

FOGGY BOTTOM CONFERENCE

REPORT

Research Study Conference  
on Problems of State-Level Supervision  
of Instruction in Modern Foreign Languages

August 1-13, 1960

The George Washington University, Washington 6, D. C.

prepared by

Theodore Andersson, Conference Director

in collaboration with

Mildred Boyer, Professional Associate

with the assistance of

Ralph W. Bassett, Professional Associate

P-1.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education  
Washington 25, D. C.

Study Conference  
for  
State Supervisors of Foreign Languages

August 1-13, 1960  
Washington, D. C.

Sponsored Jointly by the Science, Mathematics and Foreign Language  
Section and the Language Development Section

Full-time Staff:

- Dr. Theodore Andersson, Conference Director  
Chairman, Department of Romance Languages, The University of Texas
- Mr. Ralph Bassett, Professional Assistant  
Supervisor, Foreign Languages, Portland Public  
Schools, Oregon
- Dr. Mildred Boyer, Professional Assistant  
Assistant Professor of Spanish and Italian  
The University of Texas

Visiting Consultants (in addition to Washington personnel):

- Mr. Donald D. Walsh, Director, Foreign Language Program  
Research Center, Modern Language Association of  
America, 70 Fifth Ave., New York 11, N. Y. (August 2-3)
- Dr. Nelson Brooks, Associate Professor of French  
Yale University, New Haven 11, Connecticut (August 4-5)
- Mrs. Andrea McHenry, Supervisor of Foreign Languages,  
Houston Independent School System, Texas (August 8-9)
- Miss Mary Thompson, Director of Curriculum and Instruction,  
Glastonbury Public Schools, Connecticut (August 10-11)

Conference Headquarters: Tompkins Hall of Engineering, George  
Washington University, 725 23rd St., N. W. (between G and H  
Streets)

First Meeting: Monday, August 1, 1960, at 8:30 a.m., in Room 202  
Tompkins Hall

*725 23rd Street*

STATE SUPERVISORS CONFERENCE

August 1-13

Washington, D. C.

Alabama	Miss Joanna Breedlove
Alaska	Mr. Herbert E. Bruce
Arkansas	Miss Wilma Jimerson
California	Dr. Emil O. Toews
Colorado	Miss Dorothy Duhon
District of Columbia	Mrs. Marjorie Bowen
Florida	Mr. O. E. Pérez
Georgia	Dr. M. Gordon Brown
Hawaii	Dr. Erwin Gordon
Idaho	Miss Jane J. Scott
Illinois	Dr. Robert O. deVette
Indiana	Dr. George F. Smith
Louisiana	Mrs. Lavinia McNeely
Maine	Mr. Edward F. Booth
Maryland	Mrs. Genevieve Blew
Massachusetts	Mr. James Powers
Minnesota	Mr. Jermaine Arendt
Missouri	Mr. David J. Burns
Montana	Mr. Lester McKim
Nevada	Mr. Philip D. Smith
New Mexico	Mr. Joseph Michel
New Hampshire	Mr. André Paquette
New York	Mr. Edgar Moreau
Oklahoma	Mr. Robert O. Sumter
Oregon	Dr. Paul Arriola
Pennsylvania	Dr. Louise Logan
Rhode Island	Mr. Clarence E. Sturtevant
Tennessee	Mrs. Sara Whitten
Texas	Miss Ann Greer
Utah	Mr. J. Dale Miller
Vermont	Mr. Louis T. M. DesChenes
Wyoming	Mr. William L. Wells

## Introduction

This report is being written in August 1960. Two short years ago, just before the passage of the National Defense Education Act, there were only two States, New York and Georgia, which had in their departments of education supervisors of foreign languages. New York has had at least one FL specialist since 1915 and now has six professionals responsible exclusively for providing guidance and leadership in foreign language instruction. Georgia appointed its supervisor in July 1958. The District of Columbia has had a department head or supervisor going back at least as far as 1918, and provision for a head of department was made in the Organic Act of 1906. Thanks to the encouragement and assistance provided by the National Defense Education Act, 37 States have now appointed at least one professional responsible for supervising foreign languages. Not all of these, however, are full-time appointments. In one or two cases a university professor has been appointed on a part-time basis to perform this function. In other cases, the supervisor is responsible for foreign languages and one or more other fields, usually science or mathematics. The modern foreign languages are lagging behind science and mathematics, each of which has supervisors in 44 States. Only 35 States have supervisors in all three fields.

Several of the State supervisors have been on their jobs for only a few weeks or months. One of the chief purposes of the present Conference was therefore to provide those supervisors who have so far been appointed with an opportunity to meet, become acquainted with one another, and discuss some of the problems of their new positions. Each State was invited to send one representative. Thirty-two States responded to the invitation. (See Appendix A: State Supervisors' Conference and State Supervisors for Modern Foreign Languages, August 1960). Others expressed interest but for one reason or another could not send a representative. In several cases, the State supervisor of foreign languages had already made plans for professional work, study, or travel. On the whole, the response of State departments of education and of State FL supervisors was most gratifying.

This report aims to describe how the Research Study Conference may have contributed toward the improvement of modern foreign language teaching in the United States. After a brief word concerning its origin and its double sponsorship in the Office of Education, we shall summarize the Conference itself and attempt an evaluation of its significance.

## How the Conference Came About

Though unprecedented in many ways, the present Conference was not the first meeting of State supervisors. In August 1959 the Science, Mathematics, and Foreign Language Section of the U. S. Office of Education organized in St. Paul, Austin, Boise, Montpelier, Washington, and Atlanta six Regional Conferences for State Supervisory Personnel under Title III to discuss responsibilities of State supervisors. The Conference Summary, including a statement by Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston on "Trends in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages" contains much valuable information. (See Appendix B: Summary of Regional Conferences for Science, Mathematics, and Foreign Languages Supervisory Personnel.)

A second meeting, at the Palmer House in Chicago on December 29, 1959, in connection with the Seventy-fourth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association, brought together supervisors from 22 States as well as chairmen of State advisory committees for foreign languages from four States. The meeting had been organized chiefly by Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston of the Science, Mathematics, and Foreign Language Section of the Office of Education, but because of illness she could not preside at the meeting and her place was taken by Dr. Joseph C. Hutchinson of the same Section. On this occasion State supervisors received reports from Dr. John R. Ludington, Director, Aid to State and Local Schools Branch, Office of Education, and Dr. Kenneth W. Mildenerger, Chief, Language Development Section, Division of Higher Education, Office of Education, concerning activities under NDEA in the field of modern foreign languages. They also heard reports from Mr. Donald D. Walsh, Director of the Foreign Language Program Research Center of the Modern Language Association, and from Dr. Wesley Childers, Director of Research, Foreign Language Research Center of the MLA, concerning the services of the Center. Discussion at this meeting, though limited by time, sufficed to define further the problems which were to be discussed more extensively during the Research Study Conference in Washington. (For a full account of the Chicago meeting see Appendix C: Report of the Meeting of State Supervisors of Modern Foreign Languages, December 29, 1959.)

In July 1960, a series of five Regional Conferences for State Supervisory Personnel under Title III, NDEA, were held in Nashville, Topeka, Salt Lake City, Madison, and Albany. These again were organized by staff members of the Science, Mathematics, and Foreign Language Section of the Office of Education and served further to put the State supervisors in touch with up-to-date information and to discuss some of their common problems. (For a full account of the section meetings on foreign languages see Appendix D: Regional Conference Summary: Modern Foreign Language Group Meetings.)

The Research Study Conference on Problems of State-Level Supervision of Instruction in Modern Foreign Languages, August 1-13, 1960, is therefore

a fourth step in the effort by the Office of Education to place at the disposal of State supervisors of modern foreign languages information and materials necessary to enable them to carry out their leadership roles in their respective States. Chief credit for conceiving the idea of this Conference goes to Dr. Kenneth W. Mildenberger, but the Science, Mathematics, and Foreign Language Section of the Aid to State and Local Schools Branch of the Division of State and Local School Systems early expressed a desire to collaborate and shared equally with the Language Development Section of the Financial Aid Branch of the Division of Higher Education in preparing for the Conference and in supporting it financially. Once official approval was obtained for this unprecedented meeting, the staff members in these two Sections, assisted by Miss Esther M. Eaton, Foreign Language Specialist in the Instruction, Organizations, and Services Branch of the Division of State and Local School Systems of the Office of Education, and many others collaborated enthusiastically in order as far as possible to assure the success of the Conference.

## Action and Recommendations

The following proposals represent the consensus of the Conference. Not necessarily every individual would agree completely to every detail in these proposals, but there was no serious dissent from anything contained herein.

The Conference approved unanimously of the recommendation of a special committee presided over by Mr. J. Dale Miller of Utah to establish the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages for the purpose of: 1) assuring continuing communication; 2) providing opportunity for considering FL issues; and 3) providing for exchange of information, ideas, and materials. Dr. Robert O. deVette of Illinois was elected Coordinating Secretary of the new Council. A first meeting of the Council was planned for the morning of December 29, 1960, in Hotel Sylvania in Philadelphia in connection with the Seventy-fifth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association of America. (See Appendix M: Establishment of the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages.)

A special committee under the chairmanship of Joseph Michel of New Mexico undertook to define the leadership role of the State supervisor of foreign languages under the following headings: Consultative and informational services to various professional individuals and organizations and to the general public; guidance and direction in developing leadership among teachers, stimulating activities, marshalling resources, and strengthening teacher training; coordination with other educational administrators; dissemination of professional information; administration of NDEA Title III and coordination with other titles of the NDEA; research; and self-improvement. In addition the committee recommended the Report of the Foreign Language Group Meeting of the Title III Regional Conference held in Nashville, Tennessee, July 11-12, 1960 as a valuable source document on the same subject. (See Appendix N: The Leadership Role of the State Supervisor of Foreign Languages.)

In order to study in more detail the leadership role of the State supervisor of foreign languages the Conference decided to create a special committee on the gathering, exchange, and dissemination of professional information, under the chairmanship of Dr. George Smith of Indiana. This committee pointed out the great need for exchanging information on such matters as research needed or in progress, experimental programs, reports, articles, bulletins, bibliographies, etc., concerned with foreign language developments. The committee therefore recommended 1) that the U. S. Office of Education continue to provide the State supervisors periodically with revised lists of its available publications having a direct bearing on foreign languages; 2) that the MLA Foreign Language Research Center also provide respective State supervisors of foreign languages with a similar list of its available publications; 3) that the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages establish a clearing house for the exchange of important FL information; 4) that the State supervisors of foreign languages encourage and support the publication of State newsletters to be distributed to all

FL teachers and principal administrative personnel in their respective States; 5) that State supervisors assume responsibility for gathering and distributing materials to FL teachers in their States; and 6) that the State supervisors take care to indicate clearly the source, availability, and price of all materials distributed. In addition the committee listed some vehicles for exchange and dissemination of information and some types of information needed. (See Appendix O: Gathering, Exchange, and Dissemination of Professional Information.)

Harried as the State supervisors are by equipment and textbook salesmen, they were particularly eager to agree on some criteria for the selection and best use of equipment and materials. A committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert O. deVette of Illinois submitted a report which stressed the importance of linguistically and culturally authentic models and the importance of high quality in reproduction equipment. In addition the entire Conference prepared a list of factors to be considered in the selection of materials and equipment. (See Appendix P: Criteria for the Selection and Best Use of Equipment and Materials, and Selection of Materials and Equipment.)

The public relations function of the State supervisor was also considered to be of enough importance to deserve study by a special committee. A committee chaired by Dr. M. Gordon Brown of Georgia submitted a report which emphasized the importance from a public relations point of view of a sound FL program, urged that some thought be given to increasing the teaching of the major neglected languages (MNLs), and that the State supervisor should undertake a continuing and well planned program of information to the educational profession, to parents and other citizens, and to civic and professional groups. The committee also endorsed and recommended to the Conference the Report of the Foreign Language Group Meeting of the Title III Regional Conference held in Nashville, Tennessee, July 11-12, 1960, as a valuable source document on this subject. (See Appendix Q: The Public Relations Function of the State Supervisor.)

Recognizing that improved understanding between East and West is of vital concern to us all and that some 75% of the world's people speak languages which are virtually ignored in American schools the Conference considered it of utmost urgency and importance that the major neglected languages (MNLs) be taught much more widely in our schools. To this effect a committee chaired by Dr. Erwin Gordon of Hawaii recommended 1) that a survey be made in each State to identify teachers now available to teach the major neglected languages; 2) that a careful search be made for other persons who with a little further training could teach such languages; 3) that colleges, universities, and especially teacher training institutions make broader provision, especially at the undergraduate level, for professional preparation in the major neglected languages; 4) that, however, instruction in the major neglected languages not be started unless schools are prepared to offer an adequate sequential program; 5) that each State make a special effort to stimulate interest in major neglected languages; 6) that States undertake to ascertain the extent of the public's desire to foster the study of major neglected languages and to satisfy this desire; 7) that reaffirmation be made of the intent of the NDEA to strengthen instruction in all



modern languages; and, 8) that foreign language professionals themselves consider studying a major neglected language of their choice as a contribution to widening our linguistic and cultural horizon. (See Appendix R: Increasing School Offerings in the Major Neglected Languages.)

The Conference gratefully acknowledged the invaluable services already being performed by the U. S. Office of Education and by the Modern Language Association of America. One of the purposes of this Conference, however, was to determine further services needed by State supervisors. A committee chaired by Dr. Paul Arriola of Oregon expressed a desire for: 1) continued information from the U. S. Office of Education concerning such basic materials as, for example, the Beginning Audio-Lingual Materials, Belasco's Linguistic Manual, and Modern Spanish; 2) information concerning the development of typical sequences of study in sufficient detail to serve as guides for course descriptions at the State and local levels, e.g., K-1-12, 3-12, 7-12, 9-12, K through college; 3) aid from the U. S. Office of Education in promoting closer cooperation between university foreign language departments, schools of education, and State supervisors; 4) development of guidelines for the formation of State advisory committees; 5) development of guidelines on area and State workshops, demonstrations, and conferences; 6) guidelines in establishing research projects at the State level; 7) continuing centralized evaluation of materials and equipment; and, 8) continued concern on the part of the U. S. Office of Education for the need for further professional development by State language supervisors. In this connection the Conference expressed the hope that it would prove possible for the Office of Education to sponsor annually such conferences as this. (Appendix S: Services Needed by State Supervisors of Foreign Languages.)

Since research lies at the heart of progress in education, the Conference created a committee under the chairmanship of André Paquette of New Hampshire to draft recommendations on needed research in FL instruction. Among the problems most urgently needing research or experimentation the committee listed the following: 1) evaluation of the effects of the audio-lingual approach on reading achievement at all levels; 2) a contrastive study at the beginning level of the use of the audio-lingual presentation versus the audio-lingual-visual presentation with similar content; 3) research to explore ways in which a second language may be used as a means of acquiring skills and knowledge in other subject matter areas; 4) a comparative analysis of results obtained from the use of electronic equipment according as the use of this equipment is supervised by a FL teacher or native informant or not supervised; 5) research designed to determine whether: a) hearing and speaking should proceed together or separately, b) reading and writing should be introduced separately or together, after a period of audio-lingual instruction, c) perception of sounds and comprehension of meaningful utterances can be profitably separated; 6) evaluation of sequential programs of varying lengths to determine the relationship between the number of hours spent on the program and the results obtained; 7) evaluation of programs conducted by classroom teachers being trained simultaneously; 8) research to determine the relative educational achievement of students in schools conducted in one language and in those conducted in two languages;

9) research to determine the best means of preserving and developing the language and cultural heritage of children whose native language is not English; and, 10) research to determine effectiveness of foreign-born, foreign-educated teachers as compared with American-born teachers of similar competence, as measured by objective standards. In connection with point 9 the committee endorsed the teaching of English at the pre-school level to children whose mother tongue is not English, but deplored any loss of skill in the mother tongue or delay in acquiring literacy in the mother tongue. The Conference commended the Office of Education upon the many useful experiments and research projects it is sponsoring. It specifically endorsed the "Outline of Suggested Research in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching" communicated to the Conference by Dr. A. Bruce Gaarder and attached to Appendix T. (See Appendix T: Needed Research in FL Instruction.)

The lack of adequately prepared teachers in sufficient numbers is universally recognized to be one of the major obstacles to more rapid improvement in modern foreign language instruction in our country. A special committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Jermaine Arendt of Minnesota therefore submitted the following recommendations concerning both pre-service and in-service training:

1) Colleges and universities are urged to consider carefully their responsibilities in the present emergency for recruiting and training language teachers. They may need to reconsider their entire program if they are to produce the required number of teachers qualified to use modern methods in their teaching.

2) There is urgent need for colleges and universities to use the Teacher Proficiency Tests being developed by the Modern Language Association and to develop other tests, especially to measure as objectively as possible professional competence in the classroom.

3) Teacher education institutions should reconsider their frequent insistence upon specific course requirements and the accumulation of credits, in favor of a more flexible way of meeting the specific needs of each prospective teacher. By the use of diagnostic tests institutions can determine areas in which a candidate is fully qualified to teach, partially qualified, or not qualified. Provision should be made for preparation designed to overcome specific deficiencies. When properly validated, proficiency should be accredited, no matter how it has been acquired.

4) It is imperative that colleges provide foreign language courses sequential with programs in good high schools which have audio-lingual instruction.

5) Colleges and universities are urged to weigh seriously their responsibility in connection with credentials issued to prospective teachers of modern foreign languages. Such credentials should certify the degree of proficiency a candidate has in controlling the foreign language and also his demonstrated classroom competence.

6) State departments of education, in cooperation with other interested agencies, are urged to reconsider certification procedures for foreign language teachers with a view to providing greater flexibility and achieving greater uniformity from State to State.

Referring to teachers in service, the committee found that while many foreign language teachers are doing excellent work in using audio-lingual methods, the vast majority still use a grammar-translation method of teaching. In the national interest, these teachers should be given an opportunity to learn the newer methods so that they may help to produce the needed number of Americans who can communicate with people of other nations. The proficiencies and deficiencies of teachers in training should be diagnosed, by means of the MLA Teacher Proficiency Tests and by other means, and training to overcome these deficiencies should be provided through NDEA institutes, through university courses, through workshops, TV programs, or specially designed training films. Teachers should be given the opportunity to visit and observe other teachers who are successfully using audio-lingual methods. Continuous and unrelenting efforts to reorient teachers who so desire should be made by proper local and State officials. Proficient native speakers who can teach satisfactorily should have the opportunity to be provisionally certified until such time as their readiness to teach can be fully validated. (See Appendix U: Concerning Teacher Preparation.)

A committee under the chairmanship of Mrs. Lavinia McNeely of Louisiana studied the ways in which language institutes can contribute to the strengthening of State programs in foreign languages. This committee specifically endorsed and approved the idea of national institutes as a means of providing teacher education in the field of modern foreign languages. The committee made the following recommendations: 1) that the program be expanded as much as possible so as to reach an increasing number of teachers and in order that the national purpose of the program be effected; 2) that there be further diversity in the general nature of institutes to provide for the needs of FL instructional personnel. Provision should be made for institutes for supervisors of foreign language instruction, for college instructors who will be responsible for the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers of foreign language, and for teachers who wish to move from one level to another. 3) that the number of languages offered be increased, that institutes in foreign countries be encouraged as uniquely suited to effecting major improvement of FL teacher preparation in terms of enculturation and language proficiency, that institutes specializing in certain techniques and media be considered, and that institutes for native speakers of FLs be set up to provide training in American educational philosophy and practices; 4) that flexibility be encouraged within an institute to provide for individual needs as evidenced by the diagnostic tests; 5) that the presentation of applied linguistics be improved as a useful and necessary basis for language teaching; 6) that the staff of an institute use the techniques and materials which they seek to encourage teachers to use; 7) that teachers of demonstration classes be chosen with great care, with due consideration to previous training, experience, and demonstrated ability

at their level of instruction; 8) that efforts be made to encourage institutes to offer courses with credit either in foreign languages or education and that their programs be so planned as to meet the existing needs of elementary and secondary school instructional personnel who wish to master modern methods and not be merely an adaptation of existing graduate courses; and, 9) that coordination be effected between institute personnel and State and local supervisors so that the fullest possible exchange of information may be achieved about State programs and personnel. (See Appendix V: The Role of Language Institutes in Strengthening State Programs in Foreign Languages.)

Another obstacle to enlisting qualified teachers in our classrooms in sufficient numbers are the antiquated and rigid certification procedures which still prevail in many of our States. A special committee under the able chairmanship of Dr. Emil O. Toews of California made a careful study of this difficult and delicate subject and submitted as a basis for further discussion a report and a bibliography which deserve close study. Since a summary would only serve to misrepresent this report, the reader is referred to Appendix W: Report of the Committee on Teacher Certification.

Time did not allow a thorough study of the conditions affecting the status of the State supervisor of foreign languages. However, a committee under the chairmanship of J. Dale Miller of Utah prepared a questionnaire late in the session, which was filled out by 23 participants. An analysis of this questionnaire reveals that conditions vary considerably from State to State and that in many States the FL supervisor works under great handicaps. (For an analysis of this questionnaire see Appendix X: Working Conditions Affecting the Status of the State Supervisor of Foreign Languages.)

Finally, 29 of the supervisors contributed to an informal evaluation of the Conference by filling out a questionnaire on the last day. An analysis of this questionnaire reveals that the participants considered the content of the Conference useful and were satisfied with the outcomes. Almost all agreed that future conferences are desirable but that they can now be more specialized. (See Appendix Y: Research Study Conference: Participants' Evaluation.)

## Conclusion

A period of two weeks seemed initially to some of the State supervisors as more than enough time to consider educational issues of common concern. It was soon realized, however, that two weeks was all too short a time. We could only touch most sketchily on many problems, analyze them briefly, and draw hasty conclusions, subject to closer study later.

The general picture was clear enough. The capital fact is that not enough Americans are learning enough languages well enough. Thanks to William R. Parker's National Interest and Foreign Languages and the frequent publicizing of our linguistic shortcomings, the public is coming to understand our needs. Thanks to the work of linguistic scientists and to the increasingly close collaboration between linguists and language teachers, the nature and function of language is also coming to be better understood. The work of cultural anthropologists is also helping language teachers to understand the nature of language as an important aspect of human behavior. Only a few scattered psychologists, however, are working on the process of enculturation or of second language learning.

Despite the fact that we have many educated speakers of other languages who could be prepared to teach and despite the fact that we could arrange exchanges of teachers with other countries, we are sadly lacking in enough qualified teachers of modern foreign languages. Our teacher education institutions have not yet addressed themselves vigorously enough to the problem, leaving too much to be done in the remedial programs of language institutes.

The pressing into service of potential foreign language teachers is hampered also by outdated and rigid certification procedures. As was brought out by a recent survey by the Modern Language Association of America of certification practices in the various States, not a single State requires that a foreign language teacher understand and speak the language he teaches. Instead, a system of course credits is still in use in most States. It is true that State departments of education have to depend upon the teacher preparing institution to apprise the readiness of a candidate to teach. Unfortunately, there is no necessary relationship between the credential issued by the teacher preparing institution and the candidate's mastery of a foreign language or of classroom technique. Teachers of foreign languages both in the elementary and the secondary school are often kept too busy with classes that are both too numerous and too large and with housekeeping chores to be able to contribute to the need for modern materials and methods or to design and conduct badly needed experiments.

Into this still chaotic but rapidly growing field comes the State supervisor of foreign languages. Despite salaries and working conditions which in many cases are shockingly inadequate, many of the supervisors are highly competent specialists able to direct the foreign language situation in their particular States. Collectively they will, thanks especially to their new organization, which now binds them together more closely, help to improve the quality of modern foreign language instruction in their States.

They also present a great hope for unifying a field which in the past suffered from fragmentation. Each AAT (American Association of Teachers of -- French, German, etc.) has been concerned almost exclusively with its own language. The Modern Language Association of America is a learned society for college teachers primarily, and more than half are in the field of English. There is no national organization which brings teachers of foreign languages, classical and modern, into a close working relationship. The State supervisor of foreign languages comes to occupy a most strategic position of strength in the midst of this situation. Located in the State department of education, where responsibility for American education is traditionally centered, he can exercise vigorous leadership within his State and can now through the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages correlate his efforts with those of his fellow supervisors in other States, acting as a point of contact and liaison with the U.S. Office of Education, with the Modern Language Association of America, with the AATs, and with the various regional organizations.

Two years ago only Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston and one research assistant in the Office of Education were responsible for foreign languages. Now there is a professional staff of 24. Two years ago the Modern Language Association FL Program, directed by Dr. Kenneth W. Mildenerger, had only three staff members. Now it has a staff of 22. Two years ago there was little favorable reaction to a proposal for a department of foreign languages in the National Education Association. Now over 250 FL teachers who are members of NEA from over 25 States have petitioned for such a department. There is no committee concerned with foreign languages in the American Council on Education. And whereas the National Science Foundation exists for the purpose of improving the teaching of science, there is no corresponding organization to assist in the up-grading of teaching in the field of modern foreign languages or indeed of the humanities in general.

The Research Study Conference was organized for the purpose of helping the State supervisors of foreign languages to bring up-to-date their acquaintance with the situation in the language field. The U. S. Office of Education has no desire to control education in the States and would not be allowed to do so if it wished, but it does have access to

information and materials and it does have a tradition of research, all of which should be placed at the disposal of authorized State officials.. A mass of such information and materials was assembled and distributed (See Appendix J.)

Representative leaders in the foreign language field and in adjacent fields reported on their latest work and thinking. The supervisors had ample opportunity to exchange views and ideas with one another, formally and informally. They left with the feeling, the staff believes, that they had accomplished a good two weeks' work, that they had become much better acquainted, that they understood the nature of the task which faces each one in his particular State, and that they had derived strength from associating with the other supervisors and with FL colleagues in the U. S. Office of Education. Analysis of an evaluation questionnaire filled out by 29 participants (See Appendix Y: Research Study Conference: Participants' Evaluation.) seems to support the conclusion that the Conference succeeded in large part in achieving its objectives.

For pictures of the Conference taken by Leonard Comparetto and Stan Singer, Staff Photographers of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the reader is referred to Appendix Z.