

Successful College and University Foreign Language Programs, 1995–99: Part 3: Program Features Associated with Rising Enrollments in AA-Granting Institutions

Natalia Lusin

ADFL Bulletin, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Spring 2005), pp. 63–78

ISSN: 0148-7639

CrossRef DOI: 10.1632/adfl.36.3.63

Copyright © 2005 by The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages

All material published by the The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages in any medium is protected by copyright. Users may link to the ADFL Web page freely and may quote from ADFL publications as allowed by the doctrine of fair use. Written permission is required for any other reproduction of material from any ADFL publication.

Send requests for permission to reprint material to the ADFL permissions manager by mail (26 Broadway, New York, NY 10004-1789), e-mail (permissions@mla.org), or fax (646 458-0030).

Successful College and University Foreign Language Programs, 1995–99: Part 3

Program Features Associated with Rising Enrollments in AA-Granting Institutions

Natalia Lusin

THIS is the third article to report on a project undertaken by the MLA to discover what factors make foreign language programs successful. The project was funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. In the fall of 1999, the MLA's Office of Foreign Language Programs conducted a survey to collect data relating to rising enrollments and specific practices of departments of foreign languages. In parts 1 and 2 of our report, the focus was on BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting departments and institutions (Goldberg and Welles; Goldberg, Lusin, and Welles); less emphasis was placed on AA-granting institutions. Because they are so different in structure and function, we decided to analyze language departments in AA-granting institutions in a separate article. While our project was undertaken to discover what features make foreign language programs successful, the results described in this report are not proof of a causal connection between program features and rising enrollments. What the results show are co-occurrences (associations, correlations) between features and enrollments; the frequency, strength, and circumstances of these co-occurrences do, however, suggest a causal link.

We defined successful departments as those with increasing enrollments. While such a quantitative measure excludes more subtle and complex ways of determining departmental success, it is a consistent measure and one often used by administrators to evaluate a department's progress. In parts 1 and 2 of our report, BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting language departments were broken out into language programs; for this study dealing with AA-granting institutions, the unit of analysis is the department. Five hundred

and thirteen departments of AA-granting institutions participated in this survey. We excluded departments for which we did not have enrollment data, because they could not be categorized as having decreasing, stable, or increasing enrollments. We therefore had a base of 484 departments from 465 institutions. For some questions, the number is less than 484, because not all departments answered all the questions.

In our analysis of the data, we found that some features occur very frequently in AA-granting institutions and that some (not necessarily the same ones) have a high correlation with enrollment growth. The features that seem to matter most for AA-granting institutions are often different from those that matter for BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions.

On the most obvious level, language departments in AA-granting institutions differ from those in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions because they are often part of large, nonlanguage divisions and do not offer advanced courses. They also differ in the languages that are taught in them. If we look for a moment at language programs rather than departments in AA-granting institutions, we can see that of 1,429 language programs, 34.9% are Spanish. The corresponding percentage for BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions is 22.7% (of 4,318 language programs).

The author is Assistant Director for Information Services in the MLA's Office of English and Foreign Language Programs.

American Sign Language (ASL) is also a stronger presence in AA-granting institutions (2.6% of 1,429 programs) than in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions (0.6% of 4,318 programs).

The most commonly taught languages (Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish) are offered by institutions at all degree-granting levels. More European, Asian, African, Middle Eastern, and classical languages are offered by BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions than by AA-granting institutions. But AA-granting institutions offer more Native American languages.

Table 1 shows that departments in AA-granting institutions are at the high end of the continuum of growth seen at BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions. The percentage of AA-granting institutions with increasing introductory-level foreign language enrollments from 1995 to 1999 is a robust 61.4%. For BA-granting institutions it is 49.5%, for MA-granting institutions it is 57.5%, and for PhD-granting institutions it is 51.7%.¹

When broken down by language, the results are similar. In AA-granting institutions, the percentage of language programs with increasing introductory-level enrollments is higher than in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions in every language except Russian and ASL (compare tables 2 and 3).

Practices and Features

The survey asked questions about departmental practices and features: teaching approaches, curricular characteristics, administrative arrangements, study abroad, and resources for students and faculty members. As might be expected, many departments in AA-granting institutions have close links to the community in which they are located. A large percentage (68.9) say that they sponsor language courses for the local community. A somewhat smaller but still significant percentage (43.2) sponsor lectures, 40.7% sponsor films, and 47.3% provide other interaction between the department and the neighboring community.

BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions provide services for their local communities even more frequently than AA-granting institutions do: 60.8% sponsor lectures, 57.4% sponsor films, and 53.9% provide other interaction between the department and the local community. In one area AA-granting institutions are stronger: only 39.1% of BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions sponsor language courses for the local community.

Given that many students at AA-granting institutions are not traditional students, and may require technological resources as a supplement to traditional classroom study, it is not surprising to find that the use of technology at AA-granting institutions, both by faculty members and students, is widespread. Seventy-eight percent of departments provide support for faculty technology training. Technology resources for students are varied: 72.8% of departments provide technology resources for student practice outside the classroom, 67.7% provide it for in-classroom practice, 52.9% use technology for distance learning, and 58.9% have language labs on campus. (A lower percentage of departments use technology for testing and placement: 28.8%.)

By a small margin, departments in AA-granting institutions train faculty members in the use of technology (78.1%) more than do departments in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions (74.9%). Resources for the use of technology by students appear less frequently at AA-granting institutions than at BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions, with one notable exception: technology resources for distance learning are much more frequently encountered at AA-granting institutions (52.9%) than at BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions (25.6%).

AA-granting institutions engage in outreach efforts (articulation) between high school and college: 42.4% of departments facilitate the placement of high school students, and 43.6% have an exchange of information between faculty members from both levels. Outreach in the form of common curriculum development, however, is less frequent (23.8%).

In the area of outreach, AA-granting institutions are stronger than BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions: they more frequently use their connection with high schools to facilitate the placement of incoming high school students (42.4% vs. 30.1%), and they more frequently engage in common curriculum development (23.8% vs. 18.1%). They have approximately the same frequency of exchange of information between high school and college faculty members as BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions do (43.6% vs. 42.8%).

A remarkably high percentage of departments in AA-granting institutions (56.4) do not have a study-abroad program. This is to be expected: many students are older than traditional college students, work full-time, and have family obligations. They are therefore less likely to have the flexibility in their schedules to allow them to travel abroad for a semester or even a month of study.

Table 1
AA-Granting Institutions Compared with BA-, MA-, and PhD-Granting Institutions: Trends in Foreign Language Enrollment, 1995–99

Highest Degree Granted	Enrollment Trend by Number of Departments						Total Number
	Loss		Stable		Gain		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
AA	89	18.4	98	20.2	297	61.4	484
BA	86	28.4	67	22.1	150	49.5	303
MA	119	24.5	87	17.9	279	57.5	485
PhD	146	28.5	102	19.9	265	51.7	513
Total	440	24.6	354	19.8	991	55.5	1,785

Table 2
Trends in Foreign Language Enrollment by Language, 1995–99 in AA-Granting Institutions

Language	Enrollment Trend by Number of Departments						Total Number
	Loss		Stable		Gain		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
ASL	5	14.3	4	11.4	26	74.3	35
Chinese	6	18.2	8	24.2	19	57.6	33
French	55	16.0	70	20.4	218	63.6	343
German	38	19.4	36	18.4	122	62.2	196
Italian	8	10.8	20	27.0	46	62.2	74
Japanese	9	10.5	25	29.1	52	60.5	86
Russian	4	14.3	11	39.3	13	46.4	28
Spanish	87	18.4	94	19.9	292	61.7	473
Other	12	13.3	13	14.4	65	72.2	90

Table 3
Trends in Foreign Language Enrollment by Language, 1995–99, in BA-, MA-, and PhD-Granting Institutions

Language	Enrollment Trend by Number of Departments						Total Number
	Loss		Stable		Gain		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
ASL	3	12.0	2	8.0	20	80.0	25
Chinese	45	28.8	26	16.7	85	54.5	156
French	210	24.2	172	19.9	484	55.9	866
German	190	28.1	129	19.1	358	52.9	677
Italian	54	19.6	52	18.8	170	61.6	276
Japanese	71	25.1	58	20.5	154	54.4	283
Russian	83	38.2	27	12.4	107	49.3	217
Spanish	216	23.0	189	20.1	533	56.8	938
Other	194	27.2	134	18.8	386	54.1	714

A substantial majority of departments, 69.5%, emphasize culture over literature in their introductory language courses. In this, AA-granting institutions are similar to BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions, where the percentage is 69.3.

For departmental practices and features, in only nine of the forty-three questions analyzed is the AA-granting category significantly higher in frequency than the BA-, MA-, PhD-granting category (see table B in the appendix). It appears that departments in AA-granting institutions have less opportunity to provide special features and resources, beyond the basic ones, for their students and faculty members.

Correlations

A correlation shows which program feature is associated with enrollment growth and to what degree that association exists. Responses were analyzed by comparing programs with and without a specified feature or characteristic in the three categories of decreasing, stable, and increasing enrollments. We focus here on the relation of a feature to increasing enrollment. The percent that expresses the correlation of growth with a feature equals the difference between the percent of programs that have that feature and the percent that do not. For example, when there was a full-time coordinator for the introductory sequence, 69.2% of departments in AA-granting institutions had increasing enrollments; in the absence of that coordinator, only 57.9% had increasing enrollments. The correlation with growth is the difference between those percents: 11.3%. In other words, AA-granting institutions that have a full-time introductory-level coordinator are 11.3% more likely to experience enrollment growth than those that do not.

In this article, all features having a correlation with growth of 4% or greater will be discussed. Although 4% may appear to represent only a modest difference in gain from 1995 to 1999, it signals an annual average gain of 1%, and the consistency of that gain (not to mention that it points to the likelihood of continuation) is significant.

Heritage Learners

In AA-granting institutions, departmental features involving heritage learners all have correlations with growth of over 4% in enrollments. For departments that have specially designed classes for heritage learners, the correlation with growth is 4.8%; for those with

special materials for heritage learners, it is 8.5%; and for those that have special preparation for faculty members to teach heritage learners, it is 15.6%. It would appear that language departments in AA-granting institutions are responding to the needs of heritage students, a significant segment of their student population. Students are enrolling in language courses in larger numbers wherever there are programs that accommodate their special circumstances. In contrast, language departments in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions have lower correlations with growth for these features, and only those that have special preparation for faculty members to teach heritage learners show a correlation with growth of 4.0%.

Coordinator for the Introductory Sequence

As stated above, when there is a full-time coordinator for the introductory sequence in AA-granting institutions, the correlation with growth in enrollments is an impressive 11.3%. This percentage suggests that the guidance and continuity provided by a coordinator help maintain a strong language program. (BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions show a slightly negative association with this feature (-1.1%), but only when all languages and levels are grouped together.)²

Culture versus Literature

In AA-granting institutions, when there is an emphasis on culture rather than on literature in introductory language courses, the correlation with growth is 7.9%. Any other approach (an emphasis on literature rather than on culture or an equal emphasis on literature and culture) produces a negative correlation. The results for departments in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions show no correlation with growth over 4% except when the emphasis is on literature over culture in introductory language courses. But the low number of positive responses to that question means that this finding should not be considered indicative of a trend in the field, and therefore there is no basis for comparison with the results for AA-granting institutions. On the other hand, the number of positive responses from AA-granting institutions to the question of emphasis on culture over literature is quite high (211).

The Local Community

In three of the services provided for the local community—lectures, films, and language courses—AA-granting institutions show a negative correlation with

growth in enrollment. Only in the fourth, “other interaction between the department and the local community,” is there a positive correlation, 7.1%. Departments in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions are also weak in this area, with none of the correlations with growth approaching 4%.

Special Opportunities

Features that we grouped under the category “special opportunities” play a lesser role at AA-granting institutions than they do at BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions. Only one feature, intensive language courses, has a good correlation with growth in enrollments (4.0%) and a sufficiently high number of positive responses to the question (52) to be significant. Other questions in this group have higher correlations with growth but a very low number of positive responses. Presemester programs have a 25.0% correlation with growth but only 11 positive responses; the corresponding numbers for language houses are 19.2% and 4, for internships in the community 10.3% and 19. But for BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions, five of the eight features related to special opportunities for students have a high correlation with growth and in most cases the number of positive responses is not small.

Oral Proficiency Exams

Departments in AA-granting institutions were 6.4% more likely to experience a gain in enrollments if they conducted an assessment of students (during or after a course, in addition to assessment for purposes of grading) that used an oral proficiency exam. In contrast, departments in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions show a negative association with this use of oral proficiency exams.

Departmental Structure

A change in foreign language departments in AA-granting institutions from a single to a multilanguage structure is associated with a 14.2% correlation with growth. BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions show only a small positive association with that feature (1.2%).

It is hard to explain why both the use of oral proficiency exams for assessment and change in departmental structure should be so strongly associated with growth in AA-granting institutions but not in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions. These features, after all, are not specifically related to the type of institution.

Study Abroad

The correlation of growth in study abroad with growth in enrollments in AA-granting institutions is 6.9%. The total number of departments answering the question positively, however, is only 60. This number reflects the difficulties that many students in AA-granting institutions have in finding the time and resources to travel abroad. Departments in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions show a high correlation with growth, 10.0%, in connection with increasing enrollments in study-abroad programs. Other study-abroad opportunities—internships and service programs—show a correlation with growth in AA-granting institutions, 9.0% and 12.3% respectively. Again, the number of departments answering the question positively is small—in both cases, around 30.

Reading and Writing versus Oral Practice

The final finding discussed here concerns a series of questions on the balance between reading-writing and oral practice in the introductory sequence. In AA-granting institutions, all possible combinations generate a negative or very low positive correlation with growth (emphasis on reading-writing over oral practice is -15.3% [with 36 positive responses], an equal emphasis on the two is -0.5% [with 167 positive responses], and an emphasis on oral practice over reading-writing is 0.9% [with 103 positive responses].) Surprisingly, only the last option, “Is the emphasis determined by the instructor?,” produces a sufficiently large response to be significant: 4.4% (with 176 positive responses). For departments in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions, the correlation with growth on this question is zero. It may be that in small language departments—and in AA-granting institutions departments are smaller—instructors must decide for themselves how to structure their courses. (In AA-granting institutions, 22.2% of departments have a single language, while in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions only 15.7% of departments are single-language.)

In sum, certain features, such as service programs in the community, the emphasis on oral practice over reading and writing, and the use of technology resources for testing and placement, that are important on the BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting level are not significant at the AA-granting level. But in other areas, such as study abroad, presemester programs, internships in the community, and special preparation for faculty

members to teach heritage learners, there is a correlation with growth at all institutional levels. Finally, some features are important at the AA-granting level but not at the BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting level: other services for heritage learners, introductory-level language coordinators, oral proficiency assessment, interaction between the department and the local community, departmental change from a single- to a multilanguage structure, intensive courses, the emphasis on culture over literature in introductory language courses, and the determination by the instructor of the balance between reading-writing and oral practice.

What applies to BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions does not necessarily apply to AA-granting institutions. The lower frequencies of response for AA-granting institutions indicate that these institutions often have more limitations in the special features that they can offer in their language departments. Students are often more limited in their time and resources. What AA-granting institutions do provide, judging from the large number of programs with rising enrollments, is compelling teaching. One wonders how much better enrollments would be if more financial resources were directed to foreign languages at these institutions.

Notes

¹The figures in these tables differ slightly from those in comparable tables in part 1 of this report (Goldberg and Welles),

because the percentage of enrollment change used to define the category “stable” is different. In this article, stable departments are those with enrollment change between -5% and $+5\%$; in part 1, “stable” was more narrowly defined.

²As stated in part 2 of this report (Goldberg, Lusin, and Welles), French and German advanced-level programs in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions have a correlation with growth of 12.8% and 8.9% , respectively, for this feature. The marked difference between these correlations and the correlation of -1.1% for departments in BA-, MA-, and PhD-granting institutions overall illustrates how results vary depending on the unit chosen for analysis. In the first case, the unit of analysis is the language program, not the department, and it is limited to advanced courses only. In the second, the unit of analysis is the department, and all languages and levels are grouped together. For correlations based on advanced language programs, see part 2. For correlations based on departments, see table D in the appendix.

Works Cited

- Goldberg, David, Natalia Lusin, and Elizabeth B. Welles. “Successful College and University Foreign Language Programs, 1995–99: Part 2: Program Features Associated with Rising Enrollments in Advanced Courses and with Increasing Numbers of Majors.” *ADFL Bulletin* 35.2–3 (2004): 27–70. 7 Sept. 2004. 22 Dec. 2004 <<http://www.mla.org>>. Path: Professional Resources; Surveys.
- Goldberg, David, and Elizabeth B. Welles. “Successful College and University Foreign Language Programs, 1995–99: Part 1.” *Profession* 2001. New York: MLA, 2001. 171–210. 7 Sept. 2004. 22 Dec. 2004 <<http://www.mla.org>>. Path: Professional Resources; Surveys.

Appendix

Table A: Frequencies: AA-Granting Institutions, All Languages (N = 484)

Question		Number	Percentage
1 Is there a foreign language entrance requirement?	Yes	30	6.2
	No	452	93.8
2 Is there a foreign language graduation requirement?	Yes	139	28.8
	No	344	71.2
3 Is there support for faculty study abroad?	Yes	181	37.4
	No	303	62.6
4 Is there release time for course development?	Yes	184	38.0
	No	300	62.0
5 Is there support for faculty technology training?	Yes	378	78.1
	No	106	21.9
6 Is there support for faculty research and scholarship?	Yes	143	29.5
	No	341	70.5
7 Does your department have a full-time introductory course coordinator?	Yes	143	29.6
	No	340	70.4
8 Is there assessment and placement of incoming students?	Yes	176	36.4
	No	308	63.6

Table A (Frequencies, cont.)

Question		Number	Percentage
Are there special opportunities:			
9 intensive courses?	Yes	81	32.1
	No	171	67.9
10 immersion programs?	Yes	41	16.3
	No	211	83.7
11 presemester programs?	Yes	13	5.2
	No	235	94.8
12 winter-break programs?	Yes	25	10.0
	No	226	90.0
13 weekend programs?	Yes	56	22.3
	No	195	77.7
14 language houses?	Yes	5	2.0
	No	245	98.0
15 internships in the community?	Yes	27	10.8
	No	223	89.2
16 service programs in the community?	Yes	47	18.7
	No	204	81.3
Introductory sequence:			
17 Does it emphasize reading-writing over oral practice?	Yes	36	7.5
18 Does it place equal emphasis on reading-writing and oral practice?	Yes	167	34.6
19 Does it emphasize oral practice over reading-writing?	Yes	103	21.4
20 Is its emphasis determined by the instructor?	Yes	176	36.5
Introductory language courses:			
21 Do they emphasize culture over literature?	Yes	331	69.5
22 Do they place equal emphasis on culture and literature?	Yes	122	25.6
23 Do they emphasize literature over culture?	Yes	23	4.8
Student opportunities abroad:			
24 Are there internships?	Yes	43	9.0
	No	433	91.0
25 Are there service programs?	Yes	44	9.2
	No	435	90.8
26 Are there exchange programs?	Yes	113	23.5
	No	367	76.5
Is there assessment of students:			
27 OPI, SOPI, MOPI?	Yes	179	37.2
	No	302	62.8
28 portfolios?	Yes	105	22.0
	No	373	78.0
Articulation with high schools:			
29 Is there placing of students?	Yes	205	42.4
	No	278	57.6
30 Is there faculty exchange?	Yes	211	43.6
	No	273	56.4
31 Is there curriculum development?	Yes	115	23.8
	No	368	76.2
Heritage learners:			
32 Are there specially designed classes for them?	Yes	104	21.6
	No	378	78.4
33 Are there specially designed materials for them?	Yes	95	19.8
	No	384	80.2

Table A (Frequencies, cont.)

Question		Number	Percentage
Heritage learners (cont.):			
34 Is there special preparation for faculty members to teach them?	Yes	57	11.9
	No	423	88.1
Does the department sponsor:			
35 lectures for the local community?	Yes	208	43.2
	No	274	56.8
36 films for the local community?	Yes	196	40.7
	No	285	59.3
37 language courses for the local community?	Yes	332	68.9
	No	150	31.1
38 Is there other interaction between the department and the local community?	Yes	227	47.3
	No	253	52.7
Has the department structure changed:			
39 from single- to multilanguage?	Yes	106	22.0
	No	375	78.0
40 from multi- to single-language?	Yes	32	6.7
	No	447	93.3
41 Has the department merged with another department in another discipline?	Yes	174	36.1
	No	308	63.9
Does the department use technology resources:			
42 in the classroom?	Yes	327	67.7
	No	156	32.3
43 for student practice outside class?	Yes	351	72.8
	No	131	27.2
44 for testing and placement?	Yes	138	28.8
	No	342	71.3
45 for distance learning?	Yes	255	52.9
	No	227	47.1
46 Does the department use a language lab on campus?	Yes	285	58.9
	No	199	41.1
47 Is there a separate language center on campus?	Yes	81	16.8
	No	402	83.2
Study-abroad enrollments:			
48 Are they increasing?	Yes	89	19.5
49 Are they stable?	Yes	78	17.1
50 Are they decreasing?	Yes	21	4.6
51 Is there yearly variation?	Yes	11	2.4
52 Is study abroad not offered?	Yes	257	56.4

Table B: Comparison of Frequencies: AA-Granting Institutions, All Languages (N = 484), and BA-, MA-, and PhD-Granting Institutions, All Languages (N = 1,355)

Question		AA (Percentage)	BA-MA-PhD (Percentage)
1 Is there a foreign language entrance requirement?	Yes	6.2	30.9
	No	93.8	69.1
2 Is there a foreign language graduation requirement?	Yes	28.8	73.6
	No	71.2	26.4
3 Is there support for faculty study abroad?	Yes	37.4	53.2
	No	62.6	46.8
4 Is there release time for course development?	Yes	38.0	42.5
	No	62.0	57.5
5 Is there support for faculty technology training?	Yes	78.1	74.9
	No	21.9	25.1
6 Is there support for faculty research and scholarship?	Yes	29.5	77.1
	No	70.5	22.9
7 Does your department have a full-time introductory course coordinator?	Yes	29.6	37.6
	No	70.4	62.4
8 Is there assessment and placement of incoming students?	Yes	36.4	69.5
	No	63.6	30.5
Are there special opportunities:			
9 intensive courses?	Yes	32.1	53.0
	No	67.9	47.0
10 immersion programs?	Yes	16.3	28.0
	No	83.7	72.0
11 presemester programs?	Yes	5.2	8.3
	No	94.8	91.7
12 winter-break programs?	Yes	10.0	15.6
	No	90.0	84.4
13 weekend programs?	Yes	22.3	9.9
	No	77.7	90.1
14 language houses?	Yes	2.0	24.6
	No	98.0	75.4
15 internships in the community?	Yes	10.8	34.2
	No	89.2	65.8
16 service programs in the community?	Yes	18.7	34.3
	No	81.3	65.7
Introductory sequence:			
17 Does it emphasize reading-writing over oral practice?	Yes	7.5	4.4
18 Does it place equal emphasis on reading-writing and oral practice?	Yes	34.6	40.6
19 Does it emphasize oral practice over reading-writing?	Yes	21.4	23.9
20 Is its emphasis determined by the instructor?	Yes	36.5	31.1
Introductory language courses:			
21 Do they emphasize culture over literature?	Yes	69.5	69.3
22 Do they place equal emphasis on culture and literature?	Yes	25.6	25.5
23 Do they emphasize literature over culture?	Yes	4.8	5.1
Student opportunities abroad:			
24 Are there internships?	Yes	9.0	52.2
	No	91.0	47.8
25 Are there service programs?	Yes	9.2	33.7
	No	90.8	66.3
26 Are there exchange programs?	Yes	23.5	64.7
	No	76.5	35.3

Table B (Comparison of Frequencies, cont.)

Question		AA (Percentage)	BA-MA-PhD (Percentage)
Is there assessment of students:			
27 OPI, SOPI, MOPI?	Yes	37.2	51.3
	No	62.8	48.7
28 portfolios?	Yes	22.0	35.8
	No	78.0	64.2
Articulation with high schools:			
29 Is there placing of students?	Yes	42.4	30.1
	No	57.6	69.9
30 Is there faculty exchange?	Yes	43.6	42.8
	No	56.4	57.2
31 Is there curriculum development?	Yes	23.8	18.1
	No	76.2	81.9
Heritage learners:			
32 Are there specially designed classes for them?	Yes	21.6	20.6
	No	78.4	79.4
33 Are there specially designed materials for them?	Yes	19.8	17.8
	No	80.2	82.2
34 Is there special preparation for faculty members to teach them?	Yes	11.9	9.5
	No	88.1	90.5
Does the department sponsor:			
35 lectures for the local community?	Yes	43.2	60.8
	No	56.8	39.2
36 films for the local community?	Yes	40.7	57.4
	No	59.3	42.6
37 language courses for the local community?	Yes	68.9	39.1
	No	31.1	60.9
38 Is there other interaction between the department and the local community?	Yes	47.3	53.9
	No	52.7	46.1
Has the department structure changed:			
39 from single- to multilanguage?	Yes	22.0	17.2
	No	78.0	82.8
40 from multi- to single-language?	Yes	6.7	11.2
	No	93.3	88.8
41 Has the department merged with another department in another discipline?	Yes	36.1	17.7
	No	63.9	82.3
Does the department use technology resources:			
42 in the classroom?	Yes	67.7	72.9
	No	32.3	27.1
43 for student practice outside class?	Yes	72.8	84.0
	No	27.2	16.0
44 for testing and placement?	Yes	28.8	31.1
	No	71.3	68.9
45 for distance learning?	Yes	52.9	25.6
	No	47.1	74.4
46 Does the department use a language lab on campus?	Yes	58.9	75.6
	No	41.1	24.4
47 Is there a separate language center on campus?	Yes	16.8	22.0
	No	83.2	78.0

Table B (Comparison of Frequencies, cont.)

Question		AA (Percentage)	BA-MA-PhD (Percentage)
Study-abroad enrollments:			
48 Are they increasing?	Yes	19.5	49.2
49 Are they stable?	Yes	17.1	25.3
50 Are they decreasing?	Yes	4.6	6.3
51 Is there yearly variation?	Yes	2.4	7.8
52 Is study abroad not offered?	Yes	56.4	11.4

Table C: Correlations: AA-Granting Institutions, All Languages (N = 484)

Question		Row Total	Enrollments						Pct. Difference*
			Decreasing		Stable		Increasing		
			No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
1 Is there a foreign language entrance requirement?	Yes	30	5	16.7	7	23.3	18	60.0	-1.3
	No	452	84	18.6	91	20.1	277	61.3	
2 Is there a foreign language graduation requirement?	Yes	139	26	18.7	25	18.0	88	63.3	2.8
	No	344	63	18.3	73	21.2	208	60.5	
3 Is there support for faculty study abroad?	Yes	181	36	19.9	34	18.8	111	61.3	-0.1
	No	303	53	17.5	64	21.1	186	61.4	
4 Is there release time for course development?	Yes	184	39	21.2	32	17.4	113	61.4	0.1
	No	300	50	16.7	66	22.0	184	61.3	
5 Is there support for faculty technology training?	Yes	378	73	19.3	74	19.6	231	61.1	-1.2
	No	106	16	15.1	24	22.6	66	62.3	
6 Is there support for faculty research and scholarship?	Yes	143	28	19.6	36	25.2	79	55.2	-8.7
	No	341	61	17.9	62	18.2	218	63.9	
7 Does your department have a full-time introductory course coordinator?	Yes	143	19	13.3	25	17.5	99	69.2	11.3
	No	340	70	20.6	73	21.5	197	57.9	
8 Is there assessment and placement of incoming students?	Yes	176	35	19.9	33	18.8	108	61.4	0.0
	No	308	54	17.5	65	21.1	189	61.4	
Are there special opportunities:									
9 intensive courses?	Yes	81	15	18.5	14	17.3	52	64.2	4.0
	No	171	34	19.9	34	19.9	103	60.2	
10 immersion programs?	Yes	41	7	17.1	8	19.5	26	63.4	2.3
	No	211	42	19.9	40	19.0	129	61.1	
11 presemester programs?	Yes	13	2	15.4	0	0.0	11	84.6	25.0
	No	235	47	20.0	48	20.4	140	59.6	
12 winter-break programs?	Yes	25	5	20.0	8	32.0	12	48.0	-14.8
	No	226	44	19.5	40	17.7	142	62.8	
13 weekend programs?	Yes	56	10	17.9	15	26.8	31	55.4	-7.2
	No	195	39	20.0	34	17.4	122	62.6	
14 language houses?	Yes	5	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	19.2
	No	245	48	19.6	48	19.6	149	60.8	
15 internships in the community?	Yes	27	5	18.5	3	11.1	19	70.4	10.3
	No	223	44	19.7	45	20.2	134	60.1	
16 service programs in the community?	Yes	47	12	25.5	8	17.0	27	57.4	-4.8
	No	204	37	18.1	40	19.6	127	62.3	
Introductory sequence:									
17 Does it emphasize reading-writing over oral practice?	Yes	36	8	22.2	11	30.6	17	47.2	-15.3
	No	446	81	18.2	86	19.3	279	62.6	

Table C (Correlations, *cont.*)

Question		Row Total	Enrollments						Pct. Difference*
			Decreasing		Stable		Increasing		
			No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
Introductory sequence (<i>cont.</i>):									
18 Does it place equal emphasis on reading-writing and oral practice?	Yes	167	36	21.6	29	17.4	102	61.1	-0.5
	No	315	53	16.8	68	21.6	194	61.6	
19 Does it emphasize oral practice over reading-writing?	Yes	103	21	20.4	18	17.5	64	62.1	0.9
	No	379	68	17.9	79	20.8	232	61.2	
20 Is its emphasis determined by the instructor?	Yes	176	24	13.6	39	22.2	113	64.2	4.4
	No	306	65	21.2	58	19.0	183	59.8	
Introductory language courses:									
21 Do they emphasize culture over literature?	Yes	331	55	16.6	65	19.6	211	63.7	7.9
	No	145	34	23.4	30	20.7	81	55.9	
22 Do they place equal emphasis on culture and literature?	Yes	122	30	24.6	24	19.7	68	55.7	-7.5
	No	354	59	16.7	71	20.1	224	63.3	
23 Do they emphasize literature over culture?	Yes	23	4	17.4	6	26.1	13	56.5	-5.1
	No	453	85	18.8	89	19.6	279	61.6	
Student opportunities abroad:									
24 Are there internships?	Yes	43	8	18.6	5	11.6	30	69.8	9.0
	No	433	78	18.0	92	21.2	263	60.7	
25 Are there service programs?	Yes	44	5	11.4	7	15.9	32	72.7	12.3
	No	435	82	18.9	90	20.7	263	60.5	
26 Are there exchange programs?	Yes	113	24	21.2	20	17.7	69	61.1	-0.5
	No	367	64	17.4	77	21.0	226	61.6	
Is there assessment of students:									
27 OPI, SOPI, MOPI?	Yes	179	25	14.0	37	20.7	117	65.4	6.4
	No	302	63	20.9	61	20.2	178	58.9	
28 portfolios?	Yes	105	23	21.9	26	24.8	56	53.3	-9.9
	No	373	65	17.4	72	19.3	236	63.3	
Articulation with high schools:									
29 Is there placing of students?	Yes	205	43	21.0	42	20.5	120	58.5	-4.8
	No	278	46	16.5	56	20.1	176	63.3	
30 Is there faculty exchange?	Yes	211	37	17.5	41	19.4	133	63.0	3.0
	No	273	52	19.0	57	20.9	164	60.1	
31 Is there curriculum development?	Yes	115	21	18.3	22	19.1	72	62.6	1.7
	No	368	68	18.5	76	20.7	224	60.9	
Heritage learners:									
32 Are there specially designed classes for them?	Yes	104	17	16.3	19	18.3	68	65.4	4.8
	No	378	72	19.0	77	20.4	229	60.6	
33 Are there specially designed materials for them?	Yes	95	16	16.8	14	14.7	65	68.4	8.5
	No	384	73	19.0	81	21.1	230	59.9	
34 Is there special preparation for faculty members to teach them?	Yes	57	6	10.5	8	14.0	43	75.4	15.6
	No	423	83	19.6	87	20.6	253	59.8	
Does the department sponsor:									
35 lectures for the local community?	Yes	208	37	17.8	50	24.0	121	58.2	-6.1
	No	274	52	19.0	46	16.8	176	64.2	
36 films for the local community?	Yes	196	40	20.4	45	23.0	111	56.6	-8.6
	No	285	48	16.8	51	17.9	186	65.3	
37 language courses for the local community?	Yes	332	60	18.1	69	20.8	203	61.1	-0.9
	No	150	29	19.3	28	18.7	93	62.0	
38 Is there other interaction between the department and the local community?	Yes	227	39	17.2	40	17.6	148	65.2	7.1
	No	253	49	19.4	57	22.5	147	58.1	

Table C (Correlations, cont.)

Question	Row Total	Enrollments						Pct. Difference*	
		Decreasing		Stable		Increasing			
		No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Has the department structure changed:									
39 from single- to multilanguage?	Yes	106	12	11.3	17	16.0	77	72.6	14.2
	No	375	77	20.5	79	21.1	219	58.4	
40 from multi- to single-language?	Yes	32	7	21.9	8	25.0	17	53.1	-8.8
	No	447	82	18.3	88	19.7	277	62.0	
41 Has the department merged with another department in another discipline?	Yes	174	34	19.5	32	18.4	108	62.1	1.0
	No	308	55	17.9	65	21.1	188	61.0	
Does the department use technology resources:									
42 in the classroom?	Yes	327	60	18.3	62	19.0	205	62.7	3.7
	No	156	28	17.9	36	23.1	92	59.0	
43 for student practice outside class?	Yes	351	66	18.8	66	18.8	219	62.4	3.6
	No	131	23	17.6	31	23.7	77	58.8	
44 for testing and placement?	Yes	138	26	18.8	31	22.5	81	58.7	-4.5
	No	342	61	17.8	65	19.0	216	63.2	
45 for distance learning?	Yes	255	52	20.4	55	21.6	148	58.0	-7.6
	No	227	36	15.9	42	18.5	149	65.6	
46 Does the department use a language lab on campus?	Yes	285	46	16.1	60	21.1	179	62.8	3.5
	No	199	43	21.6	38	19.1	118	59.3	
47 Is there a separate language center on campus?	Yes	81	15	18.5	18	22.2	48	59.3	-2.4
	No	402	74	18.4	80	19.9	248	61.7	
Study-abroad enrollments:									
48 Are they increasing?	Yes	89	11	12.4	18	20.2	60	67.4	6.9
	No	367	73	19.9	72	19.6	222	60.5	
49 Are they stable?	Yes	78	16	20.5	14	17.9	48	61.5	-0.4
	No	378	68	18.0	76	20.1	234	61.9	
50 Are they decreasing?	Yes	21	7	33.3	4	19.0	10	47.6	-14.9
	No	435	77	17.7	86	19.8	272	62.5	
51 Is there yearly variation?	Yes	11	0	0.0	3	27.3	8	72.7	11.2
	No	445	84	18.9	87	19.6	274	61.6	
52 Is study abroad not offered?	Yes	257	50	19.5	51	19.8	156	60.7	-2.6
	No	199	34	17.1	39	19.6	126	63.3	

*This column shows the difference between the percentages in categories Increasing and Yes and Increasing and No.

Table D: Correlations: BA-, MA-, and PhD-Granting Institutions, All Languages (N = 1,301)

Question		Row Total	Enrollments						Pct. Difference*
			Decreasing		Stable		Increasing		
			No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	
1 Is there a foreign language entrance requirement?	Yes	404	114	28.2	86	21.3	204	50.5	-4.1
	No	892	236	26.5	169	18.9	487	54.6	
2 Is there a foreign language graduation requirement?	Yes	956	257	26.9	192	20.1	507	53.0	-1.5
	No	343	94	27.4	62	18.1	187	54.5	
3 Is there support for faculty study abroad?	Yes	690	180	26.1	139	20.1	371	53.8	0.9
	No	611	171	28.0	117	19.1	323	52.9	
4 Is there release time for course development?	Yes	554	150	27.1	109	19.7	295	53.2	-0.2
	No	747	201	26.9	147	19.7	399	53.4	
5 Is there support for faculty technology training?	Yes	975	270	27.7	202	20.7	503	51.6	-7.0
	No	326	81	24.8	54	16.6	191	58.6	
6 Is there support for faculty research and scholarship?	Yes	1,009	270	26.8	209	20.7	530	52.5	-3.6
	No	292	81	27.7	47	16.1	164	56.2	
7 Does your department have a full-time introductory course coordinator?	Yes	484	122	25.2	107	22.1	255	52.7	-1.1
	No	814	227	27.9	149	18.3	438	53.8	
8 Is there assessment and placement of incoming students?	Yes	908	258	28.4	189	20.8	461	50.8	-8.6
	No	391	92	23.5	67	17.1	232	59.3	
Are there special opportunities:									
9 intensive courses?	Yes	526	146	27.8	113	21.5	267	50.8	-1.1
	No	461	134	29.1	88	19.1	239	51.8	
10 immersion programs?	Yes	269	69	25.7	60	22.3	140	52.0	0.3
	No	692	199	28.8	135	19.5	358	51.7	
11 presemester programs?	Yes	76	12	15.8	17	22.4	47	61.8	10.8
	No	873	252	28.9	175	20.0	446	51.1	
12 winter-break programs?	Yes	148	41	27.7	25	16.9	82	55.4	4.2
	No	808	226	28.0	168	20.8	414	51.2	
13 weekend programs?	Yes	95	24	25.3	17	17.9	54	56.8	6.0
	No	864	246	28.5	179	20.7	439	50.8	
14 language houses?	Yes	240	68	28.3	45	18.8	127	52.9	1.4
	No	724	201	27.8	150	20.7	373	51.5	
15 internships in the community?	Yes	334	76	22.8	62	18.6	196	58.7	10.6
	No	634	194	30.6	135	21.3	305	48.1	
16 service programs in the community?	Yes	329	69	21.0	69	21.0	191	58.1	9.6
	No	631	199	31.5	126	20.0	306	48.5	
Introductory sequence:									
17 Does it emphasize reading-writing over oral practice?	Yes	58	14	24.1	11	19.0	33	56.9	3.7
	No	1,233	334	27.1	243	19.7	656	53.2	
18 Does it place equal emphasis on reading-writing and oral practice?	Yes	524	164	31.3	101	19.3	259	49.4	-6.6
	No	767	184	24.0	153	19.9	430	56.1	
19 Does it emphasize oral practice over reading-writing?	Yes	308	66	21.4	59	19.2	183	59.4	7.9
	No	983	282	28.7	195	19.8	506	51.5	
20 Is its emphasis determined by the instructor?	Yes	401	104	25.9	83	20.7	214	53.4	0.0
	No	890	244	27.4	171	19.2	475	53.4	
Introductory language courses:									
21 Do they emphasize culture over literature?	Yes	892	256	28.7	157	17.6	479	53.7	0.9
	No	398	95	23.9	93	23.4	210	52.8	
22 Do they place equal emphasis on culture and literature?	Yes	330	80	24.2	83	25.2	167	50.6	-3.8
	No	960	271	28.2	167	17.4	522	54.4	
23 Do they emphasize literature over culture?	Yes	68	15	22.1	10	14.7	43	63.2	10.4
	No	1,222	336	27.5	240	19.6	646	52.9	

Table D (Correlations, cont.)

Question		Row Total	Enrollments						Pct. Difference*	
			Decreasing		Stable		Increasing			
			No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Student opportunities abroad:										
24 Are there internships?	Yes	668	194	55.3	129	50.4	345	49.7	1.3	
	No	604	149	42.5	119	46.5	336	48.4		
25 Are there service programs?	Yes	406	92	26.2	75	29.3	239	34.4	-26.4	
	No	831	242	68.9	167	65.2	422	60.8		
26 Are there exchange programs?	Yes	827	223	27.0	151	18.3	453	54.8	3.7	
	No	452	122	27.0	99	21.9	231	51.1		
Is there assessment of students:										
27 OPI, SOPI, MOPI?	Yes	656	174	26.5	135	20.6	347	52.9	-1.1	
	No	620	170	27.4	115	18.5	335	54.0		
28 portfolios?	Yes	457	115	25.2	94	20.6	248	54.3	1.2	
	No	807	226	28.0	153	19.0	428	53.0		
Articulation with high schools:										
29 Is there placing of students?	Yes	390	95	24.4	78	20.0	217	55.6	3.2	
	No	897	252	28.1	175	19.5	470	52.4		
30 Is there faculty exchange?	Yes	559	144	25.8	120	21.5	295	52.8	-0.7	
	No	731	206	28.2	134	18.3	391	53.5		
31 Is there curriculum development?	Yes	231	47	20.3	56	24.2	128	55.4	2.8	
	No	1,048	299	28.5	198	18.9	551	52.6		
Heritage learners:										
32 Are there specially designed classes for them?	Yes	266	69	25.9	57	21.4	140	52.6	-0.9	
	No	1,024	278	27.1	198	19.3	548	53.5		
33 Are there specially designed materials for them?	Yes	227	59	26.0	41	18.1	127	55.9	3.0	
	No	1,052	283	26.9	212	20.2	557	52.9		
34 Is there special preparation for faculty members to teach them?	Yes	119	26	21.8	25	21.0	68	57.1	4.0	
	No	1,155	314	27.2	227	19.7	614	53.2		
Does the department sponsor:										
35 lectures for the local community?	Yes	782	211	27.0	149	19.1	422	54.0	1.9	
	No	503	137	27.2	104	20.7	262	52.1		
36 films for the local community?	Yes	742	202	27.2	156	21.0	384	51.8	-3.2	
	No	544	146	26.8	99	18.2	299	55.0		
37 language courses for the local community?	Yes	496	128	25.8	100	20.2	268	54.0	1.0	
	No	779	216	27.7	150	19.3	413	53.0		
38 Is there other interaction between the department and the local community?	Yes	687	190	27.7	133	19.4	364	53.0	-0.5	
	No	578	150	26.0	119	20.6	309	53.5		
Has the department structure changed:										
39 from single- to multilanguage?	Yes	216	56	25.9	43	19.9	117	54.2	1.2	
	No	1,062	291	27.4	209	19.7	562	52.9		
40 from multi- to single-language?	Yes	142	35	24.6	30	21.1	77	54.2	1.2	
	No	1,132	309	27.3	223	19.7	600	53.0		
41 Has the department merged with another department in another discipline?	Yes	221	58	26.2	41	18.6	122	55.2	2.2	
	No	1,063	289	27.2	211	19.8	563	53.0		
Does the department use technology resources:										
42 in the classroom?	Yes	953	260	27.3	201	21.1	492	51.6	-6.4	
	No	343	90	26.2	54	15.7	199	58.0		
43 for student practice outside class?	Yes	1,095	312	28.5	213	19.5	570	52.1	-8.1	
	No	201	38	18.9	42	20.9	121	60.2		

Table D (Correlations, *cont.*)

Question	Row Total	Enrollments						Pct. Difference*	
		Decreasing		Stable		Increasing			
		No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
Does the department use technology resources (<i>cont.</i>):									
44 for testing and placement?	Yes	403	93	23.1	84	20.8	226	56.1	4.2
	No	893	258	28.9	172	19.3	463	51.8	
45 for distance learning?	Yes	334	85	25.4	70	21.0	179	53.6	0.4
	No	961	265	27.6	185	19.3	511	53.2	
46 Does the department use a language lab on campus?	Yes	988	281	28.4	203	20.5	504	51.0	-9.4
	No	311	70	22.5	53	17.0	188	60.5	
47 Is there a separate language center on campus?	Yes	285	87	30.5	48	16.8	150	52.6	-0.9
	No	1,015	264	26.0	208	20.5	543	53.5	
Study-abroad enrollments:									
48 Are they increasing?	Yes	638	132	20.7	133	20.8	373	58.5	10.0
	No	654	215	32.9	122	18.7	317	48.5	
49 Are they stable?	Yes	322	112	34.8	62	19.3	148	46.0	-9.9
	No	970	235	24.2	193	19.9	542	55.9	
50 Are they decreasing?	Yes	84	34	40.5	18	21.4	32	38.1	-16.4
	No	1,208	313	25.9	237	19.6	658	54.5	
51 Is there yearly variation?	Yes	102	35	34.3	13	12.7	54	52.9	-0.5
	No	1,190	312	26.2	242	20.3	636	53.4	
52 Is study abroad not offered?	Yes	146	34	23.3	29	19.9	83	56.8	3.9
	No	1,146	313	27.3	226	19.7	607	53.0	

*This column shows the difference between the percentages in categories Increasing and Yes and Increasing and No.

AMBASSADE DE FRANCE A WASHINGTON

*Service Culturel
Service de Coopération Universitaire
Linguistique et Educative*

4101 Reservoir Road, NW
Washington DC, 20007



Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité

RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE

Teaching assistant program: 1500 teaching assistantship positions are offered every year in French primary and secondary schools for American citizens under 30 years of age for graduates or undergraduates, majoring and minoring in French: assistants teach English conversation classes 12 hours a week for a monthly stipend of 890 euros.

Internships in France: a unique opportunity for undergraduates and graduates to spend 3 months in France within a vast array of sectors, both private and public ranging from cultural to scientific.

Chateaubriand Scholarships: French Government awards about 20 scholarships a year to American Ph.D candidates who wish to conduct research in France. Field of study at a French research institution may be any discipline in the humanities.

Youth and sports grants: Every year, 50 students spend 10 days in places as varied as Festival d'Avignon, Mont Blanc, Festival de Cannes or in more than 10 different areas in France.

Find more about our activities on: www.frenchculture.org