

Higher Education Foreign Language Needs: Student Supply & Demand

*Scott McGinnis
National Foreign Language Center*

In the 200-some years since Jefferson built his “academical village” in Charlottesville, it may be argued that while the status of foreign language instruction in American higher education has remained at best marginal, the demand for the products of that instructional system has only increased, particularly in the months since September of 2001. Without describing the needs for foreign language expertise in the United States too narrowly by merely focusing on those programs producing expertise directly related to national and international security, it is unquestionable that such needs may well serve a major contributory role in justifying continued or enhanced financial support for language and international studies at the federal level.

In considering the supply of such language and area studies expertise, the most recent data (Brod and Welles 2000) clearly reveals the preponderance of enrollments in the most commonly taught languages (French, German, and Spanish). Table 1 provides examples of enrollments for some of the less commonly taught languages (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Russian) and least commonly taught languages (e.g., Arabic, Hindi, Korean) as well as the more commonly taught ones.

TABLE 1

Fall 1998 registrations in selected languages at American colleges & universities

| Language | Two-year colleges | Undergraduates | Graduates | Total |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Arabic | 1158 | 3902 | 445 | 5505 |
| Chinese | 4764 | 22,472 | 1220 | 28,456 |
| French | 29,807 | 164,407 | 4850 | 199,064 |
| German | 11,645 | 74,437 | 2938 | 89,020 |
| Hindi | -- | 767 | 64 | 831 |
| Japanese | 9219 | 32,588 | 1334 | 43,141 |
| Korean | 624 | 3546 | 309 | 4479 |
| Russian | 2286 | 20,451 | 964 | 23,791 |
| Spanish | 179,504 | 466,040 | 9064 | 656,590 |

However, such data is fundamentally meaningless without an understanding of the proficiency levels of those students being produced by American colleges and university language programs.

Based upon their 50 years of instructional experience, the Foreign Service Institute has developed benchmarks for instructional contact hours in order to achieve various degrees of foreign language proficiency, classified according to the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) rating scale. Table 2 below details the number of instructional hours necessary for a learner with average language learning aptitude to achieve “absolute speaking proficiency” at the ACTFL Advanced level (ILR level 2) for the same languages presented in Table 1. As noted by Brecht and Rivers, “the minimum working proficiency for most jobs requiring language competence in the government is ILR level 2 (ACTFL Advanced), while other positions in

private industry and in federal agencies require ACTFL Superior or ILR 3 and above” (2000, p. 99).

TABLE 2
Length of training to achieve absolute speaking proficiency in selected languages

| Language | Length of training |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Arabic | 1320 hours |
| Chinese | 1320 hours |
| French | 480 hours |
| German | 480 hours |
| Hindi | 720 hours |
| Japanese | 1320 hours |
| Korean | 1320 hours |
| Russian | 720 hours |
| Spanish | 480 hours |

Given the above data, it is clear that no standard four-year curriculum at the college or university level will be sufficient to produce proficiency of the sort needed for either government or private sector careers even in the more commonly taught languages. Consequently, a significant study abroad component has been increasingly understood to be essential for students to develop truly professional competencies. But as Brecht and Rivers comment, “most students of language in our nation’s schools and universities do not study abroad at all” (2000, p. 100). And those that do commence their study abroad experience at still relatively low levels of proficiency.

The Brecht and Rivers study analyzed a number of participant databases from the American Council of Teachers of Russian (ACTR), the Center for Arabic Studies Abroad (CASA), and the National Security Education Program (NSEP), all of which, with the exception of NSEP, focus exclusively on the Less Commonly Taught Languages (that is, all of the languages in Table 1 except French, German and Spanish). Consistently across LCTLs, students who had enrolled in a prototypical four-year language course curriculum at the college/university level without study abroad experience achieved at best a median proficiency of Intermediate Low on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). Table 3 below provides an example of such trends for undergraduate NSEP participants for a number of languages, both more and less commonly taught.

TABLE 3
NSEP undergraduate languages, preprogram proficiency count
(from Brecht & Rivers, 2000)

| Language | Number tested | Median proficiency |
|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Arabic | 11 | Novice Low |
| Chinese | 27 | Intermediate Low |
| Japanese | 19 | Novice High |
| Russian | 36 | Intermediate Low |
| Spanish | 31 | Intermediate Mid |

Similar trends can be seen in the self-reported OPI scores for students that had been awarded Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships during the academic years and summers for 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, as reflected in the data compiled through the Evaluation of Exchange, Language, International, and Area Studies (EELIAS) Project being conducted at the United States Department of Education. For those students with five years of foreign

language study, generally including a significant study abroad experience, the median OPI ratings ranged from proficiency levels of Advanced Mid to High in French, German and Spanish, but only Advanced Low to Mid for Chinese, Japanese and Russian, and only Intermediate Mid to High for LCTLs such as Arabic and Korean. Because the EELIAS database is still relatively limited (for each of the languages cited above, there were at most seven, and in some cases only a single student, that had completed five years of study prior to receiving the FLAS), it would be inappropriate to characterize such results as conclusive – to say nothing of the fact that these are all self-reported OPI ratings (cf. the NSEP ratings, which were obtained through the use of a certified OPI tester). In any event, the database that is being developed through the EELIAS project may very well provide colleges and universities to better assess their success with regard to foreign language instruction.

Given these current conditions, the following recommendations are proposed for those engaged in teaching foreign languages in colleges and universities in the United States.

- There is a need to build the American foreign language educational “pipeline” both down and out – that is to say, to think not just in terms of vertical articulation, from kindergarten to college, but also in terms of horizontal articulation, among instructional settings both domestically and overseas, at all levels of instruction.
- There is a need for greater articulation with the heritage sector (and where they exist, heritage schools, such as for Chinese and Korean), wherein a significant population of genuinely bilingually and biculturally proficient young men and women are being developed even prior to commencing college study.
- There is need to enhance the articulation among the various programs supporting language learning at the advanced levels – including, but not limited to, those

supported by Department of Education (Title VI), the Department of Defense (e.g., DLI, NSEP, the National Flagship Language Initiative), and the Department of State (FSI) -- so that the participants view themselves not so much as being competitors for funds as they are collaborators for meeting national needs, with each of them serving unique roles with respect to those needs.

- Finally, and perhaps foremost, there is a need for the higher educational community to come to the realization that for some of the most critical languages in particular, colleges and universities are in fact a minority rather than a majority provider of foreign language education in the United States. No clearer case can be seen for that claim than in the Chinese language field, as detailed by the following measured and estimated enrollment figures.

TABLE 4

Most recent measured and current estimated Chinese language enrollments in the United States (from Brod & Welles 2000, SSCLC 2002, Wang 1996, and CSAUS 2002)

| Institutional level | Date of most recent measured enrollment | Measured enrollment | 2003 estimated enrollment |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Higher education | Autumn, 1998 | 28,456 | 30,000 |
| K-12 | Autumn, 2001 | 23,900 | 24,100 |
| Heritage school (Taiwan) | Autumn, 1994 | 82,675 | 110,000 |
| Heritage school (mainland) | Autumn, 2002 | 34,432 (incomplete) | 40,000 |

As the above data demonstrate, American colleges and universities only represent perhaps at most 20% of the Chinese language learning population in the United States. In their position at the exit point from the foreign language education pipeline, their need to provide high levels of instruction appropriate to their student populations has never been greater.

REFERENCES

- Brecht, R. and Rivers, W. (2000). *Language and National Security in the 21st Century*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Brod, R. and Welles, E. (2000). Foreign Language Enrollments in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1998. *ADFL Bulletin* 31.2, 22-29.
- Chinese School Association in the United States. (2002). Association Membership Statistics: A Brief Report (in Chinese). *CSAUS Newsletter* 30 (December 2002), 17.
- Foreign Service Institute. (1973). Expected Levels of Absolute Speaking Proficiency in Languages Taught at the Foreign Service Institute. Arlington, VA: Foreign Service Institute.
- Secondary School Chinese Language Center. (2002). A Report on 2001-2002 Chinese Enrollments At the Pre-Collegiate Level. *Secondary School Chinese Language Center Newsletter* 13(1), 4-13.
- Wang, X. (1996) *A View From Within: A Case Study of Chinese Heritage Community Language Schools in the United States*. Washington: National Foreign Language Center.