

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 304

FL 014 308

TITLE Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act of 1983. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, First Session on H.R. 2708.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 27 Apr 83

NOTE 55p.; For a related document, see ED 235 683. Portions contain small print.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Higher Education; National Security; *Program Development; *Second Language Instruction

IDENTIFIERS Congress 98th

ABSTRACT

The text of H.R.2708, the Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act of 1983, is presented and a transcript of the testimony given at the hearings is provided. The purposes of the bill are to further national security and improve the economy of the United States by providing grants (1) for the improvement of proficiency in critical languages, (2) for the improvement of elementary and secondary language instruction, and (3) to reimburse institutions of higher education to promote the growth and improve the quality of postsecondary foreign language instruction. The testimony includes the statements and prepared materials of James E. Alatis, Earl L. Backman, Richard L. McElheny, Ramon Santiago, and Congressman Paul Simon. (MSE)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

**FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE FOR
NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1983**

ED243304

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
H.R. 2708



TO FURTHER THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND IMPROVE THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES BY PROVIDING GRANTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PROFICIENCY IN CRITICAL LANGUAGES, FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, AND FOR PER CAPITA GRANTS TO REIMBURSE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO PROMOTE THE GROWTH AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF POSTSECONDARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

FL014308

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C. ON APRIL 21, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)



This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it. Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1984

24-729 0

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California	JOHN N. ERLNBORN, Illinois
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania	WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri	E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York	THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina	MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
PAUL SIMON, Illinois	STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
GEORGE MILLER, California	STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania	RON PACKARD, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico	HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan	(Vacancy)
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana	
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado	
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois	
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California	
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York	
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania	
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia	
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York	
(Vacancy)	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

PAUL SIMON, Illinois, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan	E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina	STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado	JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania	WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia	THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York	RON PACKARD, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York	(Ex Officio)
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky	
(Ex Officio)	

(11)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C. on April 27, 1983.....	1
Text of H.R. 2708.....	2
Statement of:	
Alatis, Dean James E., School of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University, representing the Joint National Committee for Languages.....	21
Backman, Dr. Earl L., director, Center for International Studies, University of North Carolina, Charlotte and chairman, National Committee of International Studies and Programs Administrators.....	39
McElheny, Richard L., director general for the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.....	7
Santiago, Dr. Ramon, director, Bilingual Education Service Center, Georgetown University and chairman, Annual Conference, National Association for Bilingual Education.....	44
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera.	
Alatis, James E., president, Joint National Committee for Languages, dean, School of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University, executive director, teachers of English to speakers of other languages: "A Nation At Risk," the final report of the President's Commission on Excellence in Education.....	22
Prepared statement of.....	18
Backman, Dr. Earl, director, Center for International Studies, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, prepared statement of.....	35
McElheny, Richard L., director general for the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service, Department of Commerce, prepared statement of.....	7
Santiago, Ramon, Ph.D., immediate past president, National Association for Bilingual Education, prepared statement of.....	42
Simon, Hon. Paul, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois and chairman, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, opening statement of.....	6

FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1983

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1983

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:37 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Paul Simon (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Simon, Harrison, Ackerman, Coleman, Goodling, Petri, and Packard.

Staff present: Nicholas Penning, legislative assistant, and Betsy Brand, minority legislative associate.

Mr. SIMON. Our Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education will come to order. We are having a hearing on a proposal for encouraging foreign language study in this country. Let me mention, there is one amendment that will have to be worked out yet. There was some misunderstanding on one portion of the bill and one amendment has to be worked out yet. This amendment is fairly significant and I hope we can get it worked out so we can proceed with the markup next week.

Nearly 2 years ago, the highly respected Deputy Director of the CIA, Adm. Bobby Inman, testified before our subcommittee, "The deteriorating language study capabilities programs of this country are presenting a major hazard to our national security."

He concluded that, "Decisive action should be taken on the Federal level to insure improvement in foreign language training in the United States."

In gathering information on the need for action to boost foreign language education in this country, the subcommittee heard from other intelligence and defense officials, from educators, and from business people. There is no question that a serious need exists.

It was very interesting that yesterday the President's Commission on Excellence in Education emphasized over and over again that, "We have to be stressing foreign languages in our schools." The report cited both the security and the economic considerations and recommended, among other things, that all elementary school students in our country should have foreign language studies.

So what we are doing today is very timely in view of the recommendations that just yesterday emerged from the President's National Commission on Excellence in Education.

(1)

Let me just add that in terms of national security we are talking about an expenditure that is minuscule compared to a major weapons system and yet could have major impact on the security of the United States.

[Text of H.R. 2708 follows:]

[H.R. 2708, 97th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To further the national security and improve the economy of the United States by providing grants for the improvement of proficiency in critical languages, for the improvement of elementary and secondary foreign language instruction, and for per capita grants to reimburse institutions of higher education to promote the growth and improve the quality of postsecondary foreign language instruction

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act of 1983".

Sec. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the economic and security interests of this Nation require significant improvement in the quantity and quality of foreign language instruction offered in the Nation's educational institutions, and Federal funds should be made available to assist this purpose;

(2) many endeavors in both the public and private sectors involving such matters as international relations or multinational business transactions require the skills of individuals with knowledge of foreign languages; and

(3) the educational institutions of the Nation should provide students with an understanding of the history and culture which influence the perspectives, values, and attitudes of the people of other countries, and foreign language instruction is one means of achieving this goal.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to State educational agencies whose applications are approved under subsection (b) in order that such agencies may fund model programs, designed and operated by local educational agencies, providing for commencement or improvement and expansion of foreign language study for students residing within their school districts. Any State whose application is approved shall receive an amount equal to the sum of (1) \$50,000, plus (2) the product of \$0.04 multiplied by the population of the State (as determined in accordance with the most recent decennial census). The amount described in the preceding sentence shall be made available to the State for two additional years after the first fiscal year during which the State received a grant under this section if the Secretary determines that the funds made available to the State during the first year of funding were used in the manner required under the State's approved application.

(b) Any State educational agency desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of model programs designed by local educational agencies, and representing a variety of alternative and innovative approaches to foreign language instruction, which were selected by the State educational agency for funding under this section;

(2) provides assurances that all children aged five through seventeen who reside within the school district of the local educational agency shall be eligible to participate in any model program funded under this section (without regard to whether such children attend schools operated by such agency);

(3) provides assurances that, if the application of the State educational agency is approved, each model program described in the application shall have available to it sufficient funds from State and local sources, in addition to any funds under this section, to ensure that the program is carried out as described in the application; and

(4) provides that the local educational agency will provide standard evaluations of pupils' proficiency at appropriate intervals in the program, and provide such evaluations to the State educational agency.

(c) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which State educational agencies may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to State agencies whose applications are approved under subsection (b) for the purpose of providing assistance to model

programs designed and operated by community and junior colleges providing for the commencement or improvement and expansion of foreign language studies at those institutions. Any State whose application is so approved shall receive an amount equal to the sum of (1) \$30,000, plus (2) the product of \$0.01 multiplied by the population of the State (as determined in accordance with the most recent decennial census).

(b) Any State desiring to receive a grant under this section shall, through a State agency designated (in accordance with State law) for this purpose, submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of model programs designed by community and junior colleges, and representing a variety of alternative and innovative approaches to foreign language instruction, which were selected by the State agency for funding under this section;

(2) provides assurances that, if the application of the State agency is approved, each model program described in the application shall have available to it sufficient funds from State and local sources, in addition to any funds under this section, to ensure that the program is carried out as described in the application; and

(3) provides that the community and junior colleges will provide standard evaluations of pupils' proficiency at appropriate intervals in the program, and provide such evaluations to the State agency.

(c) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which State agencies may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

Sec. 5. (a)(1) The Secretary shall make grants to institutions of higher education to reimburse such institutions for part of the costs of providing undergraduate foreign language instruction to students at such institutions. Any institution of higher education desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(2)(A) An institution of higher education shall not be eligible for a grant under this section for a fiscal year unless—

(i) the sum of the number of students enrolled at such institution in qualified postsecondary language courses on October 1 of that fiscal year exceeds 5 per centum of the total number of students enrolled at such institution; and

(ii) such institution requires that each entering student have successfully completed at least two years of secondary school foreign language instruction or requires that each graduating student have earned two years of postsecondary credit in a foreign language (or have demonstrated equivalent competence in a foreign language).

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), the total number of students enrolled in an institution shall be considered to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time degree candidate students enrolled at the institution, and (ii) the number of part-time degree candidate students who are enrolled at the institution for an academic workload which is at least half the full-time academic workload, as determined by the institution in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary.

(3) As a condition for the award of any grant under this section, the Secretary may establish criteria for evaluating programs assisted with funds under this section and requires an annual report which evaluates the progress and proficiency of students in such programs.

(b)(1) Any institution of higher education which submits an application under this section for a grant for any fiscal year, and which has sufficient undergraduate enrollment in postsecondary language courses and foreign language requirements as required under subsection (a)(2), shall be eligible to receive an amount equal to the sum of the following:

(A) To provide assistance for the costs of postsecondary foreign language instruction at the level of the first or second year of postsecondary study of a language, an amount equal to—

(i) \$30, multiplied by

(ii) the remainder, if any, of—

(1) the number of students enrolled in a qualified postsecondary foreign language course at such level on October 1 of such fiscal year, minus

(II) the number of students equal to 5 per centum of the total number of students enrolled at such institutions.

(B) To provide assistance for the costs of foreign language instruction above the level of the second year of postsecondary study of a language, an amount equal to

- (i) \$10, multiplied by
- (ii) the number of students enrolled in a qualified postsecondary foreign language course at such level on October 1 of such fiscal year.

(2) Any institution which is eligible to receive an amount under paragraph (1) shall be eligible to receive an additional amount equal to \$40 multiplied by the number of students enrolled (at any level of instruction) in any foreign language instruction in languages determined by the Secretary to be less commonly taught.

(c) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which an institution of higher education may receive under subsection (b), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to an institution of higher education (or a consortium of such institutions) in each Federal region whose application is approved under subsection (b) for the purposes of providing assistance to summer intensive language training institutes for exceptional secondary school students. Any institution or consortium whose application is so approved shall receive an amount equal to not more than \$3,000 multiplied by the number of students, not to exceed 150, enrolled in such institute.

(b) Any institution of higher education or consortium of such institutions desiring to receive the grant for its region shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No such application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application-

- (1) contains a description of the proposed program of intensive instruction, which may include but is not limited to the languages described in section 5(b);
- (2) provides adequate assurance that students from any Federal region who wish to participate will be selected on the basis of aptitude of that language, as determined by appropriate testing and verified by their teachers, and of motivation;
- (3) provides assurances that the institution of higher education will seek to enroll at least 80 qualified students in the institute; and
- (4) provides assurances that the program of intensive instruction will be developed and operated in close cooperation with secondary school teachers and administrators.

(c) The Secretary shall encourage, to the extent possible, diversity in the languages taught in institutes during any summer within the United States.

(d) Awards under this section shall be made to institutes (or consortia) on the basis of excellence of the program proposed in the application, taking into consideration such elements as library resources, faculty achievement, and language learning facilities.

(e) Funds available to institutes under this section may be used to cover costs associated with enrollment in an institute, including tuition, fees, administration, and living expenses.

(f) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which institutions of higher education may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

Sec. 7. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to an institution of higher education (or a consortium of such institutions) in each Federal region whose application is approved under subsection (b) for the purposes of providing assistance to summer language training institutes for the professional development of the proficiency of elementary and secondary school language teachers. Any institution or consortium whose application is so approved shall receive an amount equal to not more than \$5,000 multiplied by the number of teachers, not to exceed 300, enrolled in such institute.

(b) Any institution of higher education or consortium of such institutions desiring to receive the grant for its region shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No such application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application-

- (1) contains a description of the proposed program of instruction;
- (2) provides adequate assurance that teachers from any Federal region who wish to participate will be selected on the basis of recommendations from a principal or other supervisory official and a demonstrated commitment to the teaching of the language studied in the institute; and

(3) provides assurances that the institution of higher education will seek to enroll at least 80 qualified students in the institute.

(c) Awards under this section shall be made to institutes (or consortia) on the basis of excellence of the program proposed in the application, taking into consideration such elements as library resources, faculty achievement, and language learning facilities.

(d) Funds available to institutes under this section may be used to cover costs associated with enrollment in an institute, including tuition, fees, administration, and living expenses.

(e) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which institutions of higher education may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to institutions of higher education, or to consortia of such institutions, whose application is approved under subsection (b) for the purposes of providing assistance to enable advanced foreign language students to develop their language skills and their knowledge of foreign cultures and societies through study abroad. Such study abroad may be combined with an internship in an international business enterprise. Any institution or consortium whose application is so approved shall be eligible to receive a grant in an amount not to exceed one-half the cost of providing such assistance.

(b) Any institution of higher education or consortium of such institutions desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No such application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of the proposed program of study abroad in any of the following areas:

- (A) Latin America for the study of Spanish or Portuguese;
- (B) the Middle East for the study of Arabic and other major languages of that region;
- (C) Japan for the study of Japanese;
- (D) the People's Republic of China or the Republic of China for the study of Chinese;
- (E) the Democratic Republic of Korea for the study of Korean;
- (F) the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the study of Russian and other major languages of that region;
- (G) Africa for the study of major languages of that region; and
- (H) South Asia for the study of Hindi and other major languages of that region;

(2) provides adequate assurance that those who wish to participate will be selected on the basis of demonstrated proficiency in the language, as shown by testing comparable to that conducted by the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State; and

(3) demonstrates that the program will provide the opportunity to combine language study with the study of journalism, international business, finance, economic development, science, engineering, political science, international studies, or other related areas and is open to students majoring in those areas if they can qualify under paragraph (2).

(c) Funds available to institutes under this section may be used to cover costs associated with enrollment in an institute, including tuition, fees, administration, and living expenses.

(d) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which institutions of higher education may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

Sec. 9. No grants shall be made or contracts entered into under this Act except to such extent, or in such amounts, as may be provided in appropriation Acts.

Sec. 10. For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "institution of higher education" means any institution of higher education, as defined under section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which is located within a State, but does not include a community or junior college.

(2) The terms "community college" and "junior college" mean any institution of higher education, as defined under section 1207(a) of such Act, which is located within a State and which provides a two-year program for which awards an associate degree or which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree.

(3) The terms "local educational agency" and "State educational agency" have the same meaning given such terms under section 198 of the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(5) The term "State" means any of the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(6) The term "qualified postsecondary foreign language course" means a course of foreign language instruction which (A) is scheduled to meet at least five days each week for at least fifty minutes each day, or (B) provides instruction each week for a period of time equivalent to the period described under clause (A).

Sec. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986—

- (1) \$10,000,000 to carry out section 3 of this Act;
- (2) \$4,000,000 to carry out section 4 of this Act;
- (3) \$11,000,000 to carry out section 5 of this Act;
- (4) \$5,000,000 to carry out section 6 of this Act;
- (5) \$10,000,000 to carry out section 7 of this Act; and
- (6) \$10,000,000 to carry out section 8 of this Act.

[Opening statement of Chairman Paul Simon:]

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL SIMON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS AND CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The subcommittee meets today to consider legislation that the ranking minority member, Mr. Coleman, and I consider critical to our nation's security. Together with our colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Goodling, we have crafted a bill that we believe will help the nation take a major step toward improving the foreign language capability of its citizens.

Nearly two years ago the highly respected Deputy Director of the CIA, Admiral Bobby R. Inman, told our subcommittee, "The deteriorating language study capabilities programs of this country are presenting a major hazard to our national security." He concluded that "decisive action should be taken on the federal level to ensure improvement in foreign language training in the U.S."

In gathering information on the need for action to boost foreign language education in this country the subcommittee heard from other intelligence and defense officials, from educators and from businessmen. There is no question that a serious need exists.

Our response has been to redraft a bill that I have been working on for some four years and fashion it to meet the particular needs of the times.

This legislation, H.R. 2708, provides the following: grants to the states to fund model foreign language programs in local school districts and in community colleges; per capita grants to colleges based on their foreign language course enrollments; summer language institutes for advanced high school students and separate institutes for elementary and secondary language teachers; and finally, matching grants to colleges and universities to help pay the costs associated with sending advanced foreign language college students abroad to further their language education in key areas of the world.

This bill represents a modest but finely tuned effort at addressing one of our most serious national failings. For only \$50 million a year, a mere drop of sand when compared with the enormous sums we spend on weapons systems, we can help move our businesses into a more competitive stance in the international marketplace, our diplomats and intelligence officers onto a par with their counterparts, and our citizenry into a world that they will be able to at least understand while making themselves understood.

I welcome our witnesses and our audience to one of the most little known but highly significant hearings that will be held on Capitol Hill today.

Mr. SIMON. Before we proceed with our opening witness, Mr. Harrison, do you wish to add anything?

Mr. HARRISON. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Sorry I am late.

Mr. SIMON. Good morning. You are virtually on time.

We are very pleased to have today Mr. Richard McElheny, Director General for the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service, International Trade Administration of the Department of Commerce as our first witness.

We are reading about possible changes in the Department of Commerce with a little bit more of a thrust toward the export side of things, which, at least at first blush, I think is probably a move in the right direction.

Mr. McElheny, we would be pleased to hear from you at this point.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD L. McELHENY, DIRECTOR GENERAL FOR THE U.S. AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE, INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. McELHENY. Well, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee. I of course, have some testimony and some materials which we will submit for the record and I would like to depart a bit from the prepared text. I will summarize some of the main points and then share with you some recent experiences I have had which address themselves precisely to your area of concern and support your growing interest in it.

[Prepared statement of Richard L. McElheny follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD L. McELHENY, DIRECTOR GENERAL FOR THE U.S. AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before this Subcommittee to discuss H.R. 2708 and the need to improve U.S. citizen foreign language capability.

We in the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service (USFCS) are very aware of the need for foreign language capabilities. Our mission is to promote American exports through our 120 posts overseas in 69 countries and our 55 District and Satellite offices in the United States. We know how important it is for U.S. Government officials to be able to do business in a country in the language of that country, and we have been doing something about it.

Our overseas Foreign Commercial Service component has only been in business since 1980, when some 162 Foreign Service Commercial Officers and 487 Foreign Service National positions were transferred to the Department of Commerce from the Department of State. These positions are located in the countries with which we did almost 95 percent of our total trade.

The transfer was intended to give our trade promotion efforts a new, fresh impetus—and it has. In terms of language proficiency, we have increased the number of our overseas positions requiring at least minimum working proficiency in the language of the country to 109 of a current total of 177 positions. Only 37 of our positions in countries where languages other than English are used are not "language designated." Many of these are in areas such as Scandinavia, where English is very widespread. Even in these countries we provide our officers with at least "courtesy-level" language training, preferably before they arrive in the country and certainly while they are serving there.

We have had to work hard to keep all these positions—three out of four in all non-English speaking countries for which we are responsible—filled with qualified officers who are proficient in both languages and commercial skills. But we are holding our own, through careful and extensive recruitment and training efforts. Let me give you some details:

Our present overseas U.S. citizen employee cadre is proficient, to one degree or another, in some 28 languages. Each employee speaks in average of two and one-half languages. To provide this pool of skilled manpower, we have been emphasizing in our recruiting efforts language skills and overseas experience. Despite our high standards, we have found many candidates who meet our criteria. For example, in the 1982-83 recruitment cycle, which we have almost completed, we received 1300 applications for some 50 positions. The 77 applicants who reached the Final Regis-

ter from which we will make employment offers, have indicated proficiency on the average in nearly two-one-half languages each, in a variety of some 33 languages.

However, I do not want to paint too rosy a picture. Although our officers are skilled in many languages, the predominant tongues are the "weird" or Western European languages, including Spanish and French. While we have officers who are fluent in the "hard" languages which are becoming increasingly important, including Chinese, Japanese and Arabic, we are a small service in terms of total numbers, and officers with the requisite skills can be in the middle of other assignments when we need a particular language. Even if the right officers are available, they may not have had occasion to use the language for some time, and their skills could be rusty.

We have also found that many of our new recruits' language proficiencies are not as good as they think they are when we put them against the objective standard of a Foreign Service Institute test. Some are, of course, just rusty. Others who have performed perfectly well in private-sector positions requiring a particular language have simply underestimated the skills necessary for diplomatic work.

As a result, this means that we must spend considerable resources on language training. Six months of full-time study is generally sufficient to attain working-level proficiency in a Western European language, and three months is usually more than enough for a "brush-up" course. However, other languages - the "hard" ones for which we are less likely to find qualified employees - do require much more study. Some, such as Turkish and Greek, require ten months of full-time study. Others, including Chinese, Japanese and Arabic, can mean two years of full-time study. Refresher courses also mean at least three months full-time training to reach basic proficiency.

So we have to spend a lot of our training resources on language. In the past two years we have paid for the equivalent of more than 20 years of full-time language training for 16 employees and their spouses, an average of almost 14 weeks per person. We provided training in some 17 different languages, from French and Spanish to Arabic, Cantonese and Thai. In addition, many of our officers and their spouses take part-time training at their posts through the Post Language Training program offered by the Foreign Service Institute. Through this program we offer three to five hours per week of training to provide at least courtesy-level proficiency in the national language. I might mention that we provide as much language training as possible to the spouses of our officers. Overseas assignments are a family affair; our officers perform better if their spouses are happy - and knowing the local language helps a great deal.

Despite the costs involved, we believe it is money well spent. Our training is targeted for specific officers going to specific positions in specific countries. It is not general training - in fact, we do not assign people to full-time language training unless they have been assigned to a position requiring that language.

As Americans, we are indeed fortunate to have been born in an English-speaking country when English is far and away the most-used international language. Yet we in the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service have already learned that English alone is by no means enough. The world of international trade is already very competitive. The competition will only get tougher and the competition knows the local language.

I have described my organization's need for language skills, and I am sure my colleagues from the four other foreign affairs agencies would echo my thoughts. What about the private sector, the American business community which is USFCS's constituency? The need here is just as important and maybe even more so. While our officers overseas act as brokers, it is American business' task to make the sale or the investment, to operate on the ground, to run factories, to develop major projects, to develop long-term customer relationships. In all these areas language is a vital skill. While American companies can hire citizens of the country to help, as, in fact, we do, the final buck usually stops with an American.

Where does American business find people with both international marketing and language skills? If our own recruitment campaign is any indication, there are a number of people available right now. I wonder how much of this availability is due to the recession. I suggest that the private-sector demand for such people will begin to expand as American business becomes more export-minded. Perhaps our most important task in the USFCS is to promote export-consciousness among American business, to show U.S. companies that, given the right approach, training and resources, America can be competitive in world markets and that there is, indeed, money to be made in exports.

It is clear that, with our large and growing trade deficits, promoting American exports must be a major goal of this nation. All of our own efforts are aimed in this direction. Recent legislation has and will be making major contributions. The

changes in tax laws for overseas income and, more importantly, the new Export Trading Company Act, are excellent examples.

All of these efforts are combining to push more and more American companies in the direction of exports. As these firms get out into the international marketplace they will learn, as we have, how important language skills can be. They will then learn that obtaining language skills must be a cost of doing business, just like any other expense. As this happens, and I believe this process has already begun, the demand for language skills will begin to grow.

When this happens, businesses will be willing to pay the costs, that is, invest in language training for their employees. They will do what we have done—target language training for specific jobs in specific countries, making the best use of their resources.

To save money, businesses will also be looking for prospective employees who already have language skills. The most likely source are college graduates who have studied language while in school. However, I would hazard a guess that business will find, again as we have, that language skills will be rusty or untested in the international arena. In other words, many employees with language education will need additional, practical job-specific training to function effectively in overseas sales or management jobs.

Given these pragmatic constraints, language training in our schools and colleges at least provides business with employees who have a head start and helps sell American products in world markets. Of course language education in our schools benefits our society in general as well. While learning a language students also learn that there are other societies than our own in the world. Through the culture-learning aspects of language study students also learn that other peoples live in other ways. Having an informed populace that is internationalist in its outlook benefits our nation as a whole as well as specific sectors such as business.

However, we do not live in a world of unlimited resources. While we support increased language training in our schools and colleges as of general benefit to our society and our country, we suggest that overall governmental resource and budget constraints preclude earmarking funds for costly specialized programs. The supply of language training will be stimulated when the demand for that training increases. For our client, the American business community, this will happen, as I have noted, when it realizes the potential that lies in increasing exports. Then business will increase its own language training spending as well as demand language-trained people from local school systems. Local schools and colleges will then increase language training in response to increased demand. The decision as to when and in what languages should be a local decision. Our existing aid to education programs provide all the funds we can afford to put into education. Whether local jurisdictions use these funds for language training or other education should be up to them. They will decide their priorities, which we believe is as it should be. If local demand is for language training, then schools will allocate more resources to this area. This will make the best use of resources, since specific supply will be responding to specific demand.

Mr. McELHENY, The U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service has 1,100 officers, including in that almost 500 foreign nationals which we employ overseas. We have gained our language fluency in those foreign countries by employing those foreign nationals, in part, to make up for the lack of adequate language capacity in U.S. citizens.

During the last 18 months, I have recruited very aggressively from the private sector in order to obtain people who have language fluency. They have lived overseas already and have picked up their language capabilities by 10 years or more of living in a foreign country.

Three different times we advertised in the international publications—"The Wall Street Journal," "The International Herald Tribune"—"The Miami Herald" overseas and domestic and often having specified country-specific interests. We were able to attract by those ads some highly qualified candidates from a marketing, commercial and a language fluency capability, particularly from the world language countries. But it was not as strong as it should

have been and their actual performance on standardized testing has not been quite as good as they thought that their skill level was.

But we needed to do that because, as we put officers overseas, running them through a language training is very time-consuming. We lose an average of 14 weeks, and 10 man-years per year for re-training on language. That's \$2 million a year just to bring their skills up to commercially acceptable levels. Many of them have been trained in school systems and thought they had a language fluency level that would have allowed them to move overseas and be conversant, but that's not the case.

We do have these problems and I am very pleased to see that your committee is addressing the long-term implications of this. We have clearly lost business overseas to foreign competition, because, like the Japanese in JETRO, many of their young people have been in a Japanese Peace Corps equivalent and have been assigned overseas as young people. They move into the commercial and marketing aspects of their organizations perhaps more easily than our Peace Corps young people do. We don't have the commercial equivalent to that and probably shouldn't, but some of our competitors have figured out more innovative ways of moving their young people into the commercial realm after those young people have lived overseas, learned languages and the cultures of the countries in which they have been.

So there are some things that other countries have done with longer term strategies in the language fluency area that we need to gain from. Of course, the French and the British and others who have had their businessmen and young people living overseas more aggressively and longer than our society, have an advantage over us in that regard.

I might share with you that yesterday I was in Boston on an International Competitiveness Seminar, attended by the UAW, educators, and business people. One of the subjects of the workshop was how business, Government and labor cooperation could develop better-trained people for international competitiveness. The question of languages was high in that list of priorities, among other skills, of course—high technology, machine workers, things like that—but languages were brought out with a high degree of concern on the part of the UAW and the teachers, the educators and the business people on exactly this issue. I see a growing awareness in the grassroots, local school boards, the unions and the business sector in a cooperative effort in this same area that you are addressing.

My own personal experience in this general area has been gained through former Congressman Al Quie who was active in this area and who is a close personal friend and who taught me the little bit that I know about how to focus on educational excellence and performance standards in education.

I would suggest that one of the things that we might start doing is rewarding performance, achievement, by grants to students and maybe to the schools, based on how well their language proficiency tests trend. That might be a way of directing incentives to better performance areas as well as maybe others. That is not inconsistent with what I believe was done in rewarding gifted students in

Al Quie's time. I mean that was done as a legislative matter here. I am not sure exactly how it was done, but it was something along those lines and that might be a possible solution for language as well.

A couple of things that I have learned recently would support that. I was in Arizona 3 weeks ago at the American Graduate School of International Management, a private school that focuses on training 1-year graduate students in both language capabilities and in business, like an MBA, but with foreign language being high on their curriculum and with a high number of foreign students attending. They also have training contracts with foreign governments as well.

So they have had a different approach to the language. Instead of the classic language education, they are more oriented to the business and commercial language vocabulary and usage patterns so that their students move easily and quickly into the commercial applications.

I think that sort of thought process and their methodologies and their focus on the kinds of useful business-oriented language is one of the things that would help us to become more competitive in a commercial sense. Now, I am not talking about the diplomatic aspects, the more complicated, subtle aspects of a foreign language, but rather those things that come up in more of a day-to-day commercial context.

I have had some difficulty getting the Foreign Service Institute here—at the State Department. We had a young person that we wanted to send to the Soviet Union and he was already in Massachusetts with his family. We had recruited him. It's expensive for me to bring all of my officers here to Washington, to put their families up, pay the moving expense while they train in a language and then send them overseas.

So we tried to get a delegated authority to have him go to the Russian language school in Massachusetts (Harvard University). There was quite a bit of bureaucratic impediment in the way of doing that, but we did, in fact, finally get FSI to designate that particular department as proficient enough to meet their standards. We did, therefore, for the first time have a student go through an outside language training cycle at a lower expense to us and reach a proficiency level that was satisfactory to FSI.

Now I submit to you that is just an example of the kind of thing that might be done by establishing standards of performance and delegating them out to either a university or high school or the private sector, Berlitz. I mean, why not go to the private sector as well and see if we can't allow achievement of those scores on a national standard—and they are fairly easily established, but at least they are more oriented toward, in that particular case, the kind of language fluency that we need in a commercial officer. There may be different standard levels for a diplomatic career versus a commercial career. But those are the kind of things that I see and I was trying to get the American Graduate School in Arizona to work with the Foreign Service Institute to see if they can't become a designated school to be certified to reach a certain level of proficiency, maybe not the final level of proficiency but at least up to some minimum standard, which then, it takes me less time and expense

or any company less time and expense to add the additional layer of fluency.

I suggest that maybe that is a train of thought in a direction that you might also go as you bring the level of language fluency up, at least to radiate the standards of performance out to different institutions. It might be useful to you.

Well, those are some of the thoughts that I have had. They are not contained in my written text, but there is some background on the Foreign Commercial Service and our problems in finding language-fluent U.S. citizens and getting them overseas and our costs and our lost time because there is not an adequate level of language capacity in our graduates.

Mr. SIMON. We thank you very much for your testimony. Incidentally, you mentioned Al Quie. As you probably are aware he was the ranking Republican on this committee for a long time and an active member of this subcommittee.

Mr. McELHENY. Right.

Mr. SIMON. He is on the President's Commission on Excellence in Education and was in Washington yesterday for it.

Mr. McELHENY. Your Counsel just informed me of that. I missed him. I am sorry that I did.

Mr. SIMON. Yes. There's one aspect to your testimony that I don't know that we're going to be able to deal with, but I defer to my colleagues in the academic arena. I think what you're talking about in terms of tests and proficiency tests and recognition of other schools by FSI or by some kind of national recognition procedure, is one of the real needs in this whole area.

Mr. McELHENY. There's no doubt of that.

Mr. SIMON. I don't know, frankly, that the Federal Government is equipped to deal with that problem. We are in it through FSI, but it is one of the areas that maybe, Jim, we will refer to a future witness here and to the academic arena and some of my other friends in the foreign language community.

Mr. McELHENY. Well, we have a National Bureau of Standards for Technology and Weights and Measures. It doesn't seem inappropriate to have one for language competency.

Mr. SIMON. I'm not here to disagree with you on that. Laughter.

Mr. McELHENY. No.

Mr. SIMON. The basic thrust of your testimony, just to reiterate it, is that we are losing business overseas.

Mr. McELHENY. No doubt.

Mr. SIMON. Because we don't have the skills.

Mr. McELHENY. That's right. There's no doubt of that. I can't give you a quantifiable number but it's very substantive.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Coleman.

Mr. COLEMAN. Do you feel that the lack of training in foreign languages is the result of lack of requirements for entry by colleges and universities? Is that a contributing factor, do you think?

Mr. McELHENY. Well, I'm sure it would have some effect. My own personal experience and training in Spanish in California. Just seemed like a natural thing to do because of the history of California, with the Mexican tradition and Spanish language being very nearby in proximity, and I went on with 6 years of it and training at a university.

But when I took my first business trip to Mexico I was inept, virtually inept, in a conversational sense. So, even if the requirements were there, it's the content and the form that's crucial as well. So, just requiring language is not enough. It's the kind of content and the specific focus of the language training that is crucial as well.

But yes, those must proceed jointly.

Mr. SIMON. If my colleague would yield for just a moment, it's interesting that the Commission yesterday, the National Commission on Excellence, said that we ought to be getting 4 to 6 years of foreign language study for all students.

Mr. McELHENY. That's probably right.

Mr. COLEMAN. And I just hope you will agree that sometimes students won't voluntarily do what probably is best for them as students or as future citizens or as businessmen and women, and I just wonder if—I think the Commission also suggested that there be requirements in math, science, and english. They may have hesitated over foreign language but I hope we can agree that this is something that the colleges and universities have to recognize, that in order to raise the standards of graduates in a curriculum they are going to have to put in some standards of excellence in their requirements.

Mr. McELHENY. That's quite correct. I have spent a considerable sum of money tutoring my son privately in French because the school that he is now going to has those more severe standards. He is mandated for a foreign language and he has to achieve a certain achievement level and by whatever means—he's going to Berlitz on the weekends—we've been doing this for a couple of years to make sure that he reaches some level of acceptability, and it just takes those same tougher standards, in a broader sense. I mean broader, more institutions.

Mr. COLEMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. If I may ask a personal question, what school is your son attending?

Mr. McELHENY. He's currently in St. Alban's.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Harrison?

Mr. HARRISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to say I was fascinated by your testimony and I quickly read your statement while you were speaking. I agree with you. I think the thrust of your testimony is pretty clearly the case, that we are losing business opportunities. I notice on page 4 you talk about languages such as Turkish and Greek, Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic.

Mr. McELHENY. Right.

Mr. HARRISON. Those are the so-called hard languages.

Mr. McELHENY. Right.

Mr. HARRISON. I confess to some confusion, then, and I'd like to give you a chance to comment on this, about the last page of your statement, when you suggest that somehow the local school boards around the country are the ones who ought to be making the decisions about what languages should be taught. I'm not quite sure how you propose that local schools and colleges will then increase language training in response to increased demand, the decision as to when and in what languages should be a local decision.

I have great respect for the school directors in my district but I don't think that they have your level of knowledge or expertise,

and frankly, I'm not sure that they're the appropriate people to know whether Turkish or Greek or Arabic or Cantonese is what we need to accelerate our foreign business interests.

Do you have a comment on that? I'd appreciate hearing it.

Mr. McELHENY. Well, I'm very encouraged by my experience in Boston yesterday with the UAW and the local school board authorities and the business community, sitting down and beginning to address a number of competitiveness problems together, and language was one of them.

Now, Massachusetts—and New England—is a very high-exporting State, 26 percent of their manufacturing base, one out of every five jobs being created by exports. They are a lot more aware of which countries have market opportunities and of which languages might be useful to their business community and their students than we might imagine, sitting here in Washington.

And I am not so afraid of local option of decisions. But there also must be some national standards, and it's the level of proficiency that should be uniform and consistent, by which all schools are measured. But when I was in Wichita, I read they were thinking of establishing a school in Cantonese. Now, who would have thought, sitting here, that Wichita would have decided to establish a school of business training in Cantonese? I would be very nervous not providing the local option for whatever language they determine the market might, in fact, be for their graduates.

I would submit that competitiveness among the schools might be a healthy ingredient in any of your solutions.

Mr. HARRISON. That's a very thoughtful answer and I can see it happening, particularly in New England where, as you say, they do have a tremendous export experience.

Mr. McELHENY. Right.

Mr. HARRISON. I wonder, though, if we might not end up with a situation where the needs which you see are where the opportunity for language education just doesn't reach large numbers of our young people because they live in school districts which don't have either the foresight of Wichita or the practical experience of New England.

I guess what I am suggesting to you is that maybe there ought to be some motivation from the national level as well as some setting of standards.

Mr. McELHENY. I would certainly agree with that, particularly in the world languages where they are more universally useful, the four or five world languages. They might certainly lend themselves to a more general encouragement. But the local option, if they decide to pursue Turkish and build an excellent department in the Turkish language and Turkish area studies, they should not be discouraged in any way from doing that.

My most difficult language to find was Serbo-Croatian, Yugoslavia. It's very narrow. And to my knowledge there is no school that has a Serbo-Croatian department except maybe one that happens to have a couple of Yugoslav professors. But I would hope that there would be a provision that some school might want to do that and a certain number of students, and families with history and interest in that section of the world might very well—it might be

good for us to have a number of very specialized focus things going on as well as some national standard on German or French.

Mr. HARRISON. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Petri?

Mr. PETRI. I guess I have more of a comment than anything else and that is that it strikes me that if our Government is serious about being a major participant in affairs and feels it has interests all over the world, we ought to be investing on a very long-term basis in developing human capabilities within our population to be able to understand and know on a personal basis, almost, people in lots of different cultures and language groups around the world.

I think the British did that, or at least—

Mr. McELHENY. Right.

Mr. PETRI [continuing]. But the thing is we think they did it and they may still do it. I remember serving in the Peace Corps in a little country called Somalia.

Mr. McELHENY. Oh, yes.

Mr. PETRI. And then still there were two or three Englishmen who, when Somalia had to make a statement at the U.N., they didn't even have diplomatic relations but they would suddenly appear in the country and help draft this sort of thing and stay at the Prime Minister's residence and so on, and there were personal ties as well as—which were founded on linguistic ties. These people knew and interpreted Somali—the Somali language and knew Somali affairs and Somali personalities and wrote articles defending the Somali point of view in rather obscure English religious publications and things of that sort, but nonetheless, there was a sense that they had friends and ties that went two ways that we usually don't have in these sorts of countries around the world.

We sweep in, try to move the Earth and change the world overnight and then leave and forget about it, and we haven't had the continuity of attention or interest, even on the part of a few people, that serious application would require.

Mr. McELHENY. You're quite right.

My experience in visiting 35 countries in the last 24 months and talking with local business people and some of our closer friends in the foreign government or business community certainly is consistent with your assessment of that problem.

Mr. PETRI. But how do you really build that in? You have to find careers for people, whether it's in the government or in academic life or some foundation life or businesses, or something, who feel can keep body and soul together and nonetheless sustain an interest in some sort of—what today might be an obscure corner of the world, whether it's Uganda, some part of Uganda, or something else. It could turn out to be terribly important at a particular time.

There is one man who knew Kikuyu, I guess, who was an English settler's son, and that helped quell the Mau-Mau. And those resources can't be brought about if they haven't been built over a period of 20 years.

So, how can we help bring that process about for our particular situation?

Mr. McELHENY. Well, one way we're doing it, perhaps not aware of quite how extensive it is, at Wisconsin State and Iowa, State of Iowa, they're now going through and identifying all of the gradu-

ates that have come to the United States from various countries, gone through the U.S. school system and are back in those countries. They're friends of ours in a little different way than you were describing. And they are making them honorary commercial attaches.

Now, they don't have any problem with language competency. They haven't been given even a modest role in linking to the United States, even though their education was here. And I see there are some other ways of building on those graduates. We have hundreds of thousands of students in the United States, from virtually every foreign country.

There are ways of incorporating in their education patterns some follow through in behalf of everybody's bicultural interests. That's one way of getting at that. We're just beginning to understand some of the subtleties of that too.

And there's the student exchange programs that take place voluntarily in the private sector and in the international organizations, private volunteer organizations, a whole framework of private volunteer organizations. They haven't really been tapped with respect to the young people and—I mean not in the area of commercial interests, for example. It's more the health-oriented things.

But I was down with Andrew Orkey, who is the head of the International Association of Private Volunteer Organizations, in Texas last week and we talked about some of these same problems. I would anticipate that the PVO's, the private volunteer organizations, can begin to address the outflow and more permanent use of the private sector, the entrepreneur, the small businessman, as one of the linkages to the developing world and to transfer the management and entrepreneurial skills, and to build employment at the grass roots—I'm talking in a commercial sense.

You'll excuse me. That's where I come from mostly. But it does address some of your points. And those commercial linkages and those friendships do develop, the patterns, mutual trust that is important to everybody for other reasons as well. And I see the PVO's moving into this and the small business, private businessman, the entrepreneur, moving into that.

It's interesting that in Switzerland, the External Trade Organization of Switzerland, has commissioned some people who go around Asia and contact these small businesses to establish partnerships and joint ventures with Swiss small businessmen, for precisely the same reason that your concern is about.

And I think that we can learn something about that. I think that those are some of the things that we can encourage to take place and be aware of their existence.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Ackerman?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you. I'm curious. What percentage of your people who speak some of the narrower languages do so because of their family background or their parents or grandparents might speak it or come from those countries?

Mr. McELHENY. Literally grew up with it in their home, so to speak?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. McELHENY. I don't know. I'll be happy to look into that. We can see if we have some records that might suggest the answer. My

personal experience with our people on the hard languages is that it might be 20 or 30 percent. We, in fact, have some ethnic background people we've hired for the Peoples' Republic of China, for example, and we're looking—and Serbo-Croatian, Yugoslav background. I believe, and some of the African things we're trying to do.

So, I would say we've had to rely on some ethnic history for maybe 20 or 30 percent of our hard language candidates. They've come that way.

Mr. ACKERMAN. That's a rather large percentage.

Mr. McELHENY. Well, yes, of course, Particularly for those unique languages. Well, sure. Our United States is built up that way. That's not inconsistent with our democratic base.

Mr. ACKERMAN. No, I understand. I certainly understand that. I'm just trying to understand if the people that are placed in your agency with these narrower languages are culturally motivated to study and pursue them or whether they're being encouraged by external forces of the marketplace or the world of academia?

Mr. McELHENY. Oh, I think they're probably culturally motivated.

More at this point. Although the commercial realization is coming a little higher. We can see that rising as well.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Would we be better off exploiting that or would we be better off just with general encouragement of sorts in our colleges and universities today?

Mr. McELHENY. I think you'll probably find some natural tendencies in ethnic neighborhoods, in the school boards, for them to be proud of that cultural history and that a likely pattern will be in some communities, in some schools, to maintain some continuity in the school orientation in certain languages that might be indigentous to those countries or neighborhood, and I find that a good thing.

There is a natural base that we've not capitalized on that exists in our wide variety of ethnic communities that could be brought into play much more.

Mr. ACKERMAN. That would be done basically by school boards in areas which have a high percentage of people from a particular ethnic background?

Mr. McELHENY. It might well be. Sure. Why not?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I'm not discouraging you.

Mr. McELHENY. No, no. [Laughter.]

Mr. ACKERMAN. I'm just trying to figure a way to motivate in those areas where the percentage might not be that great.

Mr. McELHENY. Yes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. To motivate in areas where the school board would put in an option for Serbo-Croatian or something like that.

Mr. McELHENY. Then they revert back to the other question. You probably then have one of the world languages. There's a natural tendency for those schools, areas, section that have no natural cultural—

Mr. ACKERMAN. But those are not the areas that you're having trouble in. You're not having trouble finding people who speak Italian and so on?

Mr. McELHENY. Oh, that too, sure. Oh, yes, sure, that too. And the kind of language, vocabulary and use, conversational, business oriented language fluency, that is not much in existence yet either. I mean as a separate problem there. Nor is there any standard by which I know for testing so that I know when a student applies for a job or a business person applies for a job. I have to send them to the FSI test to get my national standard. I don't find any out there that I would be able to judge. I get a person with an "A" in mathematics from Harvard or an "A" from Yale or an "A" from Princeton or the University of Michigan or Berkeley. I am pretty sure what I've got.

But that's not the case in foreign language. You don't know what you have, whether it be a hard language or a world language.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I'd like to pursue that for just a second. I come from a very ethnically diverse district. In fact, a lot of people are within the second and third generation of coming here and the grandparents speak a number of Eastern European languages around the house. What happened in my area is precisely the reverse of what you and Mr. Ackerman were discussing. A number of the parochial schools, especially, used to encourage the foreign language and they began to discourage it on the grounds that it was somehow a mark of low status or of failure to assimilate, and so they didn't want to speak Polish as a second language because that was something embarrassing.

And I think one of the things we have to do is reverse that psychology and build up a positive image toward those languages.

Mr. McELHENY. I agree with you and I think the support somehow, and the standards, and the encouragement, from both local and Federal direction, would be useful in that.

Mr. HARRISON. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. I have no questions.

Mr. SIMON. We thank you, very, very much, for your testimony and for your leadership.

Mr. McELHENY. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. You've been a valuable witness here today.

Mr. McELHENY. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much.

We now have a panel of Dr. James Alatis, Dr. Earl Backman, and Dr. Ramon Santiago.

We will include your statement as part of the record in its entirety, Mr. Alatis, if you would like to go first.

[Prepared statement of James E. Alatis follows.]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES E. ALATIS, PRESIDENT, DEAN, SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Joint National Committee for Languages in Support of the Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act. The JNCL is an organization composed of 26 of the Nation's major language associations representing the interests of over 200,000 language professionals with expertise in all areas of the world including technology, the less commonly taught languages, the classics, translation, English as a second language, and bilingual education. We consider this legis-

lative initiative for language education of vital importance to the profession, or students, and the Nation.

Over the last few years, the national need for improved and increased language skills has been well documented by the Perkins Commission report, the chairman of this subcommittee's excellent book, "The Tongue-Tied American," and numerous articles in magazines and newspapers. While we have begun to identify the crisis proportions of our national language gap, it has not been addressed in any comprehensive and thoughtful fashion. National support and leadership, with a few important exceptions, has been lacking. Policy and legislation that will address all areas of the problem is essential if we are to resolve this national dilemma. Therefore, we commend you for the legislation under consideration here today. By encouraging model programs, by promoting language skills at the elementary and secondary level, by increasing college and university enrollments, by providing in-service language training, and by providing intensive training in the less commonly taught languages, this legislation considers the broad-based nature of the problem as it relates to our national security and economic relations, as well as its educational implications.

There is no question that language study is a legitimate and pressing national security and economic issue. To cite just a few examples, only last year, Admiral Inman of the CIA testified that the intelligence community has been "severely impacted" by the decline in foreign language study. In its report on university responsiveness, the Defense Science Board, stated that "Foreign language and area studies in American Universities are in need of support." In 1980, a General Accounting Office study estimated that of the 13,600 Department of Defense language essential positions, only about 30 percent were filled at the required proficiency level or filled at all.

The need in regard to trade and international economic policy is also relatively evident, although a great deal more study needs to be done on how to address the language needs of American Business. According to the American Council on Education's excellent study, Business and International Education, one of the few areas where businesses dealing internationally agree is that language study is important. A recent survey by the Ohio Modern Language Association of Businesses in Ohio's major cities indicated that a majority of the firms responding noted the value of language proficiency for some or all of their personnel. A number of the State commissions on foreign language and international studies have indicated strong correlations between trade in their States and foreign language/international study.

The global marketplace is now highly competitive and quite interdependent, and from our perspective, the data seem relatively compelling with one of eight U.S. manufacturing jobs dependent on export, one of every three American acres planted for export and one-third of our profits derived from trade. Six thousand U.S. companies have offices overseas, 20,000 U.S. firms engage in exporting, and 35,000 U.S. businesspersons live abroad.

There are also significant domestic implications involved in the issue of economic interdependence. Tourism is a major U.S. industry. The need for translation and interpretation services continues to mushroom in the United States. Many areas of sales, social services, hotel management, and transportation could benefit from employees with language skills. Businesses, of course, are not hiring nor will they hire the future individuals solely for their language skills. They have, nevertheless, begun to look for another language as a supplement. Consequently, the language teaching community has also begun to recognize the importance of providing language courses geared to the communicative and specialized needs of the business community.

Because there are important political, military, economic and intellectual concerns, the language community is aware that we must be willing and able to provide communicative competence and specialized skills when necessary. We would also note that the type of language competence required for high level diplomacy, technical translation, and intelligence gathering is not acquired quickly or with little effort. It requires fairly intensive, long-term study. For this reason, it is particularly important that we encourage language study in elementary and secondary schools as well as in postsecondary institutions.

In addition to the obvious benefits of acquiring language skills and increased cultural awareness, there are other advantages to beginning language study early. In terms of our national needs, it allows us to identify aptitude and motivation. In terms of educational benefits, indications are simply that it is easier to learn languages at a younger age and that those who learn languages early are more likely to continue with the language and have an easier time learning others. Finally, there appear to be some beneficial side effects to language study which may or may

not be directly related. Current data indicate that the scholastic aptitude test scores of students who have studied languages are higher on both the verbal and math tests than those who have not. Recent research also indicates that language study improves reading skills and that reading skills are transferable from one language to another.

With regard to language teacher education and the availability of language teachers, we share some problems comparable to those being experienced in the and science disciplines, but we also face problems that are unique to language teaching. Each of these critical fields have suffered declines in enrollments and an easing of requirements. As yet, the language profession has experienced severe shortages only in the classics, the less commonly taught languages and dual language requirements. On the other hand, we are now experiencing "emerging shortages" and "spot shortages" as well in the other languages as demand has begun to increase and requirements are being reimplemented. Two factors lead us to anticipate serious future language teacher shortages. First, language study reached its low point a few years ago when only 15 percent of all U.S. students, from seventh grade through graduate school, were enrolled in language courses. Secondly, a number of colleges and universities have either reinstated or strengthened their language entrance or exit requirements. Last year, for example, 70 colleges and universities reestablished entrance or degree requirements. Among these were some prestigious and large universities such as Berkeley and four others in the California system, North Carolina, Vermont, Missouri (Kansas City and St. Louis), Indiana, Emory, Duke, and, of course, Georgetown. These requirements, when combined with the possibility now being considered by some States of reintroducing academic language requirements at the secondary level, will certainly increase teacher demand.

Equally important is the necessity of periodic retraining in both skills and methods for foreign language teachers. Perhaps the most effective means of skill retraining is to provide opportunities to function in a language in another country. However, most often skill retraining is provided by weekend or week-long immersion workshops or summer institutes. The importance of in-service language training remains a significant priority of the profession.

If we are to meet the needs of Government and business, it means that teachers must also retrain and stay abreast of methodology. Increased demands for communicative skills, specialized and intensive programs, interdisciplinary approaches, specific business, and scientific terminology and practical applications will be possible only if teachers can keep abreast of new methods and have the opportunity to develop creative and innovative approaches. Language institutes will provide a means of sharing and developing methodological expertise about video cassettes, narrowcast television, interactive computer programs, and satellite communication, to name a few areas, as well as sharpening language skills.

An important part of the slight increase we have recently experienced in language study, particularly as it concerns our national security and economic growth, has been in the less commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Japanese, and Chinese. A commonly cited statistic in discussions of these languages is that less than 1 percent of America's college students study the languages of three-fourths of the world's population. However, it is even more revealing to specifically consider the actual numbers of students enrolled in some of these "low density" or "exotic" languages. In 1978, the last year for which we have complete figures, Arabic had 3,070 students enrolled at the postsecondary level and 7 students at the public secondary level. Swahili had 2,225 postsecondary students and 97 public secondary students. The figures respectively for Japanese were 10,721 and 7,332; Chinese 9,809 and 1,241, and Portuguese 4,954 and 3,547. We do not have secondary school figures for Korean and Hindi, but at the postsecondary level, the figures were 163 students and 355 students respectively. These figures serve to illustrate the very serious shortages as they concern major international economic actors such as Japan, Brazil, or OPEC, and actors of significant importance to our security such as China, Korea, and the developing nations. Consequently, we are in agreement with this legislation's preferential focus in sections 6 and 8 on specific geographical regions and languages.

In conclusion, we in the language teaching community see this legislation as a challenge and a promise. The promise is to our students and our country. The challenge is to us as a profession and, I believe, it is one we are ready to accept. In a recent article entitled "Beachheads in International Education," Sven Groennings, director of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, identified as one of the beachheads "foreign language proficiency testing." He noted that the focus of the profession on competence in communication and on testing that competence " . . . will reorient language education, revitalize the foreign language pro-

fessions, and increase the relevance of language learning for students and for a wide range of employers." In another recent article entitled "Building a Language Profession," my esteemed colleague, Richard Brod of the Modern Language Association, concluded that "... there is in fact a reasonable degree of consensus in our field concerning professional standards and the means of achieving them."

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is fair and accurate to say that the language community supports the Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act of 1983 because we feel confident we can provide the quality instruction this legislation makes possible and because we are aware of the pressing national need it identifies. We thank you and this subcommittee for the opportunity to express our support and for the leadership and thoughtfulness you have demonstrated in considering this very complex issue.

Mr. SIMON. If I can apologize in advance, at about 10:25 I'm going to have to leave for a short while. My colleague, Danny Rostenkowski, is having his portrait unveiled as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the members of the Illinois delegation, we are not required to be present but collegiality, I guess, requires my presence. At that point I'm going to turn the chair over to my colleague, Mr. Harrison.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, there are many of us who would like to be there, particularly since he has courage enough to tell the bankers where to go and how to get there. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMON. I will convey that to him, Bill.

Mr. HARRISON. One of his colleagues, Mr. Chairman, said that they were hanging Dan Rostenkowski today and 600 people came in from Chicago to see it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOODLING. They must have all been bankers. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMON. First, Dr. Alatis, who is with the—not with the school of languages and linguistics. You're the Dean if I recall correctly, at Georgetown University, and also chairman of the Joint National Committee for Languages.

STATEMENT OF DEAN JAMES E. ALATIS, SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY (REPRESENTING THE JOINT NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR LANGUAGES); DR. EARL L. BACKMAN, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHARLOTTE, AND CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATORS; AND DR. RAMON SANTIAGO, DIRECTOR, BILINGUAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, AND CHAIRMAN, ANNUAL CONFERENCE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. ALATIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the subcommittee, I am James Alatis, president of the Joint National Committee for Languages and dean of the School of Languages and Linguistics at Georgetown University. The JNCL is an organization composed of 26 of the Nation's major language associations, representing interests of over 200,000 language professionals, with expertise in all areas of the field including technology, the less commonly taught languages, the classics, translation, English as a second language, and bilingual education.

I have the honor of testifying before you today to voice the JNCL's support of the Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act. The JNCL considers this legislative initiative for lan-

guage education to be essential in our national security agenda. I am certain that this subcommittee fully understands the gravity of the problems posed by this country's linguistic incompetence.

The Perkins Commission report has documented the serious shortcomings in foreign language study and its damaging impact on trade, diplomatic relations, and national security. In addition, the Chair of this subcommittee has eloquently discussed this issue in his book, "The Tongue-Tied American," a copy of which I hold here.

Mr. SIMON. I thank you.

Mr. ALATIS. You do that for me sometime, Paul. Thank you.

As a result of this recent publicity, our inability as a Nation to communicate with others is a scandal which has become common knowledge. However, I fear that many people outside the language field fail to appreciate the far-reaching impact that this problem has had on national security and on domestic and international trade.

As our chairman has indicated, it was Admiral Inman, speaking for the CIA, that cited the decline in language study as a major problem for the intelligence gathering community, and I would like also to reinforce the chairman's mention of the study by the Commission on Excellence in Education, a Nation at Risk, which is very much in consonance with the legislation here at hand.

I'd like to have that read into the record, if that is possible.

[The information referred to follows:]

THE FINAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION—
A NATION AT RISK

Our Nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technology innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world. This report is concerned with only one of the many causes and dimensions of the problem, but it is the one that undergirds American prosperity, security, and civility. We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur; others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments.

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenges. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament.

Our society and its educational institutions seem to have lost sight of the basic purposes of schooling, and of the high expectations and disciplined effort needed to attain them. This report, the result of 18 months of study, seeks to generate reform of our educational system in fundamental ways and to renew the Nation's commitment to schools and colleges of high quality throughout the length and breadth of our land.

That we have compromised this commitment is, upon reflection, hardly surprising, given the multitude of often conflicting demands we have placed on our Nation's schools and colleges. They are routinely called on to provide solutions to personal, social, and political problems that the home and other institutions either will not or cannot resolve. We must understand that these demands on our schools and colleges often exact an educational cost as well as a financial one.

On the occasion of the Commission's first meeting, President Reagan noted the central importance of education in American life when he said: "Certainly there are

few areas of American life as important to our society, to our people, and to our families as our schools and colleges." This report, therefore, is as much an open letter to the American people as it is report to the Secretary of Education. We are confident that the American people, properly informed, will do what is right for their children and for the generation to come.

THE RISK

History is not kind to idlers. The time is long past when America's destiny was assured simply by an abundance of natural resources and inexhaustible human enthusiasm, and by our relative isolation from the malignant problems of older civilizations. The world is indeed one global village. We live among determined, well-educated, and strongly motivated competitors. We compete with them for international standing and markets, not only with products but also with the ideas of our laboratories and neighborhood workshops. America's position in the world may once have been reasonably secure with only a few exceptionally well-trained men and women. It is no longer.

The risk is not only that the Japanese make automobiles more efficiently than Americans and have government subsidies for development and export. It is not just that the South Koreans recently built the world's most efficient steel mill, or that American machine tools, once the pride of the world, are being displaced by German products. It is also that these developments signify a redistribution of trained capability throughout the globe. Knowledge, learning, information, and skilled intelligence are the new raw materials of international commerce and are today spreading throughout the world as vigorously as miracle drugs, synthetic fertilizers, and blue jeans did earlier. If only to keep and improve on the slim competitive edge we still retain in world markets, we must dedicate ourselves to the reform of our educational system for the benefit of all—old and young alike, affluent and poor, majority and minority. Learning is the indispensable investment required for success in the "information age" we are entering.

Our concern, however, goes well beyond matters such as industry and commerce. It also includes the intellectual, moral, and spiritual strengths of our people which knit together the very fabric of our society. The people of the United States need to know that individuals in our society who do not possess the levels of skill, literacy, and training essential to this new era will be effectively disenfranchised, not simply from the material rewards that accompany competent performance, but also from the chance to participate fully in our national life. A high level of shared education is essential to a free, democratic society and to the fostering of a common culture, especially in a country that prides itself on pluralism and individual freedom.

For our country to function, citizens must be able to reach some common understandings on complex issues, often on short notice and on the basis of conflicting or incomplete evidence. Education helps form these common understandings, a point Thomas Jefferson made long ago in his justly famous dictum:

I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from but to inform their discretion."

Part of what is at risk is the promise first made on this continent: All, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost. This promise means that all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself.

INDICATORS OF THE RISK

The educational dimensions of the risk before us have been amply documented in testimony received by the Commission. For example:

International comparisons of student achievement, completed a decade ago, reveal that on 19 academic tests American students were never first or second and, in comparison with other industrialized nations, were last seven times.

Some 23 million American adults are functionally illiterate by the simplest tests of everyday reading, writing, and comprehension.

About 13 percent of all 17-year-olds in the United States can be considered functionally illiterate. Functional illiteracy among minority youth may run as high as 40 percent.

Average achievement of high school students on most standardized tests is now lower than 26 years ago when Sputnik was launched.

Over half the population of gifted students do not match their tested ability with comparable achievement in school.

The College Board's Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT) demonstrate a virtually unbroken decline from 1963 to 1980. Average verbal scores fell over 50 points and average mathematics scores dropped nearly 40 points.

College Board achievement tests also reveal consistent declines in recent years in such subjects as physics and English.

Both the number and proportion of students demonstrating superior achievement on the SATs (i.e., those with scores of 650 or higher) have also dramatically declined.

Many 17-year-olds do not possess the "higher order" intellectual skills we should expect of them. Nearly 40 percent cannot draw inferences from written material; only one-fifth can write a persuasive essay; and only one-third can solve a mathematics problem requiring several steps.

There was a steady decline in science achievement scores of U.S. 17-year-olds as measured by national assessments of science in 1969, 1973, and 1977.

Between 1975 and 1980, remedial mathematics courses in public 4-year colleges increased by 72 percent and now constitute one-quarter of all mathematics courses taught in those institutions.

Average tested achievement of students graduating from college is also lower.

Business and military leaders complain that they are required to spend millions of dollars on costly remedial education and training programs in such basic skills as reading, writing, spelling, and computation. The Department of the Navy, for example, reported to the Commission that one-quarter of its recent recruits cannot read at the ninth grade level, the minimum needed simply to understand written safety instructions. Without remedial work they cannot even begin, much less complete, the sophisticated training essential in much of the modern military.

These deficiencies come at a time when the demand for highly skilled workers in new fields is accelerating rapidly. For example:

Computers and computer-controlled equipment are penetrating every aspect of our lives—homes, factories, and offices.

One estimate indicates that by the turn of the century millions of jobs will involve laser technology and robotics.

Technology is radically transforming a host of other occupations. They include health care, medical science, energy production, food processing, construction, and the building, repair, and maintenance of sophisticated scientific, educational, military, and industrial equipment.

Analysts examining these indicators of student performance and the demands for new skills have made some chilling observations. Educational researcher Paul Hurd concluded at the end of a thorough national survey of student achievement that within the context of the modern scientific revolution, "We are raising a new generation of Americans that is scientifically and technologically illiterate." In a similar vein, John Slaughter, a former Director of the National Science Foundation, warned of "a growing chasm between a small scientific and technological elite and a citizenry ill-informed, indeed unformed, on issues with a science component."

But the problem does not stop there, nor do all observers see it the same way. Some worry that schools may emphasize such rudiments as reading and computation at the expense of other essential skills such as comprehension, analysis, solving problems, and drawing conclusions. Still others are concerned that an over-emphasis on technical and occupational skills will leave little time for studying the arts and humanities that so enrich daily life, help maintain civility, and develop a sense of community. Knowledge of the humanities, they maintain, must be harnessed to science and technology if the latter are to remain creative and humane, just as the humanities need to be informed by science and technology if they are to remain relevant to the human condition. Another analyst, Paul Cooperman, has drawn a sobering conclusion. Until now, he has noted:

"Each generation of Americans has outstripped its parents in education, in literacy, and in economic attainment. For the first time in the history of our country, the educational skills of one generation will not surpass, will not equal, will not even approach, those of their parents."

It is important, of course, to recognize that the average citizen today is better educated and more knowledgeable than the average citizen of a generation ago—more literate, and exposed to more mathematics, literature, and science. The positive impact of this fact on the well-being of our country and the lives of our people cannot be overstated. Nevertheless, the average graduate of our schools and colleges

today is not as well-educated as the average graduate of 25 or 35 years ago, when a much smaller proportion of our population completed high school and college. The negative impact of this fact likewise cannot be overstated.

HOPE AND FRUSTRATION

Statistics and their interpretation by experts show only the surface dimension of the difficulties we face. Beneath them lies a tension between hope and frustration that characterizes current attitudes about education at every level.

We have heard the voices of high school and college students, school board members, and teachers; of leaders of industry, minority groups, and higher education; of parents and State officials. We could hear the hope evident in their commitment to quality education and in their descriptions of outstanding programs and schools. We could also hear the intensity of their frustration, a growing impatience with shoddiness is too often reflected in our schools and colleges. Their frustration threatens to overwhelm their hope.

What lies behind this emerging national sense of frustration can be described as both a dimming of personal expectations and the fear of losing a shared vision for America.

On the personal level the student, the parent, and the caring teacher all perceive that a basic promise is not being kept. More and more young people emerge from high school ready neither for college nor for work. This predicament becomes more acute as the knowledge base continues its rapid expansion, the number of traditional jobs shrinks, and new jobs demand greater sophistication and preparation.

On a broader scale, we sense that this undertone of frustration has significant political implications, for it cuts across ages, generations, races, and political and economic groups. We have come to understand that the public will demand that educational and political leaders act forcefully and effectively on these issues. Indeed, such demands have already appeared and could well become a unifying national preoccupation. This unity, however, can be achieved only if we avoid the unproductive tendency of some to search for scapegoats among the victims, such as the beleaguered teachers.

On the positive side is the significant movement by political and educational leaders to search for solutions—so far centering largely on the nearly desperate need for increased support for the teaching of mathematics and science. This movement is but a start on what we believe is a larger and more educationally encompassing need to improve teaching and learning in fields such as English, history, geography, economics, and foreign languages. We believe this movement must be broadened and directed toward reform and excellence throughout education.

EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

We define "excellence" to mean several related things. At the level of the individual learner, it means performing on the boundary of individual ability in ways that test and push back personal limits, in school and in the workplace. Excellence characterizes a school or college that sets high expectations and goals for all learners, then tries in every way possible to help students reach them. Excellence characterizes a society that has adopted these policies, for it will then be prepared through the education and skill of its people to respond to the challenges of a rapidly changing world. Our Nation's people and its schools and colleges must be committed to achieving excellence in all these senses.

We do not believe that a public commitment to excellence and educational reform must be made at the expense of a strong public commitment to the equitable treatment of our diverse population. The twin goals of equity and high-quality schooling have profound and practical meaning for our economy and society, and we cannot permit one to yield to the other either in principle or in practice. To do so would deny young people their chance to learn and live according to their aspirations and abilities. It also would lead to a generalized accommodation to mediocrity in our society on the one hand or the creation of an undemocratic elitism on the other.

Our goal must be to develop the talents of all to their fullest. Attaining that goal requires that we expect and assist all students to work to the limits of their capabilities. We should expect schools to have genuinely high standards rather than minimum ones, and parents to support and encourage their children to make the most of their talents and abilities.

The search for solutions to our educational problems must also include a commitment to life-long learning. The task of rebuilding our system of learning is enormous and must be properly understood and taken seriously: Although a million and a half new workers enter the economy each year from our schools and colleges, the

adults working today will still make up about 75 percent of the workforce in the year 2000. These workers, and new entrants into the workforce, will need further education and retraining if they—and we as a Nation—are to thrive and prosper.

THE LEARNING SOCIETY

In a world of ever-accelerating competition and change in the conditions of the workplace, of ever-greater danger, and of ever-larger opportunities for those prepared to meet them, educational reform should focus on the goal of creating a Learning Society. At the heart of such a society is the commitment to a set of values and to a system of education that affords all members the opportunity to stretch their minds to full capacity, from early childhood through adulthood, learning more as the world itself changes. Such a society has as a basic foundation the idea that education is important not only because of what it contributes to one's career goals but also because of the value it adds to the general quality of one's life. Also at the heart of the Learning Society are educational opportunities extending far beyond the traditional institutions of learning, our schools and colleges. They extend into homes and workplaces; into libraries, art galleries, museums, and science centers, indeed, into every place where the individual can develop and mature in work and life. In our view, formal schooling in youth is the essential foundation for learning throughout one's life. But without life-long learning, one's skills will become rapidly dated.

In contrast to the ideal of the Learning Society, however, we find that for too many people education means doing the minimum work necessary for the moment, then coasting through life on what may have been learned in its first quarter. But this should not surprise us because we tend to express our educational standards and expectations largely in terms of "minimum requirements." And where there should be a coherent continuum of learning, we have none, but instead an often incoherent, outdated patchwork quilt. Many individual, sometimes heroic, examples of schools and colleges of great merit do exist. Our findings and testimony confirm the vitality of a number of notable schools and programs, but their very distinction stands out against a vast mass shaped by tensions and pressures that inhibit systematic academic and vocational achievement for the majority of students. In some metropolitan areas basic literacy has become the goal rather than the starting point. In some colleges maintaining enrollments is of greater day-to-day concern than maintaining rigorous academic standards. And the ideal of academic excellence as the primary goal of schooling seems to be fading across the board in American education.

Thus, we issue this call to all who care about America and its future: to parents and students; to teachers, administrators, and school board members; to colleges and industry; to union members and military leaders; to governors and State legislators; to the President; to members of Congress and other public officials; to members of learned and scientific societies; to the print and electronic media; to concerned citizens everywhere. America is at risk.

We are confident that America can address this risk. If the tasks we set forth are initiated now and our recommendations are fully realized over the next several years, we can expect reform of our Nation's schools, colleges, and universities. This would also reverse the current declining trend—a trend that stems more from weakness of purpose, confusion of vision, underuse of talent, and lack of leadership, than from conditions beyond our control.

THE TOOLS AT HAND

It is our conviction that the essential raw materials needed to reform our educational system are waiting to be mobilized through effective leadership:

The natural abilities of the young that cry out to be developed and the undiminished concern of parents for the well-being of their children;

The commitment of the Nation to high retention rates in schools and colleges and to full access to education for all;

The persistent and authentic American dream that superior performance can raise one's state in life and shape one's own future;

The dedication, against all odds, that keeps teachers serving in schools and colleges, even as the rewards diminish;

Our better understanding of learning and teaching and the implications of this knowledge for school practice, and the numerous examples of local success as a result of superior effort and effective dissemination;

The ingenuity of our policymakers, scientists, State and local educators, and scholars in formulating solutions once problems are better understood;

The traditional belief that paying for education is an investment in ever-renewable human resources that are more durable and flexible than capital plant and equipment, and the availability in this country of sufficient financial means to invest in education;

The equally sound tradition, from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 until today, that the Federal Government should supplement State, local, and other resources to foster key national educational goals; and

The voluntary efforts of individuals, businesses, and parent and civic groups to cooperate in strengthening educational programs.

These raw materials, combined with the unparalleled array of educational organizations in America, offer us the possibility to create a Learning Society, in which public, private, and parochial school; colleges and universities; vocational and technical schools and institutes; libraries; science centers, museums, and other cultural institutions; and corporate training and retraining programs offer opportunities and choices for all to learn throughout life.

THE PUBLIC'S COMMITMENT

Of all the tools at hand, the public's support for education is the most powerful. In a message to a National Academy of Sciences meeting in May 1982, President Reagan commented on this fact when he said:

"This public awareness—and I hope public action—is long overdue. . . . This country was built on American respect for education. . . . Our challenge now is to create a resurgence of that thirst for education that typifies our Nation's history."

The most recent (1982) Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools strongly supported a theme heard during our hearings: People are steadfast in their belief that education is the major foundation for the future strength of this country. They even considered education more important than developing the best industrial system or the strongest military force, perhaps because they understood education as the cornerstone of both. They also held that education is "extremely important" to one's future success, and that public education should be the top priority for additional Federal funds. Education occupied first place among 12 funding categories considered in the survey—above health care, welfare, and military defense, with 55 percent selecting public education as one of their first three choices. Very clearly, the public understands the primary importance of education as the foundation for a satisfying life, an enlightened and civil society; a strong economy, and a secure Nation.

At the same time, the public has no patience with undemanding and superfluous high school offerings. In another survey, more than 75 percent of all those questioned believed every student planning to go to college should take 4 years of mathematics, English, history/U.S. government, and science, with more than 50 percent adding 2 years each of a foreign language and economics or business. The public even supports requiring much of this curriculum for students who do not plan to go to college. These standards far exceed the strictest high school graduation requirements of any State today, and they also exceed the admission standards of all but a handful of our most selective colleges and universities.

Another dimension of the public's support offers the prospect of constructive reform. The best term to characterize it may simply be the honorable word "patriotism." Citizens know intuitively what some of the best economists have shown in their research, that education is one of the chief engines of a society's material well-being. They know, too, that education is the common bond of a pluralistic society and helps tie us to other cultures around the globe. Citizens also know in their bones that the safety of the United States depends principally on the wit, skill, and spirit of a self-confident people, today and tomorrow. It is, therefore, essential—especially in a period of long-term decline in educational achievement—for government at all levels to affirm its responsibility for nurturing the Nation's intellectual capital.

And perhaps most important, citizens know and believe that the meaning of America to the rest of the world must be something better than it seems to many today. Americans like to think of this Nation as the preeminent country for generating the great ideas and material benefits for all mankind. The citizen is dismayed at a steady 15-year decline in industrial productivity, as one great American industry after another falls to world competition. The citizen wants the country to act on the belief, expressed in our hearings and by the large majority in the Gallup Poll, that education should be at the top of the Nation's agenda.

FINDINGS

We conclude that declines in educational performance are in large part the result of disturbing inadequacies in the way the educational process itself is often conducted. The findings that follow, culled from a much more extensive list, reflect four important aspects of the educational process: content, expectations, time, and teaching.

Findings regarding content

By content we mean the very "stuff" of education, the curriculum. Because of our concern about the curriculum, the Commission examined patterns of courses high school students took in 1964-69 compared with course patterns in 1976-81. On the basis of these analyses we conclude:

Secondary school curricula have been homogenized, diluted, and diffused to the point that they no longer have a central purpose. In effect, we have a cafeteria-style curriculum in which the appetizers and desserts can easily be mistaken for the main courses. Students have migrated from vocational and college preparatory programs to "general track" courses in large numbers. The proportion of students taking a general program of study has increased from 12 percent in 1964 to 42 percent in 1979.

This curricular smorgasbord, combined with extensive student choice, explains a great deal about where we find ourselves today. We offer intermediate algebra, but only 31 percent of our recent high school graduates complete it; we offer French I, but only 13 percent complete it; and we offer geography, but only 16 percent complete it. Calculus is available in schools enrolling about 60 percent of all students, but only 6 percent of all students complete it.

Twenty-five percent of the credits earned by general track high school students are in physical and health education, work experience outside the school, remedial English and mathematics, and personal service and development courses, such as training for adulthood and marriage.

Findings regarding expectations

We define expectations in terms of the level of knowledge, abilities, and skills school and college graduates should possess. They also refer to the time, hard work, behavior, self-discipline, and motivation that are essential for high student achievement. Such expectations are expressed to students in several different ways:

By grades, which reflect the degree to which students demonstrate their mastery of subject matter;

Through high school and college graduation requirements, which tell students which subjects are most important;

By the presence or absence of rigorous examinations requiring students to demonstrate their mastery of content and skill before receiving a diploma or a degree;

By college admissions requirements, which reinforce high school standards; and

By the difficulty of the subject matter students confront in their texts and assigned readings.

Our analyses in each of these areas indicate notable deficiencies;

The amount of homework for high school seniors has decreased (two-thirds report less than 1 hour a night) and grades have risen as average student achievement has been declining.

In many other industrialized nations, courses in mathematics (other than arithmetic or general mathematics), biology, chemistry, physics, and geography start in grade 6 and are required of all students. The time spent on these subject, based on class hours, is about three times that spent by even the most science-oriented U.S. students, i.e., those who select 4 years of science and mathematics in secondary school.

A 1980 State-by-State survey of high school diploma requirements reveals that only eight States require high schools to offer foreign language instruction, but none requires students to take the courses. Thirty-five States require only 1 year of mathematics, and 36 require only 1 year of science of a diploma.

In 13 States, 50 percent or more of the units required for high school graduation may be electives chosen by the student. Given this freedom to choose the substance of half or more of their education, many students opt for less demanding personal service courses, such as bachelor living.

"Minimum competency" examinations (now required in 37 States) fall short of what is needed, as the "minimum" tends to become the "maximum," thus lowering educational standards for all.

One-fifth of all 4-year public colleges in the United States must accept every high school graduate within the State regardless of program followed or grades, thereby serving notice to high school students that they can expect to attend college even if they do not follow a demanding course of study in high school or perform well.

About 23 percent of our more selective colleges and universities reported that their general level of selectivity declined during the 1970's, and 29 percent reported reducing the number of specific high school courses required for admission (usually by dropping foreign language requirements, which are now specified as a condition for admission by only one-fifth of our institution of higher education).

Too few experienced teachers and scholars are involved in writing textbooks. During the past decade or so a large numbers of texts have been "written down" by their publishers to ever-lower reading levels in response to perceived market demands.

A recent study by Education Products Information Exchange revealed that a majority of students were able to master 80 percent of the material in some of their subject-matter texts before they had even opened the books. Many books do not challenge the students to whom they are assigned.

Expenditures for textbooks and other instructional materials have declined by 50 percent over the past 17 years. While some recommended a level of spending on texts of between 5 and 10 percent of the operating costs of schools, the budgets for basal texts and related materials have been dropping during the past decade and a half to only 0.7 percent today.

Findings regarding time

Evidence presented to the Commission demonstrates three disturbing facts about the use that American schools and students make of time: (1) compared to other nations, American students spend much less time on school work; (2) time spent in the classroom and on homework is often used ineffectively; and (3) schools are not doing enough to help students develop either the study skills required to use time well or the willingness to spend more time on school work.

In England and other industrialized countries, it is not unusual for academic high school students to spend 8 hours a day at school, 220 days per year. In the United States, by contrast, the typical school day lasts 6 hours and the school year is 180 days.

In many schools, the time spent learning how to cook and drive counts as much toward a high schools diploma as the time spent studying mathematics, English, chemistry, U.S. history, or biology.

A study of the school week in the United States found that some schools provided students only 17 hours of academic instruction during the week, and the average school provided about 22.

A California study of individual classrooms found that because of poor management of classroom time, some elementary students received only one-fifth of the instruction others received in reading comprehension.

In most schools, the teaching of study skills is haphazard and unplanned. Consequently, many students complete high school and enter college without disciplined and systematic study habits.

Findings regarding teaching

The Commission found that not enough of the academically able students are being attracted to teaching; that teacher preparation programs need substantial improvement; that the professional working life of teachers is on the whole unacceptable; and that a serious shortage of teachers exists in key fields.

Too many teachers are being drawn from the bottom quarter of graduating high school and college students.

The teacher preparation curriculum is weighted heavily with courses in "educational methods" at the expense of courses in subjects to be taught. A survey of 1,350 institutions training teachers indicated that 41 percent of the time of elementary school teacher candidates is spent in education courses, which reduces the amount of time available for subject matter courses.

The average salary after 12 years of teaching is only \$17,000 per year, and many teachers are required to supplement their income with part-time and summer employment. In addition, individual teachers have little influence in such critical professional decisions as, for example, textbook selection.

Despite widespread publicity about an overpopulation of teachers, severe shortages of certain kinds of teachers exist: in the fields of mathematics, science, and foreign languages; and among specialists in education for gifted and talented, language minority, and handicapped students.

The shortage of teachers in mathematics and science is particularly severe. A 1981 survey of 11 States revealed shortages of mathematics teachers in 43 States, critical shortages of earth sciences teachers in 33 States, and of physics teachers everywhere.

Half of the newly employed mathematics, science, and English teachers are not qualified to teach these subjects; fewer than one-third of U.S. high schools offer physics taught by qualified teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the urgent need for improvement, both immediate and long term, this Commission has agreed on a set of recommendations that the American people can begin to act on now, that can be implemented over the next several years, and that promise lasting reform. The topics are familiar; there is little mystery about what we believe must be done. Many schools, districts, and States are already giving serious and constructive attention to these matters, even though their plans may differ from our recommendations in some details.

We wish to note that we refer to public, private, and parochial schools and colleges alike. All are valuable national resources. Examples of actions similar to those recommended below can be found in each of them.

We must emphasize that the variety of student aspirations, abilities, and preparation requires that appropriate content be available to satisfy diverse needs. Attention must be directed to both the nature of the content available and to the needs of particular learners. The most gifted students, for example, may need a curriculum enriched and accelerated beyond even the needs of other students of high ability. Similarly, educationally disadvantaged students may require special curriculum materials, smaller classes, or individual tutoring to help them master the material presented. Nevertheless, there remains a common expectation: We must demand the best effort and performance from all students, whether they are gifted or less able, affluent or disadvantaged, whether destined for college, the farm, or industry.

Our recommendations are based on the beliefs that everyone can learn, that everyone is born with an urge to learn which can be nurtured, that a solid high school education is within the reach of virtually all, and that life-long learning will equip people with the skills required for new careers and for citizenship.

RECOMMENDATION A: CONTENT

We recommend that State and local high school graduation requirements be strengthened and that, at a minimum, all students seeking a diploma be required to lay the foundations in the Five New Basics by taking the following curriculum during their 4 years of high school: (a) 4 years of English; (b) 3 years of mathematics; (c) 3 years of science; (d) 3 years of social studies; and (e) one-half year of computer science. For the college-bound, 2 years of foreign language in high school are strongly recommended in addition to those taken earlier.

Whatever the student's educational or work objectives, knowledge of the New Basics is the foundation of success for the after-school years and, therefore, forms the core of the modern curriculum. A high level of shared education in these Basics, together with work in the fine and performing arts and foreign languages, constitutes the mind and spirit of our culture. The following Implementing Recommendations are intended as illustrative descriptions. They are included here to clarify what we mean by the essentials of a strong curriculum.

Implementing recommendations

(1) The teaching of English in high school should equip graduates to: (a) comprehend, interpret, evaluate, and use what they read; (b) write well-organized, effective papers; (c) listen effectively and discuss ideas intelligently; and (d) know our literary heritage and how it enhances imagination and ethical understanding, and how it relates to the customs, ideas, and values of today's life and culture.

(2) The teaching of mathematics in high school should equip graduates to: (a) understand geometric and algebraic concepts; (b) understand elementary probability and statistics; (c) apply mathematics in everyday situations; and (d) estimate, approximate, measure, and test the accuracy of their calculations. In addition to the traditional sequence of studies available for college-bound students, new, equally demanding mathematics curricula need to be developed for those who do not plan to continue their formal education immediately.

(3) The teaching of science in high school should provide graduates with an introduction to: (a) the concepts, laws, and processes of the physical and biological sciences; (b) the methods of scientific inquiry and reasoning; (c) the application of sci-

entific knowledge to everyday life; and (d) the social and environmental implications of scientific and technological development. Science courses must be revised and updated for both the college-bound and those not intending to go to college. An example of such work is the American Chemical Society's "Chemistry in the Community" program.

(4) The teaching of social studies in high school should be designed to: (a) enable students to fix their places and possibilities within the large social and cultural structure; (b) understand the broad sweep of both ancient and contemporary ideas that have shaped our world; and (c) understand the fundamentals of how our economic system works and how our political system functions; and (d) grasp the difference between free and repressive societies. An understanding of each of these areas is requisite to the informed and committed exercise of citizenship in our free society.

(5) The teaching of computer science in high school should equip graduates to: (a) understand the computer as an information, computation, and communication device; (b) use the computer in the study of the other Basics and for personal and work-related purposes; and (c) understand the world of computers, electronics, and related technologies.

In addition to the New Basics, other important curriculum matters must be addressed.

(6) Achieving proficiency in a foreign language ordinarily requires from 4 to 6 years of study and should, therefore, be started in the elementary grades. We believe it is desirable that students achieve such proficiency because study of a foreign language introduces students to non-English-speaking cultures, heightens awareness and comprehension of one's native tongue, and serves the Nation's needs in commerce, diplomacy, defense, and education.

(7) The high school curriculum should also provide students with programs requiring rigorous effort in subjects that advance students' personal, educational, and occupational goals, such as the fine and performing arts and vocational education. These areas complement the New Basics, and they should demand the same level of performance as the Basics.

(8) The curriculum in the crucial eight grades leading to the high school years should be specifically designed to provide a sound base for study in those and later years in such areas as English language development and writing, computational and problem solving skills, science, social studies, foreign language, and the arts. These years should foster an enthusiasm for learning and the development of the individual's gifts and talents.

(9) We encourage the continuation of efforts by groups such as the American Chemical Society, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Modern Language Association, and the National Councils of Teachers of English and Teachers of Mathematics, to revise, update, improve, and make available new and more diverse curricular materials. We applaud the consortia of educators and scientific, industrial, and scholarly societies that cooperate to improve the school curriculum.

RECOMMENDATION B: STANDARDS AND EXPECTATIONS

We recommend that schools, colleges, and universities adopt more rigorous and measurable standards, and higher expectations, for academic performance and student conduct, and that 4-year colleges and universities raise their requirements for admission. This will help students do their best educationally with challenging materials in an environment that supports learning and authentic accomplishment.

Implementing recommendations

(1) Grades should be indicators of academic achievement so they can be relied on as evidence of a student's readiness for further study.

(2) Four-year colleges and universities should raise their admissions requirements and advise all potential applicants of the standards for admission in terms of specific courses required, performance in these areas, and levels of achievement on standardized achievement tests in each of the five Basics and, where applicable, foreign languages.

(3) Standardized tests of achievement (not to be confused with aptitude tests) should be administered at major transition points from one level of schooling to another and particularly from high school to college or work. The purposes of these tests would be to: (a) certify the student's credentials; (b) identify the need for remedial intervention; and (c) identify the opportunity for advanced or accelerated work. The tests should be administered as part of a nationwide (but not Federal) system of

State and local standardized tests. This system should include other diagnostic procedures that assist teachers and students to evaluate student progress.

(4) Textbooks and other tools of learning and teaching should be upgraded and updated to assure more rigorous content. We call upon university scientists, scholars, and members of professional societies, in collaboration with master teachers, to help in this task, as they did in the post-Sputnik era. They should assist willing publishers in developing the products or publish their own alternatives where there are persistent inadequacies.

(5) In considering textbooks for adoption, States and school districts should: (a) evaluate texts and other materials on their ability to present rigorous and challenging material clearly; and (b) require publishers to furnish evaluation data on the material's effectiveness.

(6) Because no textbook in any subject can be geared to the needs of all students, funds should be made available to support text development in "thin-market" areas, such as those for disadvantaged students, the learning disabled, and the gifted and talented.

(7) To assure quality, all publishers should furnish evidence of the quality and appropriateness of textbooks, based on results from field trials and credible evaluations. In view of the enormous numbers and varieties of texts available, more widespread consumer information services for purchasers are badly needed.

(8) New instructional materials should reflect the most current applications of technology in appropriate curriculum areas, the best scholarship in each discipline, and research in learning and teaching.

RECOMMENDATION C: TIME

We recommend that significantly more time be devoted to learning the New Basics. This will require more effective use of the existing school day, a longer school day, or a lengthened school year.

Implementing recommendations

(1) Students in high schools should be assigned far more homework than is now the case.

(2) Instruction in effective study and work skills, which are essential if school and independent time is to be used efficiently, should be introduced in the early grades and continued throughout the student's schooling.

(3) School districts and State legislatures should strongly consider 7-hour school days, as well as a 200- to 220-day school year.

(4) The time available for learning should be expanded through better classroom management and organization of the school day. If necessary, additional time should be found to meet the special needs of slow learners, the gifted, and others who need more instructional diversity than can be accommodated during a conventional school day or school year.

(5) The burden on teachers for maintaining discipline should be reduced through the development of firm and fair codes of student conduct that are enforced consistently, and by considering alternative classrooms, programs, and schools to meet the needs of continually disruptive students.

(6) Attendance policies with clear incentives and sanctions should be used to reduce the amount of time lost through student absenteeism and tardiness.

(7) Administrative burdens on the teacher and related intrusions into the school day should be reduced to add time for teaching and learning.

(8) Placement and grouping of students, as well as promotion and graduation policies, should be guided by the academic progress of students and their instructional needs, rather than by rigid adherence to age.

RECOMMENDATION D: TEACHING

This recommendation consists of seven parts. Each is intended to improve the preparation of teachers or to make teaching a more rewarding and respected profession. Each of the seven stands on its own and should not be considered solely as an implementing recommendation.

(1) Persons preparing to teach should be required to meet high educational standards, to demonstrate an aptitude for teaching, and to demonstrate competence in an academic discipline. Colleges and universities offering teacher preparation programs should be judged by how well their graduates meet these criteria.

(2) Salaries for the teaching profession should be increased and should be professionally competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based. Salary, promotion, tenure, and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that

includes peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and poor ones either improved or terminated.

(3) School boards should adopt an 11-month contract for teachers. This would ensure time for curriculum and professional development, programs for students with special needs, and a more adequate level of teacher compensation.

(4) School boards, administrators, and teachers should cooperate to develop career ladders for teachers that distinguish among the beginning instructor, the experienced teacher, and the master teacher.

(5) Substantial nonschool personnel resources should be employed to help solve the immediate problem of the shortage of mathematics and science teachers. Qualified individuals including recent graduates with mathematics and science degrees, graduate students, and industrial and retired scientists could, with appropriate preparation, immediately begin teaching in these fields. A number of our leading science centers have the capacity to begin educating and retraining teachers immediately. Other areas of critical teacher need, such as English, must also be addressed.

(6) Incentives, such as grants and loans, should be made available to attract outstanding students to the teaching profession, particularly in those areas of critical shortage.

(7) Master teachers should be involved in designing teacher preparation programs and in supervising teachers during their probationary years.

RECOMMENDATION E: LEADERSHIP AND FISCAL SUPPORT

We recommend that citizens across the Nation hold educators and elected officials responsible for providing the leadership necessary to achieve these reforms, and that citizens provide the fiscal support and stability required to bring about the reforms we propose.

Implementing recommendations

(1) Principals and superintendents must play a crucial leadership role in developing school and community support for the reforms we propose, and school boards must provide them with the professional development and other support required to carry out their leadership role effectively. The Commission stresses the distinction between leadership skills involving persuasion, setting goals and developing community consensus behind them, and managerial and supervisory skills. Although the latter are necessary, we believe that school boards must consciously develop leadership skills at the school and district levels if the reforms we propose are to be achieved.

(2) State and local officials, including school board members, governors, and legislators, have the primary responsibility for financing and governing the schools, and should incorporate the reforms we propose in their educational policies and fiscal planning.

(3) The Federal Government, in cooperation with States and localities, should help meet the needs of key groups of students such as the gifted and talented, the socioeconomically disadvantaged, minority and language minority students, and the handicapped. In combination these groups include both national resources and the Nation's youth who are most at risk.

(4) In addition, we believe the Federal Government's role includes several functions of national consequences that States and localities alone are unlikely to be able to meet: protecting constitutional and civil rights for students and school personnel; collecting data, statistics, and information and education generally; supporting curriculum improvement and research on teaching, learning, and the management of schools; supporting teacher training in areas of critical shortage or key national needs; and providing student financial assistance and research and graduate training. We believe the assistance of the Federal Government should be provided with a minimum of administrative burden and intrusiveness.

(5) The Federal Government has the primary responsibility to identify the national interest in education. It should also help fund and support efforts to protect and promote that interest. It must provide the national leadership to ensure that the Nation's public and private resources are marshaled to address the issues discussed in this report.

(6) This Commission calls upon educators, parents, and public officials at all levels to assist in bringing about the educational reform proposed in this report. We also call upon citizens to provide the financial support necessary to accomplish these purposes. Excellence costs. But in the long run mediocrity costs far more.

AMERICAN CAN DO IT

Despite the obstacles and difficulties that inhibit the pursuit of superior educational attainment, we are confident, with history as our guide, that we can meet our goal. The American educational system has responded to previous challenges with remark success. In the 19th century our land-grant colleges and universities provided the research and training that developed our Nation's natural resources and the rich agricultural bounty of the American farm. From the late 1800s through mid-20th century, American schools provided the educated workforce needed to seal the success of the Industrial Revolution and to provide the margin of victory in two world wars. In the early part of this century and continuing to this very day, our schools have absorbed vast waves of immigrants and educated them and their children to productive citizenship. Similarly, the Nation's Black colleges have provided opportunity and undergraduate education to the vast majority of college-educated Black Americans.

More recently, our institutions and higher education have provided the scientists and skilled technicians who helped us transcend the boundaries of our planet. In the last 30 years, the schools have been a major vehicle for expanded social opportunity, and now graduate 75 percent of our young people from high school. Indeed, the proportion of Americans of college age enrolled in higher education is nearly twice that on Japan and far exceeds other nations such as France, West Germany, and the Soviet Union. Moreover, when international comparisons were last made a decade ago, the top 9 percent of American students compared favorably in achievement with their peers in other countries.

In addition, many large urban areas in recent years report that average student achievement in elementary schools is improving. More and more schools are also offering advanced placement programs and programs for gifted and talented students, and more and more students are enrolling in them.

We are the inheritors of a past that gives us every reason to believe that we will succeed.

A WORD TO PARENTS AND STUDENTS

The task of assuring the success of our recommendations does not fall to the schools and colleges alone. Obviously, faculty members and administrators, along with policymakers and the mass media, will play a crucial role in the reform of the educational system. But even more important is the role of parents and students, and to them we speak directly.

To parents

You know that you cannot confidently launch your children into today's world unless they are of strong character and well-educated in the use of language, science, and mathematics. They must possess a deep respect for intelligence, achievement, and learning, and the skills needed to use them; for setting goals; and for disciplined work. That respect must be accompanied by an intolerance for the shoddy and second-rate masquerading as "good enough."

You have the right to demand for your children the best our schools and colleges can provide. Your vigilance and your refusal to be satisfied with less than the best are the imperative first step. But your right to a proper education for your children carries a double responsibility. As surely as you are your child's first and most influential teacher, your child's ideas about education and its significance begin with you. You must be a living example of what you expect your children to honor and to emulate. Moreover, you bear a responsibility to participate actively in your child's education. You should encourage more diligent study and discourage satisfaction with mediocrity and the attitude that says "let it slide"; monitor your child's study; encourage good study habits; encourage your child to take more demanding rather than less demanding courses; nurture your child's curiosity, creativity, and confidence; and be an active participant in the work of the schools. Above all, exhibit a commitment to continued learning in your own life. Finally, help your children understand that excellence in education cannot be achieved without intellectual and moral integrity coupled with hard work and commitment. Children will look to their parents and teachers as models of such virtues.

To students

You forfeit your chance for life at its fullest when you withhold your best effort in learning. When you give only the minimum in learning, you receive only the minimum in return. Even with your parents' best example and your teachers' best efforts, in the end it is your work that determines how much and how well you learn.

When you work to your full capacity, you can hope to attain the knowledge and skills that will enable you to create your future and control your destiny. If you do not, you will have your future thrust upon you by others. Take hold of your life, apply your gifts and talents, work with dedication and self-discipline. Have high expectations for yourself and convert every challenge into an opportunity.

A FINAL WORD

This is not the first or only commission on education, and some of our findings are surely not new, but old business that now at last must be done. For no one can doubt that the United States is under challenge from many quarters.

Children born today can expect to graduate from high school in the year 2000. We dedicate our report not only to these children, but also to those now in school and others to come. We firmly believe that a movement of America's schools in the direction called for by our recommendations will prepare these children for far more effective lives in a far stronger America.

Our final word, perhaps better characterized as a plea, is that all segments of our population give attention to the implementation of our recommendations. Our present plight did not appear overnight, and the responsibility for our current situation is widespread. Reform of our educational system will take time and unwavering commitment. It will require equally widespread, energetic, and dedicated action. For example, we call upon the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine, Science Service, National Science Foundation, Social Science Research Council, American Council of Learned Societies, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, and other scholarly, scientific, and learned societies for their help in this effort. Help should come from students themselves; from parents, teachers, and school boards; from colleges and universities; from local, State, and Federal officials; from teachers' and administrators' organizations; from industrial and labor councils; and from other groups with interest in and responsibility for educational reform.

It is their America, and the American of all of us, that is at risk; it is to each of us that this imperative is addressed. It is by our willingness to take up the challenge, and our resolve to see it through, that America's place in the world will be either secured or forfeited. Americans have succeeded before and so we shall again.

Mr. ALATIS. One of eight U.S. manufacturing jobs is dependent on export. Six thousands companies maintain offices overseas. Now, this is not to say that the problem is limited to our business dealings outside our borders. There are serious domestic implications to be considered as well. Tourism is a major industry in this country and foreign visitors can provide a major source of revenue. The hotel, transportation, and sales industries will all derive great benefits from a staff capable of communicating to others in their native tongues.

And, on a more sophisticated level, both the private and public sectors are desperately in need of competent translators and interpreters. The examples go on and are too numerous for me to cite here.

Until now, however, the national language gap has not been addressed in any comprehensive, effective way. The Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act does just that, in an intelligent, workable, and fiscally responsible manner. This legislation establishes a policy for handling all facets of the problems and details the manner in which that policy will be implemented.

It is a comprehensive program which answers a genuine need. I can assure you that this is no special interest bill. It has direct applications to the immediate problems facing this country and the world. It is in the national interest. It is in the interest of all humanity. It is in the interest of world peace and prosperity.

This legislation recognizes that the problem is broad-based and that only a sophisticated plan which treats each element of the problem will lead to a long-term resolution.

For example, this bill encourage language study at the elementary and secondary level. This will be essential if the United States is to have in its young people the level of language competence required for high-level international negotiations, technical translations, and intelligence gathering.

This very sophisticated kind of work requires fairly intensive, long-term study. In addition, our research indicates that those who learn languages at an early age have an easier time of it and they are likely to stay with a study of the language.

Another advantage of this aspect of the legislation is that we will be able to identify at an early age those with an aptitude for these highly-specialized fields.

H.R. 2708 also concentrates on the training of language teachers. Right now there is a shortage of competent teachers in the classics, in English as a foreign or second language, and in the less commonly taught languages, and these will surely spread to other languages as colleges across the country reinstate their foreign language requirements.

In addition, teachers must be able to retrain to stay abreast of current methodology. Otherwise they will be unable to meet effectively the demand for innovative teaching of foreign languages for special career purposes and for specific business and other practical applications. This legislation would give special preferences to the languages of specific geographic areas where our economic interests are concentrated and where our security interests are most critical.

This is a necessary measure aimed at reducing the serious shortage of teachers and students of the so-called less commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese.

An appreciation of American interests demands that these languages become less exotic in the curricula of American schools.

In conclusion, we in the language professions support this legislation and see it as both a challenge and a promise. The promise is to our young people and to our country. The challenge is to us as a profession, to work to find ways to meet our need for improved language competence. It is a challenge we are ready to accept and one which, with the help of the National Security Foreign Language Assistance Act, we shall meet.

Mr. Chairman, thank you and the subcommittee for this opportunity to express our support for this legislation and our gratitude for the leadership and the thoughtfulness you have devoted to this complex and pressing issue. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. We thank you very much, Dr. Alatis. Dr. Earl Backman from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and director of their Center for International Studies and chairman of the National Committee of International Studies and Programs Administrators.

It's a pleasure to have you here. We will include your prepared remarks in the records at this point and you may feel free to summarize.

[Prepared statement of Earl Backman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. EARL BACKMAN, DIRECTOR CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE, ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES, ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES, COUNCIL OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES, COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to have an opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee this morning to present the views of the higher education community with respect to H.R. 2708. We would like to commend the Subcommittee for its attention to the important issue of language education, and to express our particular appreciation for the leadership of the Chairman in his role as a champion of foreign languages and international studies. Indeed, he has literally written the book on the subject.

The case has been made many times over regarding the need for reform, innovation, revitalization and support of foreign language study. I need not repeat the litany of now familiar statistics that lead the 1980 President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies to conclude that the U.S. educational crisis in these areas was "nothing short of scandalous." The simple point I wish to make is that continued inattention to the resolution of these problems is a luxury this nation cannot afford.

Far more consequential than the fact that 300 million people in the world speak English is the fact that an overwhelmingly larger number do not. The proliferation of English speaking throughout the world owes much to the influence of the United States as a technological and economic power, and to the fact that this nation succeeded another great power, the British Empire, whose language was the same. Today, however, the dominance of the United States in these spheres of influence is being challenged. Increasingly, languages in the Third World are gaining in importance. Between 1970 and 1979, for example, two major countries have shifted their official language from English to a native tongue—Pakistan to Urdu and Kenya to Swahili.

Further, as the United States is forced to search out new international markets for its goods and services, its ability to compete with indigenous products, is seriously hampered, as has been shown, by limited language ability. Recent British experience is relevant: Fifty percent of French firms give preference to foreign firms speaking French; and fifty percent of German and Austrian firms require correspondence in German. In Third World countries, whose cultures and languages are much less familiar to Americans, these facilities will be increasingly important to U.S. trade interests.

The fact that few visible foreign language reforms have been achieved since the release of the President's Commission report is not necessarily cause for despair. Valid educational reforms generally are obtained gradually. We believe that encouraging progress is being made as evidenced by:

Promising new research efforts related to language teaching skills and their attrition rates;

The spread of mastery-based, instructor-assisted, self-instructional programs for less commonly taught languages; and

New research into and applications of interactive computer technologies.

In addition, we believe that the recognition of the erosion of language learning and its troubling implications for the nation is widespread, and support for reversing this situation continues to grow. As recently as two weeks ago in a letter sent to Education Secretary Terrel H. Bell concerning Title VI of the Higher Education Act, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger stated: "I am seriously concerned about the zero-funding of this program, and would urge you to consider restoring these funds at least to the 1983 level. My concern is shared by others in the Department of Defense, and members of the academic community on whom we depend for both a solid research base in area studies, as well as for production of foreign language specialists."

We also take perverse encouragement from the debate which ensued on the House floor March 2 over an amendment to delete foreign language from the Emergency Mathematics and Science Education Act. While members supporting the

amendment failed to equate the urgency of the foreign language crisis with the crisis in mathematics and science education, none denied its existence nor its importance.

The acknowledgment by members on both sides of the aisle that the foreign language crisis must be dealt with in its own right seems to hold promise for favorable consideration of H.R. 2708, and I would now like to turn to some specific comments on this legislation.

The higher education community strongly supports the intent of the H.R. 2708 and feels that it has several positive features. Among them are:

The provision of summer intensive language training institutes for exceptional secondary students (Sec. 6);

The provision of summer language training institutes for the professional development of the proficiency of elementary and secondary school language teachers (Sec. 7);

The provision of grants to institutions of higher education for the purpose of assisting advanced language students to enhance their skills through study abroad (Sec. 8); and

The provision of grants to State agencies to assist community and junior colleges to develop model programs to initiate, improve or expand foreign language instruction (Sec. 4).

Our concern with the legislation with respect to higher education is its lack of clarity of focus. The provision in Sec. 5(a)(2)(A)(ii) making grants to institutions of higher education contingent upon an entry or exit foreign language requirement is the principal source of this confusion and concern. Required language study remains a source of intense controversy. The practice of two years of compulsory language study which fails to achieve mastery of the language contributes to enormous frustration, which in turn fuels the general public disregard for languages.

If the intent is to achieve mandatory language study for all students, we feel strongly that subtler curriculum inducements ought to be employed. We believe that it is inappropriate to make academic participation in a federal program contingent on compliance with a federal directive that has such overwhelming consequences for the curriculum.

If the legislation carries this component to serve as a signal to secondary schools to expand their own language course offerings, it fails fundamentally to address the need for reform and improvement at the level of postsecondary instruction.

If the legislation wishes to stimulate interest and growth in less commonly taught languages, the insistence on language requirements may prove to be counterproductive, by tempting students to fulfill the requirement by means of the easiest language available.

Finally, the legislation depends on a interactive relationship of language training between levels of education that does not presently exist, and will take considerable time to develop.

We are concerned that this provision in H.R. 2708 will remove incentives for institutions to improve programs, and will serve to maintain the status quo. Rapid hiring of a number of language teachers sufficient to serve the general student population could even lead to a dilution of program quality, since the clear temptation would be fill these slots with teaching assistants. Moreover, it is unrealistic to expect that college and university administrators—many of whom already have faced the dilemma of eliminating whole departments and removing tenured faculty—could undertake the vast reallocation of scarce institutional dollars that would be needed for this purpose.

As an alternative, we would propose a substitution of quality for quantity, which makes competence and improvement its objectives. Such a program, we believe, should be analagous to that proposed in Sec. 4 for community and junior colleges. Its purpose would be to stimulate innovation and improvement of instructional quality, student motivation and competency, and to upgrade teacher skills. We recommend that the legislation provide for grants to higher education institutions to develop or implement programs that utilize innovative approaches to enhance student motivation; encourage experimental course sequences that provide for language training through immersion; make effective use of new technologies; stress improved communications skills; upgrade teaching skills, including enhanced languages capabilities; and encourage efforts to measure and assess student language proficiency.

We would conclude by commending you for your leadership in introducing this important legislation. In addition to the substantive recommendations we have made to strengthen the bill, we plan to submit further comments on its technical

provisions. We look forward to working with you on refinements of this legislation prior to markup.

STATEMENT OF DR. EARL BACKMAN, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHARLOTTE, AND CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATORS

Dr. BACKMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee.

I am pleased to have an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee this morning to present the views of the higher education community with respect to H.R. 2708. We would like to commend the subcommittee for its attention to the important issue of language education and to express our particular appreciation for the leadership of the chairman in his role as a champion of foreign languages and international studies. Indeed, he has literally written the book on the subject.

The case has been made many times and certainly this morning as well regarding the need for reform, innovation, revitalization, and support of foreign language study. I need not repeat the litany of now-familiar statistics that led the 1980 President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies to conclude that the U.S. educational crisis in these areas was, quote, "nothing short of scandalous," end quote.

The simple point I wish to make is that continued inattention to the resolution of these problems is a luxury this Nation cannot afford.

Far more consequential than the fact that 300 million people in the world speak English is the fact that an overwhelmingly larger number do not. The proliferation of English speaking throughout the world owes much to the influence of the United States as a technological and economic power, and to the fact that this Nation succeeded another great power, the British Empire, whose language was the same—more or less.

Today, however, the dominance of the United States in these spheres of influence is being challenged. We heard that this morning. Increasingly, languages in the Third World are gaining in importance. Between 1970 and 1979, for example, two major countries have shifted their official language from English to a native tongue. Pakistan to Urdu, Kenya to Swahili.

Further, as the United States is forced to search out new international markets for its goods and services, its ability to compete with indigenous products is seriously hampered, as has been shown by limited language ability. Recent British experience is relevant. Fifty percent of French firms give preference to foreign firms speaking French. Fifty percent of German and Austrian firms require correspondence in German.

In Third World countries, whose cultures and languages are much less familiar to Americans, these facilities will be increasingly important to U.S. trade and interest. If I may digress a moment here, the French firms and a number of the German firms that exist in Charlotte, and there are 143 foreign firms in Charlotte, those firms require all telexes between home office and branch office be in the native language. Well, obviously if you're a secre-

tary, you're a telex operator, you've got to be able to translate those. So there are, even in a place like Charlotte, N.C., requirements for language facilities and not just bare minimum facilities, that are very important to the economic base of our community, with people who have not received, in many cases, a post-secondary education.

The fact that few visible foreign language reforms have been achieved since the release of the President's Commission report is not necessarily cause for despair. Valid education reforms generally are obtained gradually. We believe that encouraging progress is being made, as evidenced by promising new research efforts related to language teaching skills and their attrition rates, the spread of mastery-based, instructor-assisted, self-instructional programs for less commonly taught languages, and new research into and applications of interactive computer technologies.

In addition, we believe that the recognition of the erosion of language learning and its troubling implications for the Nation is widespread, and support for reversing this situation continues to grow. As recently as 2 weeks ago, in a letter sent to Education Secretary Terrel H. Bell concerning title VI of the Higher Education Act, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger stated, and I quote:

I am seriously concerned about the zero-funding of this program and would urge you to consider restoring those funds at least to the 1983 level. My concern is shared by others in the Department of Defense and members of the academic community on whom we depend for both a solid research base in area studies, as well as for production of foreign language specialists.

We also take perverse encouragement from the debate which ensued on the House floor March 2d over an amendment to delete foreign language from the Emergency Mathematics and Science Education Act. While members supporting the amendment failed to equate the urgency of the foreign language crisis with the crisis in mathematics and science education, none denied its existence nor its importance.

The acknowledgement by members of both sides of the aisle that the foreign language crisis must be dealt with in its own right seems to hold promise for favorable consideration of H.R. 2708, and I would now like to turn to some specific comments on this legislation.

The higher education community strongly supports the intent of H.R. 2708 and feels that it has several positive features. Among them are the provision for summer intensive language training institutes for exceptional secondary students, the provision of summer language training institutes for the professional development of the proficiency of elementary and secondary school language teachers, the provision of grants to institutions of higher education for the purpose of assisting advanced language students to enhance their skills through study abroad, the provision of grants to State agencies to assist community and junior colleges to develop model programs to initiate, improve, or expand foreign language instruction.

Our concern with the legislation with respect to higher education is its lack of clarity focus. The provision in section 5 making grants to institution of higher education contingent upon an entry or exit

foreign language requirement is the principal source of this confusion and concern.

Required language study remains a source of intense controversy and certainly is on my campus and many others. The practice of 2 years of compulsory language study which fails to achieve mastery of language contributes to enormous frustration and cases abound, which in turn fuels the general public disregard for languages.

If the intent is to achieve mandatory language study for all students, we feel strongly that subtler curriculum inducements ought to be employed. We believe that it is inappropriate to make academic participation in a Federal program contingent on compliance with a Federal directive that has such overwhelming consequences for the curriculum.

If the legislation carries this component to serve as a signal to secondary schools to expand their own language course offerings, it fails fundamentally to address the need for reform and improvement at the level of post-secondary instruction. If the legislation wishes to stimulate interest and growth in less commonly taught languages, the insistence on language requirements may prove to be counter-productive by tempting students to fulfill the requirement by means of the easiest language available.

Finally, the legislation depends on an interactive relationship of language training between levels of education that does not presently exist, and by that I refer to the levels between—the relationship between secondary, elementary and secondary, and postsecondary institutions, and will take considerable time to develop.

We are concerned that this provision in H.R. 2708 will remove incentives for institutions to improve programs and will serve to maintain the status quo. Rapid hiring of a number of language teachers, sufficient to serve the general student population, could even lead to a dilution of program quality. Since the clear temptation would be to fill these slots with teaching assistants.

Moreover, it is unrealistic to expect that college and university administrators, many of whom have already faced the dilemma of eliminating whole departments and removing tenured faculty, could undertake the vast reallocation of scarce resources, institutional dollars that would be needed for this purpose.

As an alternative, we would propose a substitution of quality for quantity, which makes competence and improvement its objectives. Such a program, we believe, should be analogous to the proposed in section four for community and junior colleges. Its purpose would be to stimulate innovation and improvement of instructional quality, student motivation and competency, and to upgrade teacher skills.

We recommend that the legislation provide for grants to higher education institutions to develop or implement programs that utilize innovative approaches to enhance student motivation, encourage experimental course sequences that provide for language training through immersion, make effective use of new technologies, stress improved communications skills, upgrade teaching skills, including enhanced language capabilities and encourage efforts to measure and assess student language proficiency.

We would conclude by commending you for your leadership in introducing this important legislation. In addition to the substantive

recommendations we have made to strengthen the bill, we plan to submit further comments on its technical provisions.

We look forward to working with you on refinements of this legislation prior to markup, and I'd just like to add just a couple of comments to the prepared text.

I do most of the advising for placement for undergraduate business majors going into international business. The student that is the easiest to place in North Carolina, and I'm sure in many other parts of the world, is the student that has a double major of business and foreign language, and a concentration in international studies. In other words, they know something about the world as well.

We're receiving a great number of, or an increase in foreign language study, not by requiring language study, but by presenting the ways in which it can be used.

The problem that faces higher education in the entry/exit requirement is, one, the time that it would take to gear this thing up, and so while many of us are working on our campus to gradually get all students having a foreign language, it's an extremely complicated issue and one that for higher education in general, certainly some institutions can easily do it, but most cannot reallocate the necessary resources.

So what we would hopefully be able to see are other kinds of incentives that could eventually lead to students studying foreign language without the mandated requirement in order to participate in the program. We're finding a lot more students taking foreign language merely by upgrading the advising process, faculty members working with students to illustrate the use of a foreign language.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HARRISON. Thank you very much, Dr. Backman.

Our third panelist is Dr. Ramon Santiago, who is director of the Bilingual Education Service Center at Georgetown and who appears today as chairman of the annual conference of the National Association for Bilingual Education. Good to have you here, Doctor.

We will include your prepared statement as part of the record. [Prepared statement of Ramon Santiago follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RAMON SANTIAGO, PH.D., IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of the National Association for Bilingual Education [NABE] regarding the Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act of 1983.

NABE is a professional organization devoted to the promotion of bilingualism and the effective education of linguistic minority children. The membership of NABE and its 32 State affiliates numbers over 10,000 teachers, administrators, other educational personnel, parents, and interested community members.

I would like to congratulate this subcommittee, and particularly the chairman, for addressing a problem—our linguistic poverty—which threatens our national security and economic well-being.

Just 2 months ago, NABE held its annual conference here in the Nation's Capital. The theme of this year's conference, of which I was the chair, was "Bilingualism: In the National Interest." Representatives from industry and Government—including executive officials of the Xerox Corp., the Continental Group, the SCM Corp., the Federal Trade Commission, and the State Department—discussed the importance of language education to the future economic development and national security of the United States.

We were especially honored to have as a conference keynote speaker the illustrious chairman of this subcommittee, Chairman Simon. I cannot adequately express NABE's appreciation for your inspiring conference presentation and your ongoing leadership in the long-neglected area of language education.

Language education has occupied a central position in my life. My native language is Spanish; I was born and raised in Puerto Rico. Through my education at Phillips Exeter Academy, Yale University, and Teachers College of Columbia University, I have had an opportunity available to few Americans—the opportunity to become a fluent bilingual.

My professional life has been oriented towards language education. I hold a Ph.D. in applied linguistics and English as a second language. I am the director of Georgetown University's Bilingual Education Service Center and the immediate past president of NABE.

From 1975 to 1976, I taught English as a foreign language to Iranian Air Force personnel in Tehran. Our tragic relationship with Iran, which cost both nations, dearly, reflects the kind of problems which can arise from the lack of understanding of other languages and cultures. I many times wonder what our relationship with Iran would be today had people in the United States mastered the Farsi language and Iranian culture—or at least attempted to do so—to the same extent that the Iranians in my classes sought to learn the American language and culture.

This subcommittee has received extensive testimony regarding the perils of monolingualism. Indeed, our inability to speak the languages of the world and to understand the cultures of its people jeopardizes our economic standing in the community of nations.

Moreover, we know that language is essential for communication and that communication is a prerequisite for understanding among people and nations. Yet we continue to indulge in the conceit that since people in other countries are learning English, we need not study their languages. This conceit is potentially disastrous. Language education is critical to peace; it is critical to the survival of mankind. Along with nuclear disarmament, language education is a national and global imperative.

NABE views this important legislation as the second step toward the development of a Federal language education program. I say "second" step because Congress took the first step 15 years ago when it passed the Bilingual Education Act, title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The primary purpose of title VII is to teach English to native speakers of other languages.

Despite title VII's limited funding and the relatively small sums of money contemplated in this bill, the Bilingual Education Act and this bill together constitute a sound foundation for a national program to improve our language capabilities.

If the programs authorized in this legislation are to be optimally effective, however, they should build upon the knowledge and experience we have already acquired through title VII. At the same time, the programs authorized under this legislation should capitalize on and develop our existing linguistic resources, the most varied in the world. Let me explain.

We know, for example, that children learn languages best at an early age, and that children learn language—like other things—from one another. This simple wisdom, confirmed by academic research, has led to the institution of "reciprocal" (two-way) bilingual education programs such as that provided by the Oyster School here in the Nation's Capital.

In the Oyster School and in other "Reciprocal" bilingual education programs, English- and non-English-speaking students are enrolled in the same classes. These instructional programs have proven extremely successful in producing students who are not only functionally bilingual, but who also appreciate a culture other than their own. These programs also provide an ideal solution to the seemingly intractable problem of ethnic isolation in our Nation's schools.

Today, few American school children are able to take advantage of the extremely effective real-life language instruction provided through "reciprocal" bilingual education programs. The \$14 million for model language instruction programs authorized by sections 3 and 4 of this bill could help to expand these programs and to improve the language learning opportunities available to thousands of students.

The intensive language training institutes for secondary school students authorized under section 6 and the advanced foreign language instruction provided under section 8 of the legislation have great promise. This promise can be maximized if students who already have non-English language skills are encouraged to apply for and participate in these programs.

We know that language development is not spontaneous; it requires active effort. Although English is the native language of most American students, they are

quired to study the English language at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels.

Nevertheless, we have ignored—and even suppressed—the development of the native language skills of language-minority students in this country. Not many years ago, Hispanic students in certain school districts were punished for speaking Spanish on school grounds. While Federal civil rights efforts have reduced overt discrimination and active language suppression, we continue to neglect the linguistic development, both English and native language, of our language-minority student population—a population of more than 5 million children.

Although my remarks this morning have concentrated on the educational needs and potential of language-minority students, let me make clear that I believe that most American students have suffered because of our neglect of language education. Accordingly, NABE endorses the Foreign Language Assistance National Security Act of 1983 and urges its swift enactment.

STATEMENT OF DR. RAMON SANTIAGO, DIRECTOR, BILINGUAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, AND CHAIRMAN, ANNUAL CONFERENCE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Dr. SANTIAGO. Thank you very much.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of the National Association for Bilingual Education regarding the Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act of 1983 from both a professional and personal perspective.

I would like to congratulate this subcommittee, particularly the chairman, for addressing the problem of linguistic poverty in America, a problem which threatens our national security and economic well-being.

Our organization, devoted to the promotion of bilingualism and the effective education of linguistic minority children, recognizes the importance of the proposed legislation. Our constituency contained in our 32 State affiliates, numbering over 10,000 teachers, administrators, graduate students, parents, and community members, supports the effort of this subcommittee.

These hearings could not have come at a more appropriate time. Yesterday the National Commission on Educational Excellence released a report warning that, quote, "Our very future as a nation and as a people is threatened," and claiming that, quote, "We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinkable unilateral educational disarmament." End of quote.

Among the disturbing statistics revealed by the Commission is the indication that as of 1980 only eight States required high schools to offer foreign language instruction and none of these required that the students take the courses. Unfortunately, the Commission's recommendation that high schools offer, quote, "Two years of foreign language for the college bound," is patently inadequate and falls short of meeting the foreign language needs of this Nation.

Professionally, I know how critical it is for the U.S. population to have access to the benefits provided by this bill. I am the immediate past president of NABE and director of the Georgetown University Bilingual Education Service Center. Just 2 months ago NABE held its annual conference here in the District of Columbia, and I chaired this conference, emphasizing the theme of bilingualism in the national interest. Representatives from industry and Government, including Xerox, the Continental Group, the SCM Corp., the

Federal Trade Commission, and the State Department discussed the importance of language education to the future economic development and national security of the United States.

Chairman Simon himself gave an eloquent and inspiring presentation on the subject.

Personally, I can also advocate a stronger language education program. My native language is Spanish. I was born and raised in Puerto Rico. But through my education at the Phillips Exeter Academy, Yale University, and Columbia University, and through my travels abroad, I have had an opportunity apparently available to only a few Americans, the chance to become a fluent bilingual.

From 1975 to 1976 I was fortunate to have the opportunity to teach English as a foreign language to Iranian Air Force personnel in Tehran. Our tragic relationship with Iran, which cost both nations dearly, reflects the kinds of problems which can arise from the lack of understanding of other languages and cultures.

I sometimes wonder what our relationship with Iran would be today had people in the United States mastered the Farsi language and Iranian culture, or at least attempted to do so, to the same extent that the Iranians in my classes sought to learn the American language and culture 8 years ago.

NABE views this important legislation as a second step toward the development of a Federal language education program. I say second because Congress took the first step 15 years ago when it passed the Bilingual Education Act or title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The primary purpose of title VII is to teach English to native speakers of other languages.

Despite title VII's limited funding and the relatively small sums of money contemplated in this bill, the Bilingual Education Act and this bill together constitute a sound foundation for a national program to improve our language capabilities.

If the programs authorized in this legislation are to be optimally effective, however, they should build upon the knowledge and experience we have already acquired through title VII. At the same time, the programs authorized under this legislation should capitalize on and develop our existing linguistic resources, the most varied in the world.

We know, for example, that children learn languages best at an early age and that children learn language, like other things, from one another. This simple wisdom, confirmed by academic research, has led to the institution of reciprocal or two-way bilingual education programs such as that provided by the Oyster School right here in the Nation's Capital.

Today few American schoolchildren are able to take advantage of the extremely effective real-life language instruction provided through the reciprocal bilingual education programs. The \$14 million for model language instruction programs authorized by sections 3 and 4 of this bill could help to expand these programs and to improve the language learning opportunities available to thousands of students.

The intensive language training institutions for secondary school students authorized under section 6 and the advance foreign language instruction provided under section 8 of the legislation have

great promise. This promise can be maximized if students who already have non-English language skills are encouraged to apply for and participate in this program.

We know that language development is not spontaneous. It requires active effort. Although English is the native language of most American students, they are still required to study the English language at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. In spite of this, we have ignored and even suppressed the development of the native language skills of language minority students in this country.

Not many years ago hispanic students in certain school districts were punished for speaking Spanish on school grounds. While Federal civil rights efforts have reduced overt discrimination and active language suppression, we continue to neglect the linguistic development of both English and native languages of our language minority population, a population of more than 5 million children.

Although my remarks this morning have stressed the potential of language minority students, let me make clear that I believe that most American students have suffered because of our neglect of language education. Accordingly, NABE endorses the Foreign Language Assistance National Security Act of 1983 and urges its swift enactment.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HARRISON. Thank you very much, Doctor, and thank you all, gentlemen. I really have no questions. I'd like to share a personal experience with you and ask if you have found this to be a nationwide phenomenon and, if so, what we can do about it.

Before coming here I taught part time for 13 years at a relatively small Catholic college in my district and we had on our faculty a number of tenured professors of foreign language or refugees from countries where the indigenous language would have been one of the hard languages that we've talked about this morning. We had a Serbo-Croatian, a Russian, a Ukrainian, as well as expert professors of Spanish and French, and what we're finding is that their classes are now all so small that in order to save their tenure the administration is finding administrative jobs for them because you just can't afford a full professor teaching two people.

Now, I'm wondering, is this a unique experience to me or is this happening on a broader scale?

Mr. ALATIS. It's happening everywhere, it would seem to me, which all the more points to the importance of this particular legislation which would give national recognition to the importance of these languages, hard or easy, and which would give some kind of impetus to the universities to continue to support these languages, notwithstanding low enrollments.

Now, these hard languages in particular are the ones that university administrators have a hard time justifying, but they're still in the national interest. There is no question about that. We can't support them by enrollments alone.

At the same time, you know, what do we do with these very fine colleagues of ours who have the capability to teach these languages? I am very much interested in your comments about Serbo-Croatian and other languages. If I may turn to something which is, ironically, also a hard language and considered one of the low-density lan-

guages, Japanese, for example, every time I hear the expression "low-density languages" it just makes my blood curdle, because it means low density in enrollments. It certainly doesn't mean low density in the number of students. I mean we have 1 billion Chinese and 180 some million Japanese and we have to go around referring to these languages as the low-density languages.

The universities can hardly even support Japanese. Chinese is getting a little better because there is a renewed interest in Chinese. But this is all the more reason that these languages, certainly if only as a pump-priming operation, need to be given some kind of external support, until such time as we as a nation come to the realization that very soon it will be too late for us to do anything more about competence in all of these languages, so-called neglected, esoteric, exotic.

I don't know whether I've answered your question, but that's my view of it.

Dr. BACKMAN. Just briefly, in response, I think in addition to administrative assignments, which, in fact, are becoming, I think in some institutions, certainly in mid-size State institutions like mine, even rarer, it's a simple matter of those individuals who have the facility to teach the so-called hard languages often do it as an overload, often they are so committed to doing it that they will teach their required German, if that's the language to which they've been hired, or Russian, or whatever, but then will teach the other one as an added incentive for the two to four students.

The problem for an institution, particularly one like ours, which I think is much more typical of many, is that where do you draw the line and how many languages should you teach besides particularly the main three, which most institutions, do teach, and that becomes the cutting edge.

In Charlotte, N.C., we have 15 Japanese firms. Well, does that mean, then, that Japanese ought to be a language that we ought to be teaching, which we do not? Or should we teach Chinese and take advantage of the Chinese exchange programs that we have and have some of those faculty from China who are visiting with us teach a course, because we don't have the resources or choose not to do it?

Those are the hard, hard choices that we face. The idea, hopefully, is that institutions like ours should have two or three, at least, of the noncommonly taught languages for our students that are primarily undergraduate students as opposed to a graduate institute.

Thank you.

Mr. HARRISON. Thank you. Just to follow that up briefly, and certainly I am someone who supports this bill very strongly, but it seems to me that to encourage the education or training or whatever of teachers of foreign language when we already have teachers of foreign language sitting out there who are underutilized, holding administrative positions, is sort of a strange anomaly and I guess that leads to the question of what do we do, and I notice, Dr. Backman, you are opposed to language requirements. What do we do to stimulate student interest beyond the increased advisement that you mentioned in your testimony?

Dr. BACKMAN. My opposition is more of a practical implication than the fact that I think students should have another language. I am looking at it more from having spent 15 years in higher education and looking at an institution, what it would take to mandate that in terms of reallocation of resources and know full well that our institution would not be eligible to apply even if we wanted to do some innovative things with languages and to try to increase language instruction.

A couple of the things that we are trying to do, and I notice the bill speaks to that, one is the study abroad experience. I think most of us would agree you can learn a language in a classroom in the United States but there is a far better way to learn a language and that's certainly immersion. So, we're trying to combine those two. That's one aspect.

Second, obviously, with respect to business but not only business, we have a number of political science, law majors, and so forth, that want to go into Government service. We can, through their professional, where they're headed in terms of their degree, indicate to them the importance of learning a language. Obviously we come back to business because more and more of our students want to go into business even if they're not majoring in business.

I think the secondary and elementary schools are extremely important. A freshman who has not been—a freshman at the university level who has not been exposed to language, it takes more than advising and it takes more than an exit requirement for them to, in fact, learn a foreign language. If it's there they'll go where it's not. I mean, I have talked to students.

So, as my colleagues have said, starting them in the early ages. My son in the seventh grade takes French, takes French by someone who has had 1 year of college French. I find that extremely depressing. I am glad that he is able to take French but on the other hand, I question how much French he's learning of whether the instructor is spending the night before trying to get the pronunciation and grammar down.

So, I think the concentration, and I'm glad to see the legislation does focus very heavily on the elementary and secondary, the training of teachers, but districts have got to hire them, and why don't they hire them? Well, there's got to be a mandate, more than just from school districts. It's got to be a public feeling that there's an importance.

We have 30,000 foreign born in Charlotte out of a city of 275,000. Thirty thousand foreign born. We have probably 1,500 children in bilingual education programs being taught English, trying to maintain their native language, but we know, even though we spend 200 years trying to Americanize an immigrant population, it's still going on and they have these language facilities that if they could keep them up would have, in many cases, a hard language when they got to the university level.

But I think it's a combination of those things.

Thank you.

Mr. HARRISON. My distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you. Dr. Backman, I could have written your testimony. [Laughter.]

I'm sure that Paul's staff member up here has heard a lot of the same things that you have said. My whole effort in the last year and this year was to make sure that we didn't go off half cocked, as we have done so many times. I was the educator on the other end receiving all these great State and Federal mandates.

In fact, yesterday's release at the White House doesn't surprise me at all. In fact, when I was asked to comment on it I said probably what has happened more than anything else within the last 25 years with State legislation and Federal legislation, we've taken the opportunity for educational leadership from educators and basically have turned it over to lawyers and parents, and that makes it very difficult.

So, it was interesting, a year ago one of our affluent counties right outside of Washington, when they came to the end of their year and did their testing they had to publish the fact that the outstanding results were those of the Vietnamese students. Now, are they better students than our students? No. It's the incentive, particularly that is placed there by the parent to make sure that they succeed.

So, I'm glad to see that those areas that you think are very good are four areas that I was very much interested in and worked very hard to be included.

My hope is that we will only send—that we won't send less than two secondary students from any one school into the same language so that they can come back and they can be conversing with each other, which will then encourage other students to become very much involved.

I do have the same concerns that you have in relationship to how we send money out to the colleges, in relationship to what we demand as far as entrance is concerned, and particularly if that money is predicated upon not the number of students that are taking foreign language in your school but the number of students you have in your school but the number of students you have in your school, because I think that could mean that you would fill the threshold classes in order to be eligible, but from that point on it may be too expensive and you may want to use that money for other purposes.

You're going to get money because of every other student that is there and it may take away from what we're going to do.

So, I appreciate all of your testimony and being very specific in any suggestions that you have because, as I said, I don't want this to be another one of those half-cocked programs that came from the Federal level where we were very quickly going to solve the problems. Maybe we weren't quite sure what the problems were. Certainly we don't have all the expertise on how to solve things.

Any specifics that you have that you see plus and minus with the legislation, we will want to know about. We want to do well in this endeavor and at the same time we don't want to fool the public that somehow or other we're going to have a real bilingual public out there, all of a sudden.

All of you testified that it's the demand now that businesses are putting on these graduates and so on. But they've got to see a reason and that reason has to also include an economic reason. Then it will change around.

So, I appreciated all of your testimony. I don't have any questions. I just want you to submit whatever you think is right or wrong with the legislation as it exists. I am sure the chairman will be very receptive to changes if it looks like it's in the best interest of the population we want to serve.

Thank you.

Mr. HARRISON. Thank you.

Mr. Packard?

Mr. PACKARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen, I'm sorry that I wasn't able to be here to hear your personal testimony. I have, of course, the written documents and will review those carefully because I am very anxious about this, as I think you recognize the entire committee is, the whole subject of foreign language.

I suppose I only have one question and it may have already been answered, and again, I apologize if it's a duplication.

With limited dollars for such a program, where do you feel is the greatest need for the concentration of those dollars, at the primary level, at the secondary level, or at the post-secondary level of education? Again, you may have addressed that, but—and it may be that you would want a balance or a mix that would address a carry-through of the program, but I am hearing different signals from different educators, and I'd be interested to know where you see the greatest need of where we can get the most for our dollar.

Dr. SANTIAGO. I think probably the answer to that question is the old hedge of "A little bit everywhere," and let me explain.

I think if we want to see immediate results, perhaps a greater concentration should be done at the higher education level because those are the people who are going to be entering the markets soonest. So, in one respect I could easily argue for greater concentration of dollars at the higher education.

At the same time, I realize that we found out, at least in bilingual education, that the earlier the child starts studying the foreign language, the more proficient he or she will be. Therefore, some emphasis at the early levels will be—will pay off much more extensively.

And the third part of my equation is the fact that many times we have these ethnic populations in particular areas. They need, perhaps, just a slight push to become so proficient in their native language if they're not, in terms of writing and being able to read it and translate and to be the real experts in foreign languages, that some attention ought to be paid to them because bringing somebody up from no knowledge of a foreign language to expert knowledge, to the level where they would be able to be of some use to Governments and corporations requires some years. There is no instant cure for monolingualism and therefore the answer may not be the best answer, but in terms of giving you one solution, but I think that just those three levels certainly need to be paid better attention to.

Mr. GOODLING. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. Yes, certainly.

Mr. GOODLING. To followup, Dr. Santiago, you said that one part you could argue for the elementary. The question I wanted to ask is are you talking about the masses? I will say that only because the city of New York took Federal dollars and State dollars. Every-

one had to take French. I guess kindergarten on. I think it was taught in the same manner that Dr. Backman is talking about his son being taught.

But even worse than that is the fact that so many of those youngsters needed so much help in remedial reading and remedial math that it was difficult for me, at least, to justify that expenditure. How would you do that on the elementary level?

Dr. SANTIAGO. Well, in the best of all possible worlds, if you had all the money available, then you might make foreign language education an elective, an enrichment, the same way that you do art and music.

Realistically, if your dollars are limited, then I think one has to apply the same standards to foreign language education that you apply to anything else, which is identify through some means a certain degree of aptitude. I think if you want to get results quickly you have to start with the best potential available, and therefore you have to do some—everybody is not equally capable of learning a foreign language or learning anything else, except his native language. so therefore I would certainly encourage some kind of selection so that you get the best material available to start with and then I think the dollars will go much farther.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you.

Mr. PACKARD. That was going to be my second question or comment. [Laughter.]

That was that there is a—people have an aptitude, different aptitude toward languages, not only toward a foreign language, but they have different aptitudes toward specific foreign languages. I think my own church background has demonstrated a language training program for their missionary system and one of the first things they do is they give an aptitude test to the prospective missionary and that goes a long ways to determine where that missionary is sent, because they have to learn a language, and that aptitude becomes a very important part of that process, and we've learned that certainly people do have an aptitude toward French more than they do toward German or toward oriental languages in preference to others, and I think that that process would need to be effectively implemented in order to get, again, the most for your dollar. I think that's very important when we are dealing with short dollars, that we get the most mileage and that was the reason for the questions, to determine where we could spend the dollar more effectively.

I really don't have any further questions. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. HARRISON. Gentlemen, thank you all.

Mr. ALATIS. Thank you.

Mr. HARRISON. I think we're adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11 a.m., April 27, 1983, the subcommittee recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○