction and Control and other

committees as needed. The "Modern Foreign Language Study" opened offices in October of 1924. The study, structured by regions (eight in number), was national in scope and provided what may be accepted as a dependable overview of the national situation in the varied aspects of the teaching of modern foreign languages. A quotation from the foreword of the report on this study implied the aspects investigated and stated in a highly condensed manner the dismaying findings.

Even a hasty examination of Professor Purin's report will show that the foreign language teachers in this country, as a class, are poorly equipped both in the fundamentals of their subject and in the theory of teaching and the technique provided by practice under supervision. . . . The deficiencies in the training of modern language teachers, resulting in a lack of fundamental skills and capacities, appear in glaring relief to every classroom visitor and are written plainly in the statistics contained in this report. . . . Only a little over thirty percent of these teachers have ever visited a country where the language which they teach is spoken. Equally significant is the fact that one-third of them have not yet had three years of teaching experience and that thirty-six states in the Union still issue 'blanket' certificates authorizing the holders to give instruction in any subject on the secondary school curriculum.<sup>1</sup>

Later appears the following which may be considered the Committee's summarization of an adequate teacher training program:

It would be easy to outline for the teaching candidate in modern languages an ideal course which should carry in the six high school grades a program of solid training in the fundamentals of the foreign language, including abundant oral and aural practice, and follow through a well-ordered sequence of practical and

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles M. Purin, The Training of Teachers of the Modern Foreign Languages (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), p. v.

inspirational collegiate courses in language and literature to the graduate year, accompanying the training in subject matter with an introduction to educational theory and statistical technique and enforcing the entire program after the sophomore year with ever increasing professional consciousness.<sup>1</sup>

The above criteria for teacher training are more general than specific. It should be noted, however, that there is definite mention of the aural-oral skills and less specific mention of teaching methods and techniques.

During the next several years there appears to have been little to disturb the rather apathetic teaching and low status of foreign languages that was clearly spotlighted by the impressive study of Professor Purin and his committees in the "Modern Foreign Language Study." At this time many of the teachers in the older groups referred to in this dissertation were acquiring their training to prepare them for their teaching profession.

Concern was expressed by several of the leaders in the profession. A major champion of professional improvement was Professor Stephen A. Freeman of Middlebury College. He urged the developing of professionalism, the accepting of "our" individual share of responsibility and the demonstration of an "honest spirit of self-examination." His article, "What Constitutes a Well-Trained Modern Language Teacher?" appeared in The Modern Language Journal in January, 1941. In this much-cited article Professor Freeman wrote: "The

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. v-vi.

training of teachers is the dominant factor in any educational system, and especially in a democracy. More cogent and far-reaching than curricula or methods or even than content, the formation of the teacher is the key to the success of an educational program." Professor Freeman bemoaned the lax requirements for a teacher's certificate. Furthermore, he took the position that "The formal academic training of a teacher is only the beginning, the foundation of the edifice. . . . A teacher's preparation is never ended; . . ."

Nevertheless, he suggested specific essentials in the content of the formal academic training. The first essential, according to this authority, was a correct pronunciation; the second, oral facility (fluency and correctness in speaking the foreign language); the third, mastery of the grammar and syntax; the fourth, a mastery of vocabulary; the fifth, a thorough and well-digested knowledge of the foreign civilization. Involved in the last is the foreign history, literature, the modern civilization kept modern and correlated to our own. (For the acquisition of all of these essentials the author made poignant suggestions.) With regard to methods Professor Freeman felt that after pedagogy courses the teacher shapes his own method, in actual practice, according to the circumstances. The last item on his list of ideals for the language teacher he considered the most important, though the most intangible; it concerned not what the teacher had studied but what he is. He must possess

knowledge, energy and vigor, contagious enthusiasm for his subject and his profession as a teacher, limitless patience, human understanding and sympathy. "All this we call personality, but it is not a gift of the gods to some and denied to others: it is won by undaunted tenacity of purpose, and many hard knocks."<sup>1</sup>

The sources of the NDEA goals doubtless owe something to the above ideas of Professor Freeman.

The language profession suffered great shock during World War II when it became clear that insufficient numbers of qualified people were available to meet the linguistic needs of the military. Yet, despite the consequent hasty development of the ASTP and other emergency programs designed to remedy this deficiency--many of which were highly successful--relatively little improvement was made in teacher preparation and language teaching during the next decade. There was, however, a growing awareness of the inadequacy of the long-stagnant academic pattern. Many articles appeared in the professional journals suggesting a variety of reforms. Yet little was changed.

A study of certification requirements for language teachers as of 1942 showed that only three states had standards as high as those Professor Purin recommended for language teachers in the Modern Foreign Language Study which was

---

<sup>1</sup>Stephen A. Freeman, "What Constitutes a Well-Trained Modern Language Teacher?", The Modern Language Journal, XXV, No. 4 (January, 1941), pp. 293-306.

finally issued in 1929, though many states had raised their requirements somewhat during this period. Curtis Vail, who made the above-mentioned study of certification requirements in 1942, wrote: "Unless our secondary schools set higher requirements for their language teachers, it seems extremely unlikely that they will be able to make much headway in the direction of oral-aural facility even if they should wish to adopt the so-called new methods."<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere in the article Professor Vail stated that "The thorn in the side of language instruction on the secondary school level, however, has been the fact that for many years schools have been able to assign all or part of their language programs to teachers who were well aware that they lacked sufficient preparation."<sup>2</sup> Some of the present Oklahoma foreign language teachers, as well as their hundreds of counterparts over the nation, were in high school at that time.

In an address given in December, 1948 and published under the title: "What about the Teacher?" Professor Freeman referred to the Purin report published in 1929 and added: "Although it is now nearly twenty years old, and we have made progress since then, its general conclusions and recommendations are as valid for 1948 as they were then. Professor Purin uncovered conditions which shocked us all, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Curtis C. D. Vail, "State Requirements for Language Teachers," The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XXIX (October, 1945), pp. 509-517.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

gave the impetus to a number of progressive reforms; yet . . . we still run the risk of lagging behind." Freeman criticized the then current conditions, remarking that for eight years (since 1940) the quality of the teaching staff had slipped badly. He cited major causes for this decline as the shortage of teachers resulting from their entering into the armed services and also the great fluctuations in the enrollments in the various subjects. The war situation had, in effect, voided the requirements. Later in the same article he stated: "The general teacher-recruiting and training situation has been desperate for several years, and most of our universities and national associations (except the language associations) are awake to the need."<sup>1</sup> This situation was the cause of the inclusion of foreign languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The general deficiency in the oral-aural skills had been much publicized since the success stories of the ASTP. By the "Army method" (which was not invented by the Army nor was it a new method) students had learned to speak a foreign language with demonstrable skill in only nine months! The cost and the absolute requirements<sup>2</sup> basic to the "Army

---

<sup>1</sup>Stephen A. Freeman, "What About the Teacher?", The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XXXIII (April, 1949), pp. 255-268.

<sup>2</sup>William Riley Parker, The National Interest and Foreign Languages (3rd ed.; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 91: "These absolute requirements included: (1) ample time--hour for hour the Army's 9 months were equivalent to 6 years of high school

Method" were not so well publicized. The fact that competence in the oral-aural skills was highly desirable, indeed essential, was now unquestionably accepted and these skills were specifically included in all projected goals in the training of teachers of foreign languages.

Another progressive step was initiated in Connecticut. This state, followed quickly by New York, had pioneered in supplementing the quantitative requirement for a teaching certificate with an examination to test the candidate's real fitness to teach a language. Freeman commented: "Their qualifying examinations, generally well-made and adapted to the purpose, have not been graded with undue severity, but the heavy record of failures, even among students who had good grades in college, is a sad commentary on the ineptness of the college training program. I heartily wish that other states would adopt similar qualifying examinations." There was here no suggestion that a qualifying examination be used in lieu of specific course credit; that was not its intent. Later in the same article Freeman said: ". . . neither a college degree nor a specified number of semester hours are any guarantee of adequate training for teaching, . . ." <sup>1</sup>

---

language study; (2) very small classes; (3) superlatively trained teachers--frequently two instructors per class, one a native speaker; (4) up-to-date equipment; (5) students with a high IQ and with strong motivation for language study; and, finally, (6) concentration on language study to the exclusion of everything else. . . ."

<sup>1</sup>Freeman, "What About the Teacher?", pp. 255-268.

(There will be later mention of similar qualifying examinations.) The NDEA Institutes took cognizance of this situation when they structured their programs a decade later.

Language instruction declined during the late forties and continued to do so until 1953. Nevertheless, during this time, that is, particularly during the war and post-war years, a change in opinion was slowly developing. Prominent people expressed concern and deplored the inability of Americans to manage any language but their own.

Nicholas Murray Butler expressed strong convictions in favor of serious language study.

The steady decline in the study of foreign languages in American secondary schools and colleges has been a matter of deep concern to everyone interested in liberal education. . . . In the present world the ability to speak and read with ease at least one foreign language is more than ever necessary if the mind and imagination of American youth are to be set free for expansion beyond the narrow horizon of vocational interests and national prejudice.<sup>1</sup>

Some years later Earl J. McGrath, then United States Commissioner of Education, spoke in favor of foreign languages:

For some years I unwisely took the position that a foreign language did not constitute an indispensable element in a general education program. This position, I am happy to say, I have reversed. I have now seen the light and I consider foreign languages a very important element in general education. . . . Only through the ability to use another language even modestly can one become conscious of the full meaning of being a member of another nationality or cultural group. . . . It is

---

<sup>1</sup>Nicholas Murray Butler, "Study of Foreign Languages," The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XXIX, No. 4 (April, 1945), pp. 257-260.

in our national interest to give as many citizens as possible the opportunity to gain these cultural insights.<sup>1</sup>

This convinced and convincing statement was justifiably widely quoted.

Another influence toward the changing opinion signaled above was the success of the Specialists Training Programs. These had proved that the oft-heard claim that American youth was not gifted in the field of language learning, not language-prone, was indeed unfounded.

Probably the final stimulus that started the language movement on its upward swing was the first of two grants from the Rockefeller Foundation to the Modern Language Association. The grants were for the purpose of studying the position and future of modern foreign languages in American schools and colleges, their importance to the national interest, and the part they should play in American life. This was the beginning of the MLA Foreign Language Program. The year was 1952.

The MLA Foreign Language Program was founded by William Riley Parker, Distinguished Service Professor of English at Indiana University. The Program was later headed by Kenneth W. Mildenberger. Both of these men--neither of whom had ever taught a foreign language--were later to head the NDEA Language Development Program. The achievements of

---

<sup>1</sup>Quoted by William Riley Parker, The National Interest and Foreign Languages, 3rd ed., Department of State Publication No. 7324 (Washington, D.C., 1962), p. 93.

the MLA Foreign Language Program quite definitely affected the NDEA Language Development Program.

The former Commissioner of Education, Lawrence G. Derthick, wrote: "The Modern Language Association had a good deal to do--sometimes indirectly, sometimes directly--with the introduction of the Language Title into the new Act and with its favorable reception by Congress."<sup>1</sup>

"It is no exaggeration to say that without the Modern Language Association there may never have been an NDEA." That assertion was made in December, 1959 by Dr. John R. Ludington of the U.S. Office of Education.

The influence of the MLA Foreign Language Program was admittedly vast and effective. Many, probably all, areas of language development were revived and improved. Numbers of persons in the profession contributed their ideas and points of view via conferences, discussions, meetings, articles, addresses, questionnaires, etc. The MLA Foreign Language Program was the center of awakened activity in the language teaching profession.

In 1954 the first edition of Dr. Parker's "The National Interest and Foreign Languages" appeared; the second edition in January, 1957. This "Work Paper" is mentioned here because it had a large part in influencing public

---

<sup>1</sup>Lawrence G. Derthick, "The Purpose and Legislative History of the Foreign Language Titles in the NDEA, 1958." Publications of the Modern Foreign Language Association, LXXIV (May, 1959), pp. 48-51.

opinion and public interest in the study of foreign languages and, consequently, contributed to the forces that succeeded in placing foreign languages in the scope of the NDEA of 1958. In the "Acknowledgments" of the third edition, released in March, 1962, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO expressed appreciation to Dr. Parker and to the Modern Language Association for preparing materials of the greatest significance to the future success of the American people in communicating effectively with other peoples of the world and in making progress toward that important goal of UNESCO, the "moral and intellectual solidarity of mankind."<sup>1</sup>

Pertinent to the background of the Language Development Program of Title VI of the NDEA of 1958 is much of the research sponsored by the MLA Foreign Language Program. Especially pertinent was the work of the Steering Committee of the Foreign Language Program which resulted in "Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages."<sup>2</sup> Here are stated what the Committee considered to be minimal, good and superior qualifications of a secondary school teacher of modern foreign language. Seven areas of

---

<sup>1</sup>William Riley Parker, The National Interest and Foreign Languages, U.S. Department of State Publication 7324 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962).

<sup>2</sup>Modern Language Association, "Qualifications for Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages" as prepared by the Steering Committee of the Foreign Language Program of the MLA. Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXX, No. 4, Part 2 (September, 1955), pp. 46-50.

competence were designated, under each of which were concise statements defining what, in the opinion of the Steering Committee, should be expected in the divisions of minimal, good and superior, and a section called "Test" which suggested means of testing the particular basic skill involved. This statement prepared by the Steering Committee identified above was subsequently endorsed for publication by the MLA Executive Council and by a number of executive boards and councils of major organizations concerned with language teaching.

Though these qualifications underwent later revisions as they were admittedly not perfect, they nevertheless represented a sort of milestone. Here the profession found a clear statement of the absolute essentials in teacher qualification and, of not lesser importance, the expressed expectation that these qualifications were subject to testing. College or university credit hours were not mentioned.

This document was considered of sufficient importance in this study to warrant including it in its entirety as Appendix D.

These same Qualifications for Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages, but with the "Test" paragraphs omitted, are quoted as Appendix B in the Manual for Participating Institutions which Washington sent to prospective Institute directors. The Manual suggested that: ". . . the prospective director will find it advisable to limit participation to

individuals classified as superior, good, minimal, etc., as defined in appendix B."<sup>1</sup> The code classifications are referred to in a later footnote:

Since 1961 the domestic summer institutes for secondary school teachers have, in the interest of greater homogeneity and, therefore, more efficient programing, been using code numbers (1 to 4) to indicate the audio-lingual proficiency level of the prospective participants for whom the program is designed.<sup>2</sup>

The codes for the Modern Foreign Language Institutes were clearly expressed and well publicized in the literature that was sent to teachers of schools requesting information about the Institutes. Prospective participants were to give these codes serious consideration and were to send applications only to those Institutes whose instruction was designed for that code level of proficiency which the applicants judged to be theirs. As stated above, the classifications were based on audio-lingual proficiency only.

The codes were the following:

CODE (1) indicates that participants should have (a) the ability to follow closely and with ease all types of standard speech, such as rapid or group conversation, plays, and movies; and (b) the ability to approximate native speech in vocabulary, intonation, and pronunciation (e.g. the ability to exchange ideas and to be at ease in social situations).

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. National Defense Language Institute Program, NDEA, Title VI, A Manual for Participating Institutions, Washington, D.C., 1964, p. 9 (Publication OE-27006-64).

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

- CODE (2) indicates that the participants should have (a) the ability to understand conversation of average tempo, lectures, and news broadcasts; and (b) the ability to talk with a native without making glaring mistakes, and with a command of vocabulary and syntax sufficient to express his thoughts in sustained conversation.
- CODE (3) indicates that the participant should have (a) the ability to get the sense of what an educated native says when he is enunciating carefully and speaking simply on a general subject; and (b) the ability to talk on prepared topics (e.g., for classroom situations) without obvious faltering, and to use the common expressions needed for getting around in the foreign country, speaking with a pronunciation readily understandable by a native.
- CODE (4) indicates that the institute is designed especially for teachers whose audio-lingual proficiency falls below the requirements set forth in (3), and whose primary need is intensive training in understanding and speaking the language.<sup>1</sup>

However, even after the codes were established, a major problem of the Institutes was that of homogeneity, that is, of having in any one Institute only participants of a similar level of audio-lingual proficiency. Experience with this grave problem prompted Walsh to write: "But since few teachers have the divine gift to hear themselves as others hear them, this self-evaluation is only mildly effective."<sup>2</sup> He urged the use of interviews in the foreign language--if necessary by telephone--to aid the selective

---

<sup>1</sup>"NDEA Institutes for Advanced Study in Modern Foreign Languages 1967-69," The Modern Language Journal, LI (January, 1967), p. 43.

<sup>2</sup>Donald D. Walsh, "The National Defense Language Institutes: A Critical Report," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXX, No. 2 (May, 1965), p. 34.

process. Eventually Institutes did resort to interviews with applicants when practicable; at times authenticated tape recordings of a conversation or a recitation were submitted. Despite all precautions wide variations in language skills continued to be encountered in the Institutes.

The language-related research projects sponsored by the NDEA of 1958 were legion. Title VII sponsored research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes; research and experimentation in the improvement of electronic and other mechanical aids and the production of new aids; and it provided for the dissemination of information on new media. These projects included many that affected language teaching. Other Titles affected other facets of language teaching improvement through fellowships, loans to students, monies to schools for equipment, etc.

The Title most directly and most strongly affecting language teaching was, of course, Title VI, the Language Development Program. Under this Title, Part A--Centers and Research and Studies--comprised three sections: Section 601, Language and Area Centers; Section 602, Research and Studies; and Section 603, Appropriations authorized. Part B--Language Institutes--had but one section, Section 611, Authorization.

Section 602 of Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 read as follows:

The Commissioner is authorized, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields.

The projects were grouped in four categories: 1) Surveys and studies, 2) Methods of instruction, 3) Specialized materials for the commonly taught languages, 4) Specialized materials for the "neglected" languages.<sup>1</sup>

Contracts were negotiated with colleges and universities, with private individuals, with foundations and similar non-profit organizations, with Government agencies and with public school systems. During the nine fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, the Office of Education under this program awarded 494 contracts to organizations and individuals. All had a bearing on Language Development. Specialized materials and achievement tests covering the basic skills in each of the five commonly taught languages for grades 7 through 12 were developed; research on improved methods of instruction was particularly stressed; national

---

<sup>1</sup>Title VI--National Defense Education Act of 1958 Research and Studies, Report of the First Two Years, OE-12011, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. i.

foreign language enrollment statistics were gathered. Many of these research projects and the many aids resulting therefrom have been inexpressibly helpful in advancing the teaching of modern foreign languages.

The participants in the NDEA Institutes were particularly affected by the quantity of research on teaching methods and on teacher preparation as the improvement of methods and preparation was a prime objective of the Institute program.

Much research on linguistics was inspired by the needs of the participants of the Institutes. Among this research was "Preparation of a Manual and Anthology of Applied Linguistics for Use in the NDEA Institutes and Other Foreign Language Teacher-Training Programs." The "Principal Investigator" for this contract (FY60-8607) was Dr. Simon Belasco, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, the "Contractor" was Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania. (The cost was \$15,880.) Distribution of this manual was limited to trial users at the 1960 NDEA Institutes.<sup>1</sup>

Also closely related to the NDEA Institutes as well as to the entire language teaching profession was another project: "Tests to Measure Qualifications of Teachers of

---

<sup>1</sup>Language Development Program, Title VI, National Defense Education Act of 1958, RESEARCH AND STUDIES, Report on the first two years, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, OE-12011 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 15 No. 51.

Modern Foreign Language (French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish). The Principal Investigator was Dr. Wilmarth Starr and the Contractor was the Modern Language Association of America. In the description of the amended contract appeared the following:

More than 100 language teachers are helping to prepare the tests, utilizing the technical facilities of the Education Testing Service (Princeton, N.J.). NDEA summer language institutes in 1959 and 1960 have served as trial grounds for evaluation and norming. When completed the tests will provide effective measurements for placing enrollees and checking achievement at future institutes. They will also be available for use by institutions engaged in training teachers of modern foreign languages.<sup>1</sup>

More should be said about this last research project because it is of prime importance to this study. This project resulted in the production of a battery of proficiency tests for teachers and advanced students. These tests--which take about four hours to complete--cover seven areas of competence--as did the "Qualifications for Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages" which served as a sort of point of departure, "a guide and spectrum," in the study that produced the "MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students." The names of the seven competencies were slightly modified: Listening Comprehension, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Applied Linguistics, Culture and civilization,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 12-13, No. 42.

and Professional Preparation.<sup>1</sup> In the summer and fall of 1960 preliminary forms of the tests were administered to participants in NDEA Institutes and to selected control groups. The scoring of over 26,000 tests provided data for revision purposes. The final forms were ready for administration in the summer of 1961 and their administration became a regular part of the Institute program. The tests were considered excellent and valuable.

In 1965 John S. Diekhoff wrote: "As a definition of the competence expected of teachers and as a means of measuring it, they [the Proficiency Tests] may have far-reaching consequences."<sup>2</sup> Several states have used these to certify teachers whose credentials in some respects did not meet the prescribed requirements but who had acquired the necessary knowledge outside of the formal college classroom. Donald W. Walsh would like to see the use of these tests extended to all regular candidates for teaching.<sup>3</sup>

James Bryant Conant, in The Education of American Teachers, recommended "enthusiastically to all colleges and

---

<sup>1</sup>Wilmarth H. Starr, "MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVII, No. 4, Part 2 (September, 1962), pp. 31-43.

<sup>2</sup>John S. Diekhoff, NDEA and Modern Foreign Languages (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1965), p. 44.

<sup>3</sup>Donald D. Walsh, "The Foreign Language Program in 1963," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXIX (May, 1964), p. 25.

universities training foreign language teachers that they use this proficiency test to determine who is to be certified as a teacher. The counting of semester hours should be scrapped."<sup>1</sup>

It is indeed remarkable and rare to find tests that can actually assess the proficiency in the major basic skills in the area of specialization. It is hoped that these seven-area tests or the later and future forms thereof--since review and modification are necessary steps in progress--will be used nationwide as one basis for teacher certification.

The Language Institutes, Part B of Title VI, the Language Development Program of the NDEA of 1958 (in a later revised Act to be placed under Title XI) are the direct concern of this study. The Institutes consisted of both summer and academic-year institutes and had as their purpose the training or re-training of the foreign language teachers in elementary and in secondary schools. These were the teachers who had been tabulated in all those shocking research statistics; those same teachers who had been the victims of, and consequently the perpetrators of, the poor teaching that had brought on an obvious imbalance in the American educational system, an imbalance so great that it was marked as a national emergency, and therefore persuaded the legislators

---

<sup>1</sup>James Bryant Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), p. 182.

to include languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The basic purpose of the NDEA Modern Foreign Language Institutes was to present "an intensive program designed to promote marked advancement both in foreign language proficiency and in the mastery of new teaching methods and instructional materials."<sup>1</sup> The manual for participating institutions specified that the curriculum of an institute

should comprise work which will enable the institute participant to make measurable improvement in listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing, language analysis, knowledge of the culture reflected by the target language, and professional preparation.

Ample consideration should be given to classroom implications of applied linguistic principles, to discussions and readings which will give participants an enlightened understanding of the foreign people and their culture, and to such professional training as will enable them to evaluate and use effectively new methods and techniques of language teaching. Throughout the institute the particular problems of teaching modern foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools should be kept in mind, and the work should be directed toward meeting those problems rather than placed on a theoretical plane.<sup>2</sup>

More specifically the objectives of one Institute were stated as follows:

1. To increase the participants' audio-lingual proficiency in the foreign language.
2. To give the participants a more thorough knowledge and a deeper appreciation of the general culture of the country whose language they are studying.
3. To show the participants how linguistics can have practical value in teaching.

---

<sup>1</sup>National Defense Language Institute Program, A Manual for Participating Institutions, NDEA, Title VI (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

4. To show the value of the language laboratory and other audio-visual equipment in language instruction and to give practical demonstrations of their uses.
5. To acquaint the participants with the new teaching methods and materials.
6. To arrange for the participants to observe a demonstration class of high school pupils taught daily through the audio-lingual approach (and) the materials now known as A-LM.
7. To give the participants in a reading and writing clinic class a chance to develop their reading and writing ability.
8. To prove clearly to the participants the need for more masterful teaching in secondary schools in order to help them awaken in their students a greater desire to learn languages more thoroughly.

A summer institute is no vacation. The proposal from which this class schedule and statement of objectives are taken observes that 'the formal class schedule has accounted for about 30 hours per week. This does not include mealtime conversation, films, lectures, singing sessions, extra time spent in the lab, week-end or recreational activity.'<sup>1</sup>

The participants in Institutes were generally required to meet heavy class schedules and engage in additional programmed activities aimed at carrying out the objectives of the NDEA Language Institutes.

The questionnaire used in this study was designed to determine to what degree, in the opinion of the participant himself, these goals were achieved.

Certainly a proper use of the fine teaching materials developed and an insistence upon standards of competence in foreign language teachers should most definitely raise the quality of language teaching far above the dismal level that

---

<sup>1</sup>John S. Diekhoff, NDEA and Modern Foreign Languages (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1965), p. 85.

existed at the time foreign language was included in a national defense emergency act. And indeed, there has been notable advancement in recent years.

This great improvement was begun by deep concern and devoted effort on the part of leaders in the profession; it was aided by strong group effort put forth under the auspices of the professional organizations grouped under the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations and most especially by the concerted efforts of the Modern Language Association of America. Yet the undeniable revealer of the shocking state of language teaching, the donor of the "sine qua non" money, the great catalyst in this improvement was the NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958.

## CHAPTER III

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### The Respondents to the Questionnaire

The three parts of the questionnaire used in this study were preceded by an introductory section requesting the name, home address, school where now teaching, sex and age (this last in brackets to be check-marked only). The purpose of requesting the age was to allow the questionnaire to show possible differences in the teacher preparation attributable to chronological age.

To facilitate subsequent reference the age categories were assigned "labels" which were used throughout the study. Group I included those respondents who checked the space indicating their present age to be in the range of 20-30; Group II, those 30-40 years of age; Group III, 40-50 years of age and Group IV those "Over 50."

Table I shows the distribution of the respondents in these age brackets and the percentage of the total respondents represented in each of these age categories.

TABLE I  
SEX AND AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

AGE CATEGORY	Male	Female	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
GROUP I	2	6	8	10.8
GROUP II	5	9	14	18.9
GROUP III	3	14	17	22.9
GROUP IV	<u>3</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>47.3</u>
Total	13	61	74	100.

It should be mentioned here that the age of the teacher at the time of attendance at the Institute(s) would be from zero to nine years less than the age at the "present time." (The questionnaires were returned in April or May, 1969.) No respondent attended an Institute prior to 1960 nor later than the summer of 1968.

The National Defense Language Institute Program did not establish an age limit to be considered in the selection of applicants. In a manual entitled: "General Information and Instructions for Directors of NDEA--Title VI--Part B" the section on "Participants" made the following provision:

1. Criteria for admission. Each institute will establish its own criteria for admission within the letter and spirit of the National Defense Education Act. . . .

Later in the same manual this further instruction appeared:

In selecting individuals for attendance at the Institute and in otherwise conducting the institute, the contractor

will not discriminate on account of the sex, race, creed, color, or national origin of an applicant or enrollee.<sup>1</sup>

No mention was made of age specifically. However, in considering applications it was suggested that the basic point to consider was the need that the applicant had for the institute training and the extent to which it was felt that such training would be put to good advantage in the classroom. The recentness of the applicant's training was also to be considered, and it was pointed out that one of the purposes of the program was to update the language preparation of older teachers and provide them with intensive training in the language and in the teaching methods. Yet the number of years of teaching remaining to the applicant before retirement was another point to be considered and in this connection there appeared the following: "No specific age limits have been set, but this [the number of years of teaching remaining] should also be a factor to consider."<sup>2</sup>

It would appear, then, that the large percentage of participants in the "Over 50" group was in accord with the "letter and spirit"<sup>3</sup> of the Act.

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, National Defense Language Institute Program Manual, Part I (4th edition), "General Information and Instructions for Directors of NDEA--Title VI--Part B, December 1963" (Washington, D.C.: Language Institute Section, Language Development Branch, U.S. Office of Education), pp. 5-6.

<sup>2</sup>Directive from Dr. Jim Artman, Director of NDEA Foreign Language Institute at the University of Oklahoma, to the Evaluation Committee, January 20, 1965.

<sup>3</sup>U.S. Dept. of H.E.W., op. cit., p. 5.

On a national basis the number of participants in French Institutes and in Spanish Institutes were roughly the same. It was of interest to this study to note that this was not the case in Oklahoma. Of the seventy-four respondents, forty-four had attended Spanish Institutes, (twelve of these had attended two Institutes,) while only twenty-five had attended French Institutes (five of these had attended two Institutes). Of the remaining number, four had attended German Institutes, (two of them twice,) and two had attended Russian Institutes. (The discrepancy in numbers resulted from the fact that one respondent attended a Spanish Institute and also a French Institute.) Among these respondents there were three native speakers of Spanish and three native speakers of German. There were no native speakers of French or of Russian.

The seventy-four respondents in this study had attended Institutes in twenty states. As might well be expected Institutes in Oklahoma had enrolled by far the greatest number of these: thirty-eight. Kansas was second with eleven.

Thirteen respondents had attended Institutes outside of the United States. These were second-level Institutes. Five respondents participated in Institutes in France, four attended Institutes in Mexico, two traveled to Germany to participate in Institutes and two attended Institutes in Puerto Rico.

Teaching Experience

The first section of the questionnaire--that dealing with teaching experience--requested the respondent to report separately the total number of years of teaching experience and the total number of years the respondent had taught a foreign language. Though the study was interested in the foreign language experience primarily, the question asking the total experience was added partly to clarify and to minimize error but also because it was considered relevant.

Table II indicates the average of the total years of teaching experience of each of the age groups set up in the questionnaire:

TABLE II  
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	Total years of teaching	Average number of years
GROUP I	8	40	5.05
GROUP II	14	123	8.78
GROUP III	16	190	11.87
GROUP IV	<u>32</u>	<u>767</u>	<u>23.96</u>
Total	70	1120	16.

Table III tabulates the average years of experience which these same respondents had in teaching foreign language. The use of age-group categories enabled comparisons with regard to this criterion.

TABLE III

## YEARS RESPONDENTS TAUGHT FOREIGN LANGUAGE

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	Total years taught FL	Average years taught FL
GROUP I	8	35.5	4.43
GROUP II	14	86.	6.14
GROUP III	16	139.	8.68
GROUP IV	<u>32</u>	<u>475.</u>	<u>14.84</u>
Total	70	735.5	10.5

The statistics on teaching experience would not be complete without the tabulation of the difference between the average total years of teaching and the average total years of teaching foreign language. The averages shown in Tables II and III were used to figure this difference which is given in Column C of Table IV.

TABLE IV

## YEARS TAUGHT OTHER THAN FOREIGN LANGUAGE

CATEGORY	Average years experience <u>Column A</u>	Average years taught FL <u>Column B</u>	Difference (A minus B) <u>Column C</u>
GROUP I	5.06	4.43	.63
GROUP II	8.78	6.14	2.64
GROUP III	11.87	8.68	3.19
GROUP IV	23.96	14.84	9.12
ALL RESPONDENTS	16.	10.5	5.5

The last column of Table IV, Column C, shows a notable difference between the number of years of teaching foreign language and the total number of years of teaching. This difference is particularly great in the category of Group IV, the teachers "Over 50." It is probable that the explanation of these differences would have supported the research which some years ago exposed the regrettable situation with regard to laxness in teaching certification requirements, or that which revealed the great fluctuation in enrollments that pressed numbers of teachers into the teaching of subjects which they were not prepared to teach, and also, no doubt, that which noted in recent years the revived interest in foreign language and the resulting shortage of teachers in that field.

#### Academic Training

In the second section of the questionnaire--that concerning the academic training of the respondents--the answers indicated that all respondents had at least a bachelor's degree at the time they participated in their first NDEA Foreign Language Institute. Several of them already had a master's degree. Others had completed a master's degree since their first participation in an NDEA Institute. (Generally, Institutes gave graduate credit to those participants who enrolled for credit. It is probable that such credit was used toward the graduate degree in many instances.) The respondents were asked to write-in their undergraduate major and minor. These

majors and minors are tabulated below in Table V with reference to the field of foreign languages; any other field of study is listed as "Other."

TABLE V  
UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS AND MINORS

CATEGORY	FL Majors and FL Minors	FL Majors and Non-FL Minors	Non-FL Majors and FL Minors	Other
GROUP I	1	4	2	1
GROUP II	3	1	4	6
GROUP III	3	5	6	3
GROUP IV	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	16	19	25	14

The figures in Table V above indicate that during the undergraduate period the younger foreign language teachers, that is Group I, had elected foreign language as a field of major concentration more often, relatively, than had any of the other three Groups. This difference may well be attributed to the fact that the respondents of Group I graduated at a time when there was a shortage of foreign language teachers. It was interesting to note also that Group II had the smallest proportion of foreign language majors and that in Groups III and IV the total FL majors and the total non-FL majors was almost the same. The greatest number of participants of each Group having neither a foreign language major nor minor was that of Group II where six persons out of a

total of fourteen indicated no special interest in foreign languages during their undergraduate study. In both Group III and Group IV the single largest number fell in the classification of Non-FL (Foreign Language) Majors but FL Minors.

Table VI provides information regarding the master's degree earned by those in the study. No attempt was made to differentiate between the several kinds of master's degrees, just as none was made to identify the different categories of bachelor's degrees. Furthermore, no attempt whatever was made to discover subjects of study selected for the minor. Only a very few of the respondents listed a minor subject. It is well known that there is considerable variation in college and university policies concerning a minor topic of study as a part of the requirements for a master's degree. Some school policies require no minor field; they expect all of the graduate work for the master's to be in the field of major study. None of the respondents indicated that they had completed requirements for a doctor's degree.

It is relevant to note again here that in the instances of the acquisition of the master's degree after attendance at the NDEA Modern Foreign Language Institute the graduate credit hours resulting from the participant's work at the Institute (whenever he had selected to work for

graduate credit) very probably constituted a part of the degree's total requirements.

TABLE VI  
MASTER'S DEGREES REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

CATEGORY	Master's before Institute	Master's after Institute	Total Master's Degrees	Master's FL majors	Master's Non-FL majors
GROUP I	0	1	1	1	0
GROUP II	6	2	8	2	6
GROUP III	3	2	5	0	5
GROUP IV	<u>16</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	25	6	31	11	20

The next item of importance requested in the questionnaire was that inquiring into the total credit hours in foreign language held by the respondent. In compiling Table VII the writer considered only the total number of hours in the language of major interest, that is, the target language of the Institute. In one instance a respondent in Group II attended Institutes in two different languages; in that case both were separately included. It appeared that this total number of credit hours was a fair indication of the interest of the respondent.

In Table VII the average total semester hours of each Group was figured on the assumption that the average number was reasonably representative of the academic preparation of the Group of which it is an average.

TABLE VII

## AVERAGE CREDIT HOURS IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	Total credit hours	Average credit hours
GROUP I	7	266	38.0
GROUP II	15	537	35.8
GROUP III	17	695	40.8
GROUP IV	<u>35</u>	<u>1502</u>	<u>42.9</u>
Total	74	3000	40.5

It was interesting to note that the averages in Table VII did not show a consistent or steady increase in number from Groups I to IV, as might have been expected. The average number of credit hours of Group II was smaller than that of Group I--a reverse position.

Since there has been much discussion and even disagreement on the matter of the value of a methods course in the teaching of foreign language, it was decided to collect information on this matter. The question was therefore asked: "Did you have a course in methods of teaching foreign language?" Table VIII provides the information received on this important question.

Although in Groups I and III more than half of the respondents did have a course in methods of teaching foreign language the percentage was considerably smaller than was that of Groups II and IV.

TABLE VIII

## PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAD A METHODS COURSE

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	"Yes" Answers	"No" Answers	Percentage of "Yes" Answers
GROUP I	8	5	3	62.5
GROUP II	14	12	2	82.8
GROUP III	15	9	6	60.0
GROUP IV	<u>34</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>79.4</u>
Total	71	53	18	74.6

It should be noted that approximately three-fourths of the entire number did have a course in methods. Of course all of the respondents received intensive training in methods of teaching foreign language at the Institutes.

The question relating to travel in a country where the target language is the native language was inserted in the section on academic training because it seemed better-placed next to the question regarding study in a country of the target language than elsewhere. This position was further substantiated by the fact that a few--very few--colleges and universities do give credit for such travel.

In Table IX there is shown a tabulation of the number and the percentage of each group who traveled in a country of the target language. No attempt was made to indicate the length of time spent in such travel. The range indicated was from days to years. Some respondents

answered only that they had traveled in a country of the target language but gave no answer to the question asking how long they were there. "Travel" can differ so much that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to propose any general estimate of its value. Insofar as proficiency in a language is concerned the results of "travel" might range from no effect whatsoever to much improved skill in the use of the language.

TABLE IX  
TRAVEL IN A "TARGET" COUNTRY

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	Number who had traveled	Number who had not traveled	Percentage who had traveled
GROUP I	8	5	3	62.5
GROUP II	14	11	3	78.5
GROUP III	17	11	6	64.7
GROUP IV	<u>35</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>80.0</u>
Total	74	55	19	74.3

In a 1964 report on the preparation of modern foreign language teachers in public schools of thirty-four representative states Walsh indicated that fifty per cent of those teachers who responded had had foreign travel. In that same survey the Oklahoma average was 39.2 per cent.<sup>1</sup> The seventy-four respondents in this study indicated a considerably

<sup>1</sup>Donald D. Walsh, "The Preparation of Modern-Foreign-Language Teachers," The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (October, 1964), pp. 352-6.

higher average. This marked difference may be partly attributable to the fact that thirteen of the respondents had participated in Institutes held in foreign countries.

The travel reported in Table IX is closely related to the study charted in Table X.

TABLE X  
STUDY IN A "TARGET" COUNTRY

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	Number who had studied	Number who had not studied	Percentage who had studied
GROUP I	8	4	4	50.
GROUP II	14	6	8	42.8
GROUP III	17	6	11	35.2
GROUP IV	<u>35</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>57.1</u>
Total	74	36	38	48.6

A respondent who has studied in a country where his target language is native may well suppose that such stay in the foreign country could also be considered travel. No advantage was seen in attempting to control this dual response for the same experience. It was judged that study in the area, even though it occurred in the one location, very likely contributed enough in a better understanding of the people and their customs to more than balance the advantages of wider travel experience. Perhaps the student did have a less extensive view of the country, its

geography, its cities, architecture, museums, etc., than an interested traveler might have. However, the location selected for the study was quite probably in a representative or typical town or city and some travel in the vicinity was doubtless encouraged and perhaps arranged to add to the instruction as well as the entertainment of the students.

#### Evaluation of Academic Training

Of particular importance in this study was the information derived from the answers to the questions dealing with the respondent's evaluation of his academic training pertaining to foreign language.

The respondent was asked whether with regard to the preparation for teaching foreign language he considered the quality of his college or university training to have been superior, good, adequate or below average. Since colleges or universities attended were never named or identified in any way in the questionnaire, the respondents could answer freely. In Table XI these answers are tabulated. It was interesting to note that the two younger Groups seemed to hold a rather lower opinion of their colleges than the two older Groups did. No attempt was made to ascertain any reasons for these opinions. However, a later table, Table XIV, concerning items possibly contributing to deficiencies in specific skills, may suggest some reasons.

TABLE XI

## QUALITY OF COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY LANGUAGE TRAINING

CATEGORY	Superior	Good	Average	Below Average
GROUP I	0	3	4	1
GROUP II	2	4	6	2
GROUP III	4	5	2	4
GROUP IV	<u>7</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	13	30	14	14

As more specific information was essential, the respondents were asked which skills their university training had stressed: the traditional, that is, the reading and writing skills, or the modern, that is, the understanding and the speaking skills. A related question asked which of the four skills the respondent considered unsatisfactorily developed in the training he had received. The assumption was that it was entirely possible for college or university training to have stressed the traditional or the modern training and yet not have been unsatisfactory in the non-stressed skills. This last did appear to have been the case for a few respondents.

Table XII tabulates the answers to the question: "Do you consider your university training in foreign languages to have stressed most: 1) Reading and writing skills \_\_\_\_, 2) Understanding and speaking skills \_\_\_\_?"

TABLE XII

## SKILLS MOST STRESSED IN UNIVERSITY TRAINING

CATEGORY	Traditional Stress	Modern Stress	Traditional <u>and</u> Modern	Percentage of Traditional
GROUP I	8			100.
GROUP II	12	1		92.3
GROUP III	14	1	2	82.3
GROUP IV	31	2	2	88.5

In Table XII above, the difference shown between the Groups is of particular interest. Considering the really great change reported in language teaching and its goals in recent years and the constant emphasis on the importance of developing the oral-aural skills, it seems rather surprising that Group I, consisting of teachers between twenty and thirty years of age, should all check that their universities stressed the reading and writing skills. The 100% of Group I is notably higher than the 88.5% of the Group IV teachers who might well be expected to check the traditional stress one hundred per cent of the time.

Closely linked with the great dominance of the traditional method of language teaching indicated in Table XII was the dissatisfaction which the respondents expressed with regard to the training they received in each of the four skills. This dissatisfaction is quite apparent from an examination of Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

## DISSATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION IN INDIVIDUAL SKILLS

CATEGORY	Reading Skill	Writing Skill	Understanding Skill	Speaking Skill
GROUP I		2	4	5
GROUP II	2	4	6	10
GROUP III			8	14
GROUP IV	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>23</u>
Total	4	8	32	52

More than half of the total ninety-six indicated areas of dissatisfaction lay in the speaking skills and a third were in the skill of understanding the spoken language. Very few were dissatisfied with their academic training in the writing skill and almost none with that in the reading skill.

Of further interest is the fact that although all of the respondents of Group I had indicated that their academic training had stressed the reading and writing skills, only about half of them indicated dissatisfaction with their training in the understanding and the speaking skills.

Following the question regarding areas of dissatisfaction was one giving the respondents an opportunity to check possible reasons affecting or effecting the dissatisfaction(s) indicated. In addition to suggested reasons

to be checked, space was provided to allow the respondent to write-in reasons of his own. Very few respondents wrote-in any individual reasons. One stated that in her opinion too much literature was taught and that not enough conversation and advanced grammar training was provided. Another respondent felt the programs attempted too much in too little time. A few made comments to the effect that their language study had been long ago, before the time of language laboratories and the modern stress on listening comprehension and speaking. Table XIV shows checks on the reasons listed.

TABLE XIV  
ITEMS CONTRIBUTING TO DEFICIENCIES IN PREPARATION

ITEMS LISTED	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Total
Lack of laboratory facilities	3	7	9	17	36
Insufficient foreign language courses	3	2	5	2	12
Unbalanced course selection	4	2	5	2	13
Teaching staff not qualified	2	0	1	4	7
Excessively . . . traditional teaching method	6	10	12	22	50
Excessively . . . modern teaching method	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total (by Groups)	17	22	32	48	(120)

Apparently the major sources of dissatisfaction were "Excessively or exclusively traditional teaching method" and "Lack of laboratory facilities."

Of special importance in this study was the respondent's own evaluation of his proficiency in the four language skills prior to his participation in the NDEA Institute(s). Though the question seeking information on this evaluation was designed to be either checked or left blank, several respondents sought to qualify their answers by inserting such words as: "laboriously," "fair," "poor," etc. It was deemed impractical to attempt to tabulate any qualifications or degrees of these skills. Therefore, if the item was checked at all, it was counted.

TABLE XV  
SELF-EVALUATION OF PROFICIENCY BEFORE NDEA INSTITUTE(S)

CATEGORY	Read easily	Write easily	Understand readily when spoken	Speak with some fluency
GROUP I	7	4	2	2
GROUP II	12	7	5	6
GROUP III	16	14	8	11
GROUP IV	<u>31</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>25</u>
Total	66	48	32	44

About three-fourths of the respondents felt that they read easily prior to their participation in an NDEA Institute; about two-thirds thought they wrote easily. As to the two remaining skills the respondents indicated far greater confidence in their ability to speak than in their ability to understand.

At times second languages were checked by the respondents but only the language of the Institute attended was included in Table XV above. The evaluation of the proficiency in a second or in a third language was not pertinent to this research. However, with regard to the target language the self-evaluation of proficiency in the four skills before participation in the Institute(s) was of singular importance.

#### Evaluation of the NDEA Institute Training

The last section of the questionnaire dealt with an evaluation by the respondents of the NDEA Institute(s) which they attended, more especially, an evaluation of the benefits they had derived from their participation in the NDEA Institute(s).

The first question of the third section asked the respondent how he would estimate his own proficiency in the four language skills of his target language after his participation in the NDEA Institute(s). Again this estimate was to be indicated by check marks in the appropriate areas. In Table XVI below, these evaluations are shown.

It is necessary to compare Tables XV and XVI, the "Before" and "After" tables on language proficiency. The difference between the total figures of Table XV and those of Table XVI indicate that at least 44.5 per cent of the respondents achieved marked improvement in the area of listening comprehension, or understanding, and that 35.1 per

cent were aware of marked improvement in their ability to speak with some fluency. The area indicating the least difference was that of reading ability, only 8.1 per cent of the respondents who had not marked this in Table XV marking it here in the evaluation after the Institute. A slightly greater figure of improvement, 16.2 per cent, was noted in the ability to write.

TABLE XVI  
SELF-EVALUATION OF PROFICIENCY AFTER NDEA INSTITUTE(S)

CATEGORY	Read easily	Write easily	Understand readily when spoken	Speak with some fluency
GROUP I	7	4	6	8
GROUP II	14	10	14	11
GROUP III	17	16	14	16
GROUP IV	<u>34</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>35</u>
Total	72	60	65	70

The increased proficiency indicated so significantly in Table XVI should not, however, be taken as a total, dependable indication of the improvement made. It was taken for granted that even though a respondent could check one of these areas prior to his participation in the NDEA Institute(s) his same check in the same area after his Institute attendance stood for greater competence in that skill. However, this degree of improvement was not ascertained.

By means of the next question an attempt was made to acquire further information concerning the respondent's improvement resulting from participation in the NDEA Institute(s). In this question the different subjects taught at the Institutes were listed individually, as were also other subjects closely related and probably adjuncts or complements thereof. By each of these the respondent could select and check one of four indicated ranges of benefit:

"Greatly," "Much," "Some," or "None." Here, by selecting the most suitable range, a respondent who had felt that he spoke his target language with some fluency at the point in time prior to his study at the Institute(s) and who had therefore checked this item in the "Before" Institute evaluation as well as again in the "After" Institute evaluation could now indicate his own estimate of how much he had benefited, that is, improved, in that area.

In Table XVII are presented the quantitative responses that were checked by the respondents with regard to their self-evaluation of the benefits derived from the Institute training in the fourteen areas indicated. The information shown in this Table XVII is perhaps the greatest single contribution of the study. Here is the evidence that in their own judgment the respondents did indeed benefit from their participation in the NDEA Modern Foreign Language Institute(s).

TABLE XVII  
 QUANTITATIVE ESTIMATE OF BENEFIT (AND TOTALS BY AREA) OF THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED IMPROVEMENT

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT	GROUP I					GROUP II					GROUP III					GROUP IV					TOTAL OF ALL GROUPS
	Greatly	Much	Some	None	Total	Greatly	Much	Some	None	Total	Greatly	Much	Some	None	Total	Greatly	Much	Some	None	Total	
a. Reading	1	2	4	(1)=	7	1	5	7	=	13	0	5	9	(2)=	14	4	11	16	(3)=	31	65
b. Writing	1	3	3	(1)=	7	1	4	8	=	13	0	5	9	(3)=	14	2	11	17	(4)=	30	64
c. Understanding	3	4	1	=	8	6	5	2	=	13	4	8	5	=	17	14	15	6	=	35	72
d. Speaking	6	1	1	=	8	8	3	3	=	14	4	8	5	=	17	16	11	8	=	35	74
Knowledge of the:																					
e. People	4	1	2	(1)=	7	7	3	3	(1)=	13	2	3	11	=	16	10	11	11	=	32	69
f. Culture	3	0	5	=	8	5	5	3	(1)=	13	3	7	6	(1)=	16	13	10	12	=	35	72
g. History	1	1	5	(1)=	7	3	6	4	(1)=	13	3	5	8	=	16	9	9	14	(1)=	32	68
h. Literature	1	2	4	(1)=	7	2	6	5	(1)=	13	1	2	13	(1)=	16	6	7	19	(2)=	32	68
i. Linguistics	2	1	5	=	8	6	2	6	=	14	2	7	7	=	16	5	12	17	=	34	72
j. Psychology of FL learning	3	2	2	(1)=	7	4	2	6	(2)=	12	3	5	6	(1)=	14	6	12	14	(1)=	32	65
k. Methodology	2	5		(1)=	7	3	7	3	(1)=	13	4	10	2	(1)=	16	15	12	8	=	35	71
l. New materials	3	4	1	=	8	4	6	4	=	14	7	7	2	(1)=	16	20	11	4	=	35	72
m. Techniques	3	4		(1)=	7	4	6	4	=	14	5	9	2	=	16	22	10	3	=	35	72
n. Problems	1	2	2	(2)=	5	2	5	5	(1)=	12	4	4	6	(3)=	14	10	12	10	(2)=	32	63

As a means of making the information given in Table XVII more readily interpreted and, at the same time, giving to that information a form that might make possible certain useful comparisons and analyses otherwise hidden, it was decided to assign numerical equivalents to the degrees of benefit expressed. To the degree "Greatly" was assigned the number "3," to the degree "Much" was assigned the number "2," and to the quantity "Some" was assigned the number "1." Of course, a check mark under "None" received no number value.

Further, since "3" represented the greatest possible benefit obtainable, then "3" multiplied by the number of respondents of the Group in question gave the number representing the maximum benefit obtainable by that Group. For example, if all of the eight respondents in Group I had checked that they had benefited "Greatly" in item "a" (Ability to read) then the total of the numerical interpretation would have been "24," or one hundred per cent of the possible total score or benefit. By this means relative benefits with regard to each item and to each Group were estimated. These assigned numerical values and the estimates of relative benefits derived therefrom are demonstrated in Table XVIII.

The percentage columns in Table XVIII were devised to make possible a determination of Group differences with regard to benefits derived from participation in the NDEA Language Institutes. A few differences did appear.

TABLE XVIII

NUMERICAL INTERPRETATION OF QUANTITATIVE BENEFITS SHOWN IN TABLE XVII

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT	GROUP I		GROUP II		GROUP III		GROUP IV	
	Total equated number	%age of possible 24	Total equated number	%age of possible 42	Total equated number	%age of possible 51	Total equated number	%age of possible 105
a. Reading	11	45.8	20	47.6	19	37.2	50	47.6
b. Writing	12	50.	19	45.8	19	37.2	45	42.8
c. Understanding	18	75.	30	71.4	33	64.7	78	74.2
d. Speaking	21	87.5	33	78.5	33	64.7	78	74.2
Knowledge of the:								
e. People	16	66.6	30	71.4	23	45.1	63	60.
f. Culture	14	58.3	28	66.6	29	56.8	71	67.5
g. History	10	41.6	25	59.5	27	52.9	59	56.1
h. Literature	11	45.8	23	54.7	20	31.2	51	48.5
i. Linguistics	12	50.	28	66.6	27	52.9	56	53.3
j. Psychology of FL learning	15	62.5	22	52.3	25	49.	56	53.3
k. Methodology	17	70.8	26	61.9	34	66.6	77	73.3
l. New materials	18	75.	28	66.6	37	72.5	86	81.9
m. Techniques	17	70.8	28	66.6	35	68.6	89	84.7
n. Problems	9	37.5	21	50.	26	50.9	64	60.9

The percentages of benefit in the areas of ability to read and to understand are quite similar for Groups I, II, and IV, though lesser for Group III.

The highest percentage figured anywhere in Table XVIII was the 87.5 per cent recorded by Group I in the area of improved ability to speak the foreign language. It is difficult to understand why the recent graduates who certainly had access to more laboratories, tape recordings, and records than did their older colleagues should have made a stronger response in this area of benefit. It should be noted, nevertheless, that all four groups indicated great improvement in the speaking skill--a major goal of the NDEA Language Institutes.

Also of interest is the fact that Groups I and IV indicated the greatest gain in the major areas of professional preparation. It may be inferred that the professional preparation of the recent graduates was not appreciably better than was that of those teachers who graduated some thirty years earlier.

It may be noted that Group II indicated a considerably higher appreciation of the study of Applied Linguistics than did the other three Groups (66.6% compared to roughly 50% for all three of the others). (A 50% response was considered rather non-committal.)

Following the question on estimate of progress in fourteen specified areas was one asking the respondent to list in order of importance the three items of the fourteen which he considered to have been the most helpful to him in

TABLE XIX

TOPICS THAT RESPONDENTS RATED MOST HELPFUL IN TEACHING--FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD PREFERENCES

TOPICS	GROUP I	GROUP II	GROUP III	GROUP IV	Ratings	Total per rank (A)	Total per topic (B)
a. Reading		1		1	1st	2	
		1	1		2nd	2	
					3rd		4
b. Writing					1st		
		1			2nd		
					3rd	1	1
c. Understanding	2	6		4	1st	12	
		2	3	7	2nd	12	
			1	4	3rd	5	29
d. Speaking	4	5	10	15	1st	34	
	3	5		2	2nd	10	
		1	2	2	3rd	5	49
Knowledge of the:							
e. People				1	1st	1	
	1	2	1	2	2nd	6	
	2			1	3rd	3	10
f. Culture					1st		
	1	2	1	3	2nd	7	
		3		3	3rd	6	13
g. History			1		1st		
				1	2nd	1	
					3rd	1	2
h. Literature			1		1st		
				2	2nd	1	
					3rd	2	3
i. Linguistics		1			1st	1	
			1	1	2nd	2	
	1	1	3	2	3rd	7	10
j. Psychology of FL learning			1	3	1st	4	
		1		1	2nd	2	
				1	3rd	1	7
k. Methodology			2	1	1st	3	
	1		2	5	2nd	8	
	3	4	3	6	3rd	16	27
l. New materials		1	1	2	1st	4	
		1	4	6	2nd	11	
		1	1	6	3rd	8	23
m. Techniques	1		4	8	1st	13	
	2	1	2	7	2nd	12	
	2	3	6	5	3rd	16	41
n. Problems				1	1st		
				1	2nd	1	
				1	3rd	1	2

his teaching. These were to be rated as first, second, and third. A few respondents found it difficult to choose only three, apparently, and listed two items under one (or more) of the numbers. It was necessary to adjust such dual responses to the established pattern of three choices. This was done by lowering the second-mentioned item under one number down to the next lower-numbered choice, and by then similarly reducing the item that had been in that numbered choice to the next lower one, etc. No fourth choices resulting from such adjustment were included. Table XIX shows and totals the first three preferences expressed by the respondents; the first total is that of the figures in each one of the first, second or third choices; the second total is the total per topic of all three of the choices.

From the last total figures of Table XIX (the combined number of mentions as first, second, and third choice) was derived the order of rank demonstrated in Table XX.

TABLE XX  
ORDER OF HELPFULNESS IN TEACHING  
(From Table XIX)

Item (Abbreviated)	No. of men- tions	Rank	Item (Abbreviated)	No. of men- tions	Rank
Speaking (d)	(49)	1st	Linguis-		
Techniques (m)	(41)	2nd	tics (i)	(10)	7-8th
Understand-			Psychology (j)	(6)	9th
ing (c)	(29)	3rd	Reading (a)	(4)	10th
Methodology (k)	(27)	4th	Literature (h)	(3)	11th
Materials (l)	(23)	5th	History (g)	(2)	12-13th
Culture (f)	(13)	6th	Problems (n)	(2)	12-13th
People (e)	(10)	7-8th	Writing (b)	(1)	14th

It should be noted that the improvement in ability to speak the target language was placed in the first three choices by forty-nine of the respondents, thirty-four of whom placed it in the first preference position. Greater proficiency in the speaking skill undoubtedly gave to the teachers far greater confidence in the classroom--an absolute essential to effective teaching.

Also noteworthy were the forty-one mentions under the item "Knowledge of teaching techniques," a subdivision under Professional Preparation. Though only thirteen respondents placed this item under first choice (compared to the thirty-four first-choice positions of the speaking skill) the total number of mentions was significant.

The preference ratings that the respondents in this study gave to the areas of oral-aural skills and to the items dealing with professional preparation indicated strongly that the Institute training was highly effective in those areas. That the reading and writing skills rather trailed was to be expected since those skills were not considered of major importance in the emergency situation that prompted the passing of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The respondents were next asked whether there were any subjects taught at the NDEA Institute(s) that they had not found useful in their teaching. This question was to be answered by checking the supplied "Yes" or "No." However,

if the respondent checked "Yes" he was requested to list the subject(s) not useful. The responses to this question are presented in Table XXI.

TABLE XXI  
WAS PART OF INSTITUTE SCHEDULE FOUND NOT USEFUL?

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	"Yes" checked	"No" checked
GROUP I	8	4	4
GROUP II	14	5	9
GROUP III	16	5	11
GROUP IV	<u>35</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>28</u>
Total	73	21	52

Of those twenty-one respondents who had found that all subjects taught at the Institute(s) were not useful in their teaching there were thirteen who named linguistics specifically as a scheduled course found not useful to them in their classrooms. The remaining subjects mentioned varied considerably: four respondents mentioned methods, two mentioned phonetics. The other subjects or topics mentioned appeared only once. No conclusions could be drawn from the few reasons offered by some respondents in explanation of their dissatisfaction.

To the question asking whether the NDEA Institute(s) had provided the training which the respondents most needed

the answers were very much in the affirmative. The responses to this question are shown in Table XXII.

TABLE XXII  
DID INSTITUTE(S) PROVIDE THE TRAINING MOST NEEDED?

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	"Yes" checked	"No" checked
GROUP I	8	8	0
GROUP II	13	12	1
GROUP III	17	17	0
GROUP IV	<u>35</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	73	70	3

Two respondents who checked the "No" answer added comments. One stated that she should have been in a more advanced Institute. The other wrote: "Some, but could have done more."

The fact that seventy of the seventy-three who answered felt that the NDEA Institute(s) had provided the training they most needed affirms the careful and extensive research on the weaknesses in teacher training that was back of the decisions on what to include in the NDEA Institute Language Programs. Apparently seventy of the respondents in this study recognized or sensed the validity of the major goals and purposes of the Institutes.

The remaining questions, though less specific, were nonetheless attempts to acquire further information concerning the benefits to the participants from their Institute experience.

The first of these questions asked the respondent whether his participation in the NDEA Institute(s) had upgraded his self-confidence as a teacher of foreign language. Table XXIII tabulates these answers.

TABLE XXIII  
INSTITUTE UPGRADED SELF-CONFIDENCE AS TEACHER

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	"Yes" checked	"No" checked
GROUP I	8	7	1
GROUP II	13	13	0
GROUP III	17	17	0
GROUP IV	<u>34</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	72	65	7

The next question asked whether participation in the NDEA Institute(s) had upgraded the respondent's appreciation of the value of his contribution to society in his profession of teacher of foreign language. The answers to this question are shown in Table XXIV.

Tables XXIII and XXIV are related in that both greater self-confidence and a deeper feeling of worth would usually contribute to greater effectiveness in the classroom. A teacher who conveys to his students an impression of insecurity and futility can hardly be an inspiring teacher. Roughly ninety per cent of these respondents made appreciable gains in self-confidence and in a feeling that what they were doing was socially worthy.

TABLE XXIV

## INSTITUTE UPGRADED APPRECIATION OF VALUE OF CONTRIBUTION

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	"Yes" checked	"No" checked
GROUP I	8	7	1
GROUP II	14	13	1
GROUP III	17	15	2
GROUP IV	<u>34</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	73	66	7

No explanatory or qualifying statements accompanied the "No" checks of Tables XXIII or XXIV. It was not possible to ascertain reasons for the failure to gain in these areas.

The respondents were asked if their participation in the NDEA Institute(s) inspired them to do further study in the foreign language, that is, in their target language. Again the answer consisted of placing a check in the space to indicate "Yes" or "No." These answers are recorded in Table XXV. Again the affirmative response approximated ninety per cent of the total, and again it was not possible to ascertain reasons for the "No" replies.

Though the desirability of one hundred per cent affirmative replies in Tables XXIII, XXIV, and XXV is obvious, yet the failure to achieve this ideal can scarcely be attributed to any fault of the Institute program or

organization since ninety per cent of the respondents did reply in the affirmative.

TABLE XXV  
INSTITUTE INSPIRED FURTHER STUDY IN FL

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	"Yes" checked	"No" checked
GROUP I	8	7	1
GROUP II	14	14	0
GROUP III	16	14	2
GROUP IV	<u>34</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	72	63	9

The last question of all was: "How would you estimate the effectiveness of the Institute(s) in improving your competence as a teacher of foreign language: 1) Very Helpful \_\_\_\_, Helpful \_\_\_\_, Not Helpful \_\_\_\_." Table XXVI provides the tabulation for this evaluation of effectiveness.

TABLE XXVI  
ESTIMATE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INSTITUTE(S)

CATEGORY	Number of Respondents	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Helpful
GROUP I	8	4	4	0
GROUP II	14	13	0	1
GROUP III	16	12	4	0
GROUP IV	<u>34</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	72	47	15	1

Since the purpose of this study was to seek an evaluation of the benefits derived by Oklahoma teachers of modern foreign language from their participation in NDEA Foreign Language Institutes, the tabulations of this third chapter were deemed essential in presenting the statistical data secured from the answers to the questionnaire completed by the respondents.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

It was the purpose of this study to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction received by Oklahoma teachers of modern foreign language from participation in NDEA Foreign Language Institutes. No differentiation based on any particular foreign language was made.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was an emergency measure. It purported to correct a grave imbalance in the educational system of the United States and focussed upon science, mathematics and modern foreign language instruction as most in need of immediate assistance. Many special research projects and other programs were funded in order to arrive at the best means of righting this imbalance. In the area of modern foreign languages the Institutes were developed as one of these best means, and the programs of the Institutes were determined with great care. The programs developed in the Institutes were based on serious research which identified areas of greatest need.

That the Oklahoma teachers of foreign language were in need of retraining when they were accepted for the NDEA Institutes is unquestioned. These teachers had been a part of the data of the studies and research which exposed and deplored the regrettable state of the teaching of foreign language in this nation. The very extensive Purin report on the training of teachers of the modern foreign languages,<sup>1</sup> the research of Professor Vail some years later,<sup>2</sup> the considered comments of Professor Freeman on the even worse state of affairs in 1946 due to the dislocations of the war, the shortage of teachers and the violent fluctuations in enrollments in all subjects,<sup>3</sup> all these had included Oklahoma teachers in their research.

Another study relating to the preparation and certification of modern foreign language teachers was begun in 1949 under the auspices of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations. Dr. Charles M. Purin was named the General Chairman. Inadequate financial support hampered the program. Dr. Purin published a "Preliminary Report" in 1953.<sup>4</sup> Continuing research was reported by

---

<sup>1</sup>Purin, The Training of Teachers of the Modern Foreign Languages.

<sup>2</sup>Vail, "State Requirements for Language Teachers."

<sup>3</sup>Stephen A. Freeman, "Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs," The Modern Language Journal, L, No. 6 (October, 1966), p. 326.

<sup>4</sup>Charles M. Purin, "Preliminary Report," The Modern Language Journal, XXXVII (October, 1953), pp. 303-307.

Dr. James B. Tharp in 1955 in which he stated: "The Purin report of 1929 found a nationwide median requirement of twenty-four semester hours based on two units of entrance credit or the equivalent; the minimum for a minor was about 14 hours. Except in the West Central region, the requirements have increased slightly in the 50's."<sup>1</sup> Oklahoma is one of the five states which Dr. Tharp designated as the West Central region. (Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma.)<sup>2</sup> Though it is certain that not all Oklahoma teachers received their training in the West Central region, it is highly probable that many of them did. Furthermore, even those who, in the 50's, received their training elsewhere presumably were included among those teachers receiving it in the other regions where the requirements had increased but slightly.<sup>3</sup> Again it would appear that Oklahoma teachers

---

<sup>1</sup>James B. Tharp, "Status of the Academic and Professional Training of Modern Language Teachers in the High Schools of the United States," The Modern Language Journal, XXXIX, No. 6 (October, 1955), p. 284.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 283.

<sup>3</sup>The requirements for certification in Oklahoma shown in the Purin study of 1929 were not specified insofar as the special subject was concerned. Oklahoma issued "Blanket" certificates. The requirement in professional subjects ranged from 8-24 semester hours. Vail wrote that in 1942 (the year selected in order to show the impact of the Modern Foreign Language Study, but not reflect any changes that may have come about in state requirements as a result of the ASTP language experience) the requirements in Oklahoma were: "16 semester hours for a one-year certificate; 24 semester hours for a life certificate. (High School credits shall count at the rate of 2 semester hours.)" In 1969 a teacher in Oklahoma may be certified with 18 semester hours in the language. The

of foreign language (as their colleagues in other states) did indeed need the refresher and retraining aids provided by the NDEA Modern Foreign Language Institutes.

The tremendous importance of the Purin report in bringing to light--glaring light--the dismal state of the training of teachers of the modern foreign languages cannot be overestimated. There had existed for some time a ferment of disquiet, of agitation, of real dismay with regard to the existing laxness in teacher certification for foreign language teachers. It had been the American Council on Education that had sponsored the request for the funds granted by the Carnegie Corporation of New York to finance the research of Dr. Purin and his associates. In defense of the profession of foreign language teaching it must be pointed out that this was not the only area of teaching affected by the appalling laxness in state requirements for certification. The then rather general practice of issuing blanket certificates did not single out the training of foreign language teachers as being especially suited to mediocrity or worse. The laxness was rather a reflection of a social lack of appreciation of the value of education, most especially of liberal education. The poor financial compensation for those who taught undoubtedly contributed to the prevailing low professional standards for licensing.

---

beginning courses of the college or university (often scheduled for 10 semester hours) may be counted in the 18.

The data from this study corroborated the conclusion above regarding the inadequate preparation of the Oklahoma teachers of modern foreign language. The respondents expressed strongly their own dissatisfaction with their academic training.<sup>1</sup> Though relatively few expressed dissatisfaction with their training in reading and in writing the target language, a very large proportion were aware of their incompetence in the areas of listening comprehension, and even more of them felt an inadequacy in the speaking skill. Perhaps the self-evaluation is not totally reliable but it was nevertheless the data basic to this study, in fact, the teachers' self-evaluation of their own competence prior to their attendance at NDEA Institutes was of prime importance in this study.

In the area of the four skills it was significant that forty-four of the respondents thought they spoke with some fluency prior to the Institute attendance and thirty-two checked that they understood readily. Yet, in answer to the question asking the respondents to list in order the three topics of study (out of fourteen) in which they made most progress, the one among the three found to be listed the most frequently of all was "Improvement in ability to speak." The third in frequency was "Improvement in ability to understand." Appreciable gains in speaking competency were apparently a

---

<sup>1</sup>See Table XII.

regularly-noted--and expected--benefit of attendance at an Institute.<sup>1</sup>

In the questionnaire sent to the respondents the section on "Professional Preparation" was divided into five separate items: 1) psychology of foreign language learning, 2) methodology, 3) new materials, 4) techniques, and 5) analysis of common teaching problems. Of these separate items the Oklahoma teachers responding indicated strong appreciation of the benefits from improved knowledge of new teaching techniques. This item was second in the total mention among the three preferences.<sup>2</sup> "Knowledge of methodology" received the fourth greatest number of mentions and "Knowledge of new teaching materials" the fifth. Since in the choices of first three preferences out of a possible fourteen these items rated second, fourth and fifth in total number of mentions it was concluded that the Oklahoma teachers had derived great benefit from the NDEA instruction in the field of teacher preparation. These results again corroborated the findings reported by Starr, that is, that the greatest gains in the non-skill areas were made in the area of professional preparation.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Wilmarth H. Starr, "Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVII, No. 4, Part 2 (September, 1962), pp. 31-43.

<sup>2</sup>See Tables XIX and XX.

<sup>3</sup>Starr, "Proficiency Tests," p. 35.

The Oklahoma teachers, then, had need of more professional training and benefited from it.

Roughly two-thirds of the respondents reported that they had found the Institutes efficient and well-planned and that the participants' time was not wasted. A few respondents did have slight complaints and of these the majority referred to the teaching of linguistics.

Though the NDEA Institutes used the linguistic materials developed especially for them through the Title VI research contract under the direction of Dr. Simon Belasco,<sup>1</sup> nevertheless the course in applied linguistics varied from Institute to Institute. There was a wide range in participant reaction: from genuine appreciation to extreme dissatisfaction and an inability to understand the function of applied linguistics in the classroom of the teacher of foreign language. Whether the adverse reaction to the linguistic phase of the program was owing to inexpert presentation or to the subject matter itself could not be determined here.

In reply to the related question: "Did the NDEA Institute(s) provide you the training you most needed?" the replies were overwhelmingly "Yes."<sup>2</sup> Apparently in the judgment of those enrolled the program of the Institutes had been well planned.

---

<sup>1</sup>Supra, pp. 33-34.

<sup>2</sup>See Table XXII.

An additional benefit of the Institute attendance was psychological. The respondents were asked: "Did your participation in the NDEA Institute(s) upgrade your self-confidence as a teacher of foreign language?" Sixty-five of the seventy-two answers were in the affirmative.<sup>1</sup> This self-confidence was no doubt founded on greater assurance of competence and must certainly have contributed to the teaching effectiveness of those individuals.

Another estimate of benefit was sought by the question: "Did your participation in the NDEA Institute(s) upgrade your appreciation of the value of your contribution to society as a teacher of foreign language?" Here too the answers were predominantly "Yes," being in the proportion of sixty-six out of seventy-three.<sup>2</sup>

Slightly less strong was the affirmative response to the question: "Did your participation in the NDEA Institute(s) inspire you to do further study in the foreign language?" Here the answers were sixty-three "Yes" out of seventy-two that were checked.<sup>3</sup>

The respondents were asked to estimate in a general manner the over-all effectiveness of the Institute training in improving their competence as teachers of foreign language in terms of "Very helpful," "Helpful," or "Not helpful."

---

<sup>1</sup>See Table XXIII.

<sup>2</sup>See Table XXIV.

<sup>3</sup>See Table XXV.

Though not all checked the first of these, still only one respondent checked the totally unfavorable response.<sup>1</sup>

### Conclusions

From the data provided by the questionnaire it was concluded that the Oklahoma teachers of modern foreign languages who had attended one or more NDEA Institutes did very definitely benefit from such participation. From this was implied that the training of these participants had been deficient in certain areas and that a need had existed.

1. The teachers felt that the Institute training in professional preparation contributed markedly to their effectiveness in teaching foreign language. It was therefore concluded that past and current teacher education programs have been inadequate in professional preparation as it relates to methodology, aids and materials and a knowledge of human learning and behavior.

2. Attitudes of teachers toward the Institutes and benefits derived from participation in them did not appear to be significantly affected by the age factor.

3. In the judgment of the respondents the NDEA Institutes generally made important contributions to improving the effectiveness of the teachers who attended them.

4. Careful planning by those responsible for organizing the Institutes must have occurred since participants

---

<sup>1</sup>See Table XXVI.

felt that the Institute curricula included treatment of those areas most needed by teachers of foreign language.

5. The NDEA Institutes offered audio-lingual situations not ordinarily provided on the usual college campus. The physical setting of an "island" of the target language, an island inhabited by students of similar audio-lingual proficiency, all of whom were sharing the same goals and purposes, was a setting in itself highly conducive to effective learning.

6. The benefits that Oklahoma teachers of modern foreign language received from participation in the NDEA Institutes were apparently so great that it would be valuable to the state if one or two of the state institutions for higher learning, in collaboration with the state education agency, would establish and regularly maintain a four-week summer school program planned on the model of the Institutes.

#### Recommendations

It is recommended that research and experimentation be done to determine how to incorporate in a summer workshop of four weeks' duration some of the major special advantages provided by the unique NDEA Foreign Language Institutes.

It is recommended that research be done on how to achieve a better balance in the presentation of the wide range of material included in "Culture-Civilization" so that

teacher candidates may acquire a broader understanding of this vast area.

With regard to the lack of background in the subject of linguistics it is recommended that an introduction to the use and usefulness of Applied Linguistics in the classroom of the modern foreign language teacher be offered as a part of the training program of the teacher candidate.

The matter of professional preparation does not fall entirely within the domain of either the department of foreign languages nor that of education but rather is shared by both. Cooperation between the two departments is vital. Research on how to improve the cooperation is recommended. Committees comprised of the representatives most suitably qualified from each department should study the problem, analyze the material content essential to a good preparation and determine a satisfactory division of responsibility. Research on the means of best accomplishing the changes necessary would be quite useful and valuable. Joseph Axelrod pointed out that a change in the established system of higher education is particularly difficult.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, a more effective program of professional preparation for teachers of modern foreign language is absolutely essential. In this area of instruction the very special advantages of the Institute "language tower" can hold no particular magic. The professional preparation

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Axelrod, The Education of the Modern Foreign Language Teacher for American Schools (New York: Modern Language Association, 1966), pp. 1-5.

must be accepted as a responsibility of the total program of teacher preparation in the institutions of higher education that prepare teachers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Almack, John C. Research and Thesis Writing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930.
- Axelrod, Joseph. The Education of the Modern Foreign Language Teacher for American Schools. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1966.
- Coleman, Algernon. An Analytical Bibliography of Modern Language Teaching. Vol. I. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927-1932.
- Conant, James Bryant. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.
- Diekhoff, John S. NDEA and Modern Foreign Languages. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1965.
- Fries, Charles C. and Sale, William M. and Zeydel, Edwin H. Language Study in American Education. New York: Commission on Trends in Education of the Modern Foreign Language Association of America, 1940.
- Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research Methodology and Design. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.
- Good, Carter V.; Barr, A. S.; and Scates, Douglas E. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Incorporated, 1936.
- Koos, Leonard Vincent. The Questionnaire in Education, A Critique and Manual. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Matthew, R. J. Language and Area Studies in the Armed Services. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947.

- Newmark, Maxim, ed. Twentieth Century Modern Language Teaching, Sources and Readings. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1948.  
The introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler was particularly apropos to this study.
- Norton, John Kelley. The Questionnaire. Washington, D.C.: Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1930.
- Oliver, Thomas Edward. Suggestions and References for Modern Language Teachers, Bulletin No. 18. Urbana: School of Education, University of Illinois, 1917.
- Parker, William Riley. The National Interest and Foreign Languages. 3rd ed. U.S. Department of State Publication 7324. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Pinloche, A. La Nouvelle Pédagogie des Langues Vivantes. 3rd ed. Paris: Librairie Henri Didier, 1940.
- Purin, Charles M. The Training of Teachers of the Modern Foreign Languages. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.
- Rivers, Wilga M. The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. The Aims of Education and Other Essays. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.
- Whitney, Frederick Lamson. Methods in Educational Research. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1931.

#### Articles

- Allen, Edward D. "The Education and Re-Education of Foreign Language Teachers." The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (May, 1964), 259-62.
- Andersson, Theodore. "Do We Want Certified Teachers or Qualified Ones." The Modern Language Journal, XLVII (October, 1963), 231-35.
- Andersson, Theodore. "Keying Foreign Language Instruction to the National Interest." The Educational Forum, XXIII, No. 3 (March, 1959), 277-87.

- Axelrod, Joseph. "NDEA Foreign Language Institute Programs: The Development of a New Educational Model." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXXII, No. 4 (September, 1967), pp. 14-19.
- Babbidge, Homer D. "The Role of the College and University in the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXV, No. 2 (May, 1960), 16-20.
- Babbidge, Homer D. "Thoughts for the Future." Modern Language Journal, XLIX, No. 1 (January, 1965), 15-19.
- Blickenstaff, Channing. "Musical Talents and Foreign Language Ability." Modern Language Journal, XLVII (December, 1963), 359-63.
- Boyer, Mildred V. "Language Institutes and Their Future." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXIX (September, 1964), 11-18.
- Brademas, John. "Foreign Languages and Federal Aid to Education." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVII, No. 2 (May, 1962), 28-34.
- Brooks, Nelson. "The Ideal Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers." The Modern Language Journal, L, No. 2 (February, 1966), 71-79.
- Carroll, John B. "The Contribution of Psychological Theory and Educational Research to the Teaching of Foreign Languages." The Modern Language Journal, XLIX, No. 5 (May, 1965), 273-281.
- Chambers, Dwight. "The Foreign Language Question Again." The Journal of Higher Education, XXIX (January, 1958), 13-22.
- Childers, J. Wesley. "Foreign Language Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1960." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVII, No. 4, Pt. 2 (September, 1962), 11-31.
- Cioffari, Vincent. "The Influence of the Language Institute Program--Past, Present, and Future." The Modern Language Journal, XLVI (February, 1962), 62-9.
- Clifford, Don P. "A Participant Reports on a Modern Language Institute." Arizona Teacher (January, 1964), 24-26.

- Diekhoff, John S. "Priorities in Language Education." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXX, No. 2 (May, 1965), 24-29.
- Dunkel, Harold B. "Language Teaching in an Old Key." The Modern Language Journal, XLVII (May, 1963), 203-10.
- Eckelberry, R. H. "The National Defense Education Act of 1958." The Journal of Higher Education, XXX (January, 1959), 54-56.
- Feldman, David M. and Barbara Schindler. "An In-Service Alternative to the Summer Institute Program." The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (February, 1964), 88-91.
- Finocchiaro, Mary, and Weiss, David. "An Alternative to the NDEA Institute." The Modern Language Journal, XLVII (April, 1963), 147-49.
- Freeman, Stephen A. "What Constitutes a Well-Trained Modern Language Teacher?" The Modern Language Journal, XXV (January, 1941), 293-306.
- Freeman, Stephen A. "What About the Teacher?" The Modern Language Journal, XXXIII (April, 1949), 255-68.
- Gallant, Clifford J. "Madness in Methods." The Modern Language Journal, XLVII (October, 1963), 243-45.
- Gardner, A. Bruce. "Conserving Our Linguistic Resources." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXX, No. 2 (May, 1965), 19-24.
- Green, Jerals R. "Supervision in the Foreign Language Classroom: Guidelines for the Department Chairman." The Modern Language Journal, XLVII (December, 1963), 366-68.
- Grew, James H. "A la Recherche d'une Profession Unie." The Modern Language Journal, XLIX, No. 8 (December, 1965), 479-82.
- Haac, Oscar A. "Language Institutes and Applied Linguistics." The Modern Language Journal, XLVII (December, 1963), 356-9.
- Harris, Julian. "The First Institutes of the Language Development Program--An Editorial." The French Review, XXXII (April, 1959), 468-9.

- Hayes, Alfred S. "New Directions in Foreign Language Teaching." The Modern Language Journal, XLIX, No. 5 (May, 1965), 281-94.
- Harmon, John T. "The Modern Language Association, Programs and Services." The Modern Language Journal, XLIX (October, 1965), 363-67.
- Hocking, Elton. "The Decade Ahead." The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (January, 1964), 3-6.
- Hocking, Elton. "The Purdue Language Program." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXX, No. 4, Pt. 2 (September, 1955), 36-40.
- Keppel, Francis. "New Horizons for the Humanities." The Journal of Higher Education, XXXV (January, 1964), 1-5.
- Kraus, Joe W. "The Development of a Curriculum in the Early American Colleges." The History of Education Quarterly, I, No. 2 (June, 1961), 64-67.
- Ludington, John R. "The Foreign Language Program of Title III of the NDEA." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXV, No. 2 (May, 1960), 11-16.
- MacAllister, Archibald T. "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXVIII (December, 1953), 1196-1218.
- McCormack, William. "New Directions in Study Abroad." The Journal of Higher Education, XXXVII (October, 1966), 369-77.
- Mildenberger, Andrea McHenry. "The NDEA as Amended by the 88th Congress." The Modern Language Journal, XLIX (May, 1965), 305-07.
- Mildenberger, Kenneth W. "The Consequences of Prudent Affluence." The Modern Language Journal, XLIX (October, 1965), 349-54.
- Newmark, Gerald. "Use of Children's Films and Other Children's Materials in Teaching Foreign Languages to Adults." The Modern Language Journal, LI (May, 1967), 272-75.
- Orwen, Gifford P. "Aid for the Language Lab." The Modern Language Journal, XLVI (January, 1962), 39-40.

- Petersen, Fred. "The Foreign Culture, Can It Be Apprehended without an Understanding of Our Own?" The Journal of Higher Education, XXXVII, No. 8 (November, 1966), 429-35.
- Politzer, Robert L. "The Impact of Linguistics on Language Teaching: Past, Present and Future." The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII, No. 3 (March, 1964), 146-51.
- Pulgram, Ernst. "Linguistics for More Language Teachers." The French Review, XXXII (December, 1958), 147-155.
- Rupp, Theodore H. "10 Point Program for Upgrading the Teaching of Foreign Language in the State of Pennsylvania." The French Review, XXXVIII (October, 1964), 89.
- Sollenberger, Howard E. "Does Everybody There Speak English?" Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVII, No. 2 (May, 1962), 23-28.
- Spillane, James M. "Institutes for 1965-66." The French Review, XXXVIII (December, 1964), 251-2.
- Spillane, James M. "The Turn of the Tide in Modern Foreign Language Teaching." The Journal of Higher Education, XVIII, No. 8 (June, 1962), 7-8.
- Starr, Wilmarth H. "MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVII, No. 4, Pt. 2 (September, 1962), 31-43.
- Stookins, Joseph S. "CEEB Advanced Placement Examination in French." The French Review, XXXIX (December, 1965), 439-51.
- Turner, Daymond. "New Graduate Programs in Modern Foreign Languages, Why They Are Needed." The Journal of Higher Education, XXXVII (May, 1966), 241-6.
- Urofsky, Melvin I. "Reforms and Responses: The Yale Report of 1928." The History of Education Quarterly, V, No. 1 (March, 1965), 53-68.
- Valdman, Albert. "Toward a Redefinition of Teacher Role and Teaching Context in Foreign Language Instruction." The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (May, 1964), 275-85.
- Vail, Curtis C. D. "State Requirements for Language Teachers." The Modern Language Journal, XXIX, No. 6 (October, 1945), 509-17.

- Voigt, Frieda. "The National Teachers' Seminary, A Unique Experience in Teacher Training." The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (October, 1964), 361-63.
- Walsh, Donald D. "The Foreign Language Program in 1964." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXX, No. 2 (May, 1965), 29-33.
- Walsh, Donald D. "The MLA Program in 1959." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXV, No. 2 (May, 1960), 20-25.
- Walsh, Donald D. "The MLA Foreign Language Program in 1961." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVII, No. 2 (May, 1962), 34-39.
- Walsh, Donald D. "NDEA Institutes, Summer 1961: A Survey." The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (April, 1964), 210-12.
- Walsh, Donald D. "The National Defense Language Institutes: A Critical Report." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXX, No. 2 (May, 1965), 33-37.
- Walsh, Donald D. "The Preparation of Modern-Foreign-Language Teachers." The Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (October, 1964), 352-56.
- Walsh, Donald D. "Too Little and Too Late." The Modern Language Journal, XLIX, No. 2 (February, 1965), 82-86.
- Zeldner, Max. "The Bewildered Modern Language Teacher." The Modern Language Journal, XLVII (October, 1963), 245-53.

#### Public Documents

- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Foreign Language Development Section, Bulletin on NDEA, Number IV, August 1, 1959, by Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Acting Chief, Language Development Section. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959.

- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Language Development Section, Bulletin on the NDEA, Title VI, No. 11, November 30, 1960, by Kenneth W. Mildenerger, Chief, Language Development Section. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, COMPLETED RESEARCH, STUDIES, AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS for Language Development under The National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title VI, Section 602. A Bibliography (List No. 6) compiled by Julia A. Petrov, Program Officer, Division of Foreign Studies. Pubn. OE-12016-69 (FS5.212: 12016-69). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Guidelines for the Preparation of Proposals for Educational Personnel Development Grants 1968, 1969, 1970. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Language Development Program, Title VI, National Defense Education Act of 1958, RESEARCH AND STUDIES, Report on the First Two Years, Pubn. OE-12011. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Language Development Program, Title VI, National Defense Education Act of 1958, RESEARCH AND STUDIES, Report on the First Four Years, Pubn. OE-12014-62. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, National Defense Language Institute Program, NDEA, Title VI, A MANUAL FOR PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS, Pubn. OE-27006-64. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.
- U.S. Statutes at Large, Vol. LXXII, pt. 1, "National Defense Education Act of 1958." September 2, 1958. Public Law 85-864. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.

Reports

Modern Foreign Language Study (The) and the Canadian Committee on Modern Languages. Prognosis Tests in the Modern Foreign Languages. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.

"NDEA Institutes for Advanced Study in Modern Foreign Languages 1967-69." The Modern Language Journal, LI (January, 1967), 43.

"NDEA The History to Date." The French Review, XXXVIII (December, 1964), 248-50.

"NDEA's Decade of Accomplishment." School and Society, XCVII (Summer, 1969), 294-50.

Panel on Educational Research and Development. A Progress Report to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. Innovation and Experiment in Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Steering Committee of the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association of America. "Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America. LXX, No. 4, Pt. 2 (September, 1955), 46-50.

Unpublished Material

Allsup, Gene Dixon. "The Influence of Titles III and VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 on the Improvement of Foreign Language Instruction in the Southern Thirty-nine Counties of Illinois." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1966.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION PLEASE!

We need to know which Oklahoma teachers have ever attended an NDEA Foreign Language Institute.

If you have attended one or more PLEASE fill in this blank.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

NDEA LANGUAGE INSTITUTE(S) attended:	Summer	Acad.yr.	Language Studied:
_____	19__	19__-	_____
_____	19__	19__-	_____

Please leave this slip in the box provided at the exit.

(If you should forget, it would be appreciated if you would mail the slip to Mrs. Frieda D. Bambas, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma. 73034, or to Mrs. Patricia Hammond, Coordinator of Foreign Languages, State Department of Education, State Capitol, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.)

THANK YOU.

## APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

## EVALUATION OF NDEA INSTITUTES ATTENDED BY OKLAHOMA FL TEACHERS

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Home address: \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
 School where now teaching: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sex: Male \_\_\_ Female \_\_\_ Present age: 20-30 \_\_\_ 30-40 \_\_\_ 40-50 \_\_\_ Over 50 \_\_\_  
 NDEA Language Institute(s) attended: Summer: Academic year: Language studied:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_ 19\_\_ - 19\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_ 19\_\_ - 19\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Are you a native speaker of the language you teach? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

I. Teaching Experience

Total years of teaching experience: \_\_\_ Years prior to first NDEA Institute: \_\_\_  
 Years taught FL \_\_\_ Name of FL \_\_\_\_\_ Years taught second FL \_\_\_ Name \_\_\_\_\_

II. Academic Training

1. What was your highest degree at the time you attended your first FL Institute?  
 No degree \_\_\_ B.A. \_\_\_ B.S. \_\_\_ M.A. \_\_\_ M.S. \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_
2. Undergraduate major(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Credit hrs: \_\_\_\_\_ (Please write in)  
 minor(s) \_\_\_\_\_
3. If you have completed an advanced degree, what was your  
 graduate major? \_\_\_\_\_ Cr.Hrs. \_\_\_\_\_  
 graduate minor? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How many credit hours (undergraduate and graduate) do you now have in each of the  
 following: French \_\_\_ Italian \_\_\_ Russian \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_  
 German \_\_\_ Latin \_\_\_ Spanish \_\_\_ (Please name) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Did you have a course in methods of teaching foreign language? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_
6. Have you TRAVELED in a country whose language you are teaching? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
 (6a) If your answer to No. 6 was yes, please indicate  
 about how long you were in that country. \_\_\_\_\_
7. Have you STUDIED in a country whose language you are teaching? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
 (7a) If your answer to No. 7 was yes, please indicate  
 about how long you studied in that country. \_\_\_\_\_
8. If you wish, add any comments pertinent to questions 6 or 7.  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation of Academic Training

9. In preparing you for teaching foreign language do you consider the quality of your college or university training to have been:

Superior \_\_\_\_\_ Good \_\_\_\_\_ Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Below average \_\_\_\_\_

10. Do you consider your university training in FL to have stressed most:

1) Reading & writing skills \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Understanding & speaking skills \_\_\_\_\_

11. If you consider your college or university preparation in foreign language to have been unsatisfactory in any of the following areas, please check them.

Reading skill \_\_\_\_\_ Understanding skill \_\_\_\_\_  
 Writing skill \_\_\_\_\_ Speaking skill \_\_\_\_\_

12. If No. 11 was checked, please indicate below whether this deficiency resulted from any of the following or from some other item(s) written in.

- a. Lack of laboratory facilities a. \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Insufficient FL courses b. \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Unbalanced course selection c. \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Teaching staff not qualified d. \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Excessively or exclusively traditional teaching method e. \_\_\_\_\_  
 (here defined as stressing reading & writing skills)
- f. Excessively or exclusively modern method f. \_\_\_\_\_  
 (here defined as stressing understanding & speaking skills)
- g. Other (Please write in) \_\_\_\_\_ g. \_\_\_\_\_
- h. Other \_\_\_\_\_ h. \_\_\_\_\_

13. How would you estimate your own proficiency in the areas indicated BEFORE your participation in the NDEA Institute(s)? (Please check the appropriate spaces.)

	Read easily	Understand readily when spoken		Speak with some fluency	Write easily
French	_____	_____	Fr.	_____	_____
German	_____	_____	G.	_____	_____
Italian	_____	_____	I.	_____	_____
Latin	_____	_____	L.	_____	_____
Russian	_____	_____	R.	_____	_____
Spanish	_____	_____	S.	_____	_____
Other (Please name)	_____	_____		_____	_____

III. Evaluation of the NDEA Institute Training

14. How would you estimate your own proficiency in the areas indicated AFTER your participation in the NDEA Institute(s)? (Please check the appropriate spaces.)

	Read easily	Understand readily when spoken		Speak with some fluency	Write easily
French	_____	_____	Fr.	_____	_____
German	_____	_____	G.	_____	_____
Italian	_____	_____	I.	_____	_____
Latin	_____	_____	L.	_____	_____
Russian	_____	_____	R.	_____	_____
Spanish	_____	_____	S.	_____	_____
Other (Please name)	_____	_____		_____	_____

15. Specifically from your participation in the NDEA Institute(s) how would you estimate your progress in the following? (Please check one in each category.)

	BENEFITED:	Greatly	Much	Some	None
a. Improvement in ability to read		___	___	___	___
b. Improvement in ability to write		___	___	___	___
c. Improvement in ability to understand		___	___	___	___
d. Improvement in ability to speak		___	___	___	___
e. Knowledge of the people whose language you studied at the NDEA Institute(s)		___	___	___	___
f. Knowledge of their culture		___	___	___	___
g. Knowledge of their history		___	___	___	___
h. Knowledge of their literature		___	___	___	___
i. Knowledge of linguistics		___	___	___	___
j. Knowledge of the psychology of language learning		___	___	___	___
k. Knowledge of methodology		___	___	___	___
l. Knowledge of new teaching materials		___	___	___	___
m. Knowledge of new teaching techniques		___	___	___	___
n. Analysis of common teaching problems		___	___	___	___
Other (Please write in)					
o. _____		___	___	___	___
p. _____		___	___	___	___

16. Of the above items under No. 15 please indicate in order the three you consider the most helpful to you in your teaching. (Example: 1. c, 2. k, etc.)

1. \_\_\_  
 2. \_\_\_  
 3. \_\_\_

17. Were there any subjects taught at the NDEA Institute(s) that you have not found useful in your teaching? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

(17a) If your answer to No. 17 was yes, please list the subject(s).

\_\_\_\_\_

18. Did the NDEA Institute(s) provide you the training you most needed? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

19. Did your participation in the NDEA Institute(s) up-grade

a. Your self-confidence as a teacher of foreign language? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

b. Your appreciation of the value of your contribution to society as a teacher of foreign language? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

c. Other (Please write in.)

\_\_\_\_\_

20. Did your participation in the NDEA Institute(s) inspire you to do further study in the foreign language? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

21. How would you estimate the effectiveness of the Institute(s) in improving your competence as a teacher of foreign language:

Very helpful \_\_\_      Helpful \_\_\_      Not helpful \_\_\_

## APPENDIX C

1115 Caddell Lane,  
Norman, Oklahoma. 73069  
April 12, 1969.

Dear Colleague:

The Oklahoma teachers of foreign languages who participated in one or more of the NDEA Foreign Language Institutes can be of great assistance in a study aimed at the improvement of the academic preparation of teachers of foreign language.

This study, which I am conducting, is being made under the supervision of Dr. Glenn R. Snider of the University of Oklahoma. The study is endorsed by Dr. D. D. Creech, State Superintendent of Education.

It is considered that a serious evaluation of the benefits derived from participation in the NDEA Foreign Language Institutes might not only be of interest in itself but might also be helpful in pointing to areas of teacher preparation that may be weak or perhaps even neglected. It is expected that this study will be used in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the doctor's degree.

No respondent, Institute, school, college or university named in this questionnaire will be identified in the study.

Since Oklahoma FL teachers who attended NDEA Foreign Language Institutes are limited in number it is very important to have your participation. Your support and help will be deeply appreciated. Would you, therefore, please complete the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest convenience? An addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your reply.

Your consideration and time will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

(Mrs.) Frieda Derdeyn Bambas

## APPENDIX D

QUALIFICATIONS FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS  
OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

It is vitally important that teachers of modern foreign languages be adequately prepared for a task which more and more Americans are declaring essential to the national welfare. Though a majority of the language teachers in our schools are well trained, many have been poorly or inadequately prepared, often through no fault of their own. The undersigned therefore present this statement of what they consider the minimal, good, and superior qualifications of a secondary school teacher of a modern foreign language.

We regret that the minimum here stated cannot yet include real proficiency in the foreign tongue or more than a superficial knowledge of the foreign culture. It must be clearly understood that teaching by persons who cannot meet this minimal standard will not produce results which our profession can endorse as making the distinctive contribution of language learning to American life in the second half of the twentieth century.

Our lowest level of preparation is not recommended. It is here stated only as a point of departure which carries with it the responsibility for continued study and self-improvement, through graduate and in-service training, toward the levels of good and superior preparation.

Those who subscribe to this statement hope that the teacher of foreign languages (1) will have the personal qualities which make an effective teacher, (2) has received a well-balanced education, including a knowledge of our own American culture, and (3) has received the appropriate training in professional education, psychology, and secondary school methods. It is not our purpose to define further these criteria. We are concerned here with the specific criteria for a teacher of modern foreign languages.

## 1. Aural Understanding

Minimal: The ability to get the sense of what an educated native says when he is enunciating carefully and speaking simply on a general subject.

Good: The ability to understand conversation at average tempo, lectures, and news broadcasts.

Superior: The ability to follow closely and with ease all types of standard speech, such as rapid or group conversation, plays and movies.

Test: These abilities can be tested by dictations, by the Listening Comprehension Tests of the College Entrance Examination Board--thus far developed for French, German, and Spanish--or by similar tests for these and other languages, with an extension in range and difficulty for the superior level.

## 2. Speaking

Minimal: The ability to talk on prepared topics (e.g., for classroom situations) without obvious faltering, and to use the common expressions needed for getting around in the foreign country, speaking with a pronunciation readily understandable to a native.

Good: The ability to talk with a native without making glaring mistakes, and with a command of vocabulary and syntax sufficient to express one's thoughts in sustained conversation. This implies speech at normal speed with good pronunciation and intonation.

Superior: The ability to approximate native speech in vocabulary, intonation, and pronunciation (e.g., the ability to exchange ideas and to be at ease in social situations).

Test: For the present, this ability has to be tested by interview, or by a recorded set of questions with a blank disc or tape for recording answers.

## 3. Reading

Minimal: The ability to grasp directly (i.e., without translating) the meaning of simple, non-technical prose, except for an occasional word.

Good: The ability to read with immediate comprehension prose and verse of average difficulty and mature content.

Superior: The ability to read, almost as easily as in English, material of considerable difficulty, such as essays and literary criticism.

Test: These abilities can be tested by a graded series of timed reading passages, with comprehension questions and multiple-choice or free-response answers.

#### 4. Writing

Minimal: The ability to write correctly sentences or paragraphs such as would be developed orally for classroom situations, and the ability to write a short, simple letter.

Good: The ability to write a simple "free composition" with clarity and correctness in vocabulary, idiom, and syntax.

Superior: The ability to write on a variety of subjects with idiomatic naturalness, ease of expression, and some feeling for the style of the language.

Test: These abilities can be tested by multiple-choice syntax items, dictations, translation of English sentences or paragraphs, and a controlled letter or free composition.

#### 5. Language Analysis

Minimal: A working command of the sound-patterns and grammar-patterns of the foreign language, and a knowledge of its main differences from English.

Good: A basic knowledge of the historical development and present characteristics of the language, and an awareness of the difference between the language as spoken and as written.

Superior: Ability to apply knowledge of descriptive, comparative, and historical linguistics to the language-teaching situation.

Test: Such information and insight can be tested for levels 1 and 2 by multiple-choice and free-response items on pronunciation, intonation patterns, and syntax; for levels 2 and 3, items on philology and descriptive linguistics.

## 6. Culture

Minimal: An awareness of language as an essential element among the learned and shared experiences that combine to form a particular culture, and a rudimentary knowledge of the geography, history, literature, art, social customs, and contemporary civilization of the foreign people.

Good: First-hand knowledge of some literary masterpieces, an understanding of the principal ways in which the foreign culture resembles and differs from our own, and possession of an organized body of information on the foreign people and their civilization.

Superior: An enlightened understanding of the foreign people and their culture, achieved through personal contact, preferably by travel and residence abroad, through study of systematic descriptions of the foreign culture, and through study of literature and the arts.

Test: Such information and insight can be tested by multiple-choice literary and cultural acquaintance tests for levels 1 and 2; for level 3, written comments on passages of prose or poetry that discuss or reveal significant aspects of the foreign culture.

## 7. Professional Preparation

Note the final paragraph of the prefatory statement.

Minimal: Some knowledge of effective methods and techniques of language teaching.

Good: The ability to apply knowledge of methods and techniques to the teaching situation (e.g., audio-visual techniques) and to relate one's teaching of the language to other areas of the curriculum.

Superior: A mastery of recognized teaching methods, and the ability to experiment with and evaluate new methods and techniques.

Test: Such knowledge and ability can be tested by multiple-choice answers to questions on pedagogy and language-teaching methods, plus written comment on language-teaching situations.

The foregoing statement was prepared by the Steering Committee of the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association of America, and was subsequently endorsed for publication by the MLA Executive Council, by the Modern

Language Committee of the Secondary Education Board, by the Committee on the Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, and by the executive boards or councils of fifteen national and regional organizations.