A discussion of foreign languages in elementary schools (FLES) includes both historical and current overviews of FLES in the United States and makes recommendations for development of FLES programs. The historical review looks at program design and methods during the 1950s and 1960s and the successes and failures of program types and approaches. Examination of present conditions looks at the variety of teaching methodologies used and their outcomes, with some attention given to the way children acquire their first language and its implications for second language learning. Advantages and disadvantages of various methods (grammar-translation, audio-lingual, cognitive-code, direct, Natural Approach, Input Hypothesis, Suggestopedia, Total Physical Response) are explored. It is concluded that salient needs include: community and administrative program support; expansion of immersion programs; expansion of languages offered; teacher training; development of technology use; better articulation across grade levels; and additional research. Contains 33 references. (MSE)
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ABSTRACT

This paper is an historical survey of foreign language programs in United States elementary schools. It reviews the educational procedures taking place during the 1950s and 1960s, it notes the successes and failures during these decades, and examines present conditions, while using all observations to make recommendations for future programs. In the process of investigating such a large topic, it became necessary to examine teaching methodologies and their subsequent impact upon learning. In order to achieve this goal, some discussion on the psychological aspect of native language learning has been studied, along with the logical implications such research has on foreign language learning and teaching. Finally, when examining various methods of teaching, it has become apparent that some methods are more effective than others. For this reason, there is some discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of various instructional methodologies, with emphasis placed on the fact that no single program is right for any one school, district, or system. It is therefore concluded that all educators, administrators, and parents should be involved in taking steps to determine the goals for success in any given elementary school foreign language program.
This paper was conceived out of the author's belief in the importance and necessity of foreign language education in this country, especially at the elementary school level. It is hoped that there will someday come a time when all, or nearly all, of our nation's people will be able to speak at least one language other than their own. The need is so great, and the reasons for doing such have been proven valid time and again, that as the reader will soon discover, there is simply no excuse for the scarcity of such foreign language programs in an advanced country. Perhaps, if more people will become aware of this need through projects like this one, there will dawn a brighter day in the hopefully successful future of elementary school foreign language programs.
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Introduction

What Is FLES and Why Is It Important?

Introducing foreign language instruction at an early age has long been proven both beneficial and effective. In the United States, however, there have been many problems with maintaining a concrete structure for elementary foreign language education. This paper attempts to explore the history of foreign language in this country, along with its successes and failures, and finally attempts to make some conclusive suggestions for the assurance of a strong and successful elementary school foreign language program nationwide. We will also look at how children successfully learn a foreign language by examining the way they learned their native language and by looking at the various teaching methodologies and types of programs used in both past and present years.

In this paper, we will use the acronym FLES to stand for Foreign Languages in Elementary Schools in all kinds of foreign language programs in any type of elementary school setting, except where otherwise indicated. We will also use the term "elementary" to refer to those students in grades K-6 in public and private school systems.

There are many advantages to FLES programs. At a young age, children are naturally curious about language; they have few inhibitions; and they imitate most easily new sounds and sound patterns. Real proficiency in a foreign
language is achieved by progressive learning over an extended period of time. Furthermore, the greatest natural barriers to international understanding are unreasoning reactions to "foreign-ness" often acquired in childhood but which may be offset by experiences with foreign language and behavior (Andersson 191). It should be kept in mind that one of the two main purposes of FLES is communication with one's fellowman. The other main purpose is the cultural or humanistic development as students prepare for life by understanding the similarities and differences of other peoples (Donoghue 306).

In a study done with Ramiro Garcia in the 1960s, it was found that puberty seems to be a biological marker for pronunciation since before this time, there is a high probability of acquiring near-native pronunciation of the target language, but after puberty, such pronunciation is rare (Asher, Learning Another Language 1:33). Research shows that after puberty, excellent pronunciation is rare even for people living for twenty years or more in a foreign country (Asher, Brainswitching 254-56). We now have one more extremely important reason to begin foreign language instruction at the elementary school level.

There are many reasons why the FLES method is psychologically sound. For example, the curve of learning by imitation is highest in the first decade of life. Children usually memorize easily and are often curious about people
in other lands due to impact of mass media and through material studied in other curricular areas. Success in language learning often permeates other learning activities and gives the child renewed interest in school. Research also shows that stuttering students of English do not display the same tendencies when speaking foreign languages in the classroom. There is also increasing evidence showing that learning a foreign language has a positive transfer effect upon the mother tongue and better enables the child to understand his native tongue (Donoghue 15). Another advantage of FLES is that since language instruction is begun early and can continue as long as schooling lasts, the language habits have time to develop. The specific contribution of early language teaching is the relative unconscious command of the second language (Stern 80).

In the next chapter, we will examine the psychology underlying the acquisition of language by children, and note the linguistic implications that understanding this process has for teachers of foreign languages.
Chapter One
The Psychology of Language Learning

In order to talk about how one learns a language, native or foreign, one must first define language itself. Perhaps the simplest definition of language may be the way a native speaker thinks, feels, and acts when he talks (Andersson 34). Some experts view language as the sum of words and phrases allowing man to express his thoughts by a body of vocal signs. In this view, the study of children's acquisition of language is not surprising since a child, after hearing a word repeatedly, should come to understand its meaning and to later pronounce it himself (Chomsky, N., Current Issues 22). An infant has the capacity to produce all sounds in the three to six thousand languages spoken on this planet. Since only a small part of his sound production meets with a response from the linguistically limited caregivers surrounding him, only those sounds belonging to the particular language of his community are reinforced, causing him to lose aptitude for imitating other sounds accurately (Andersson 35).

Grammar is the essential fabric of a language. It is the set of rules describing how to structure the language. It includes phonology (how to put sounds together to form words), syntax (how to put words into sentences), semantics (how to interpret meanings of words and sentences), and
pragmatics (how to participate in conversation). Children learn these systems of grammar by breaking them down into their smallest parts and then developing rules for combining these parts (Wang 133-34). Grammar is one of the essential conditions of the speaker strategy because it provides the speaker with the necessary structures for coding and producing sentences (Bierwisch 66).

In the actual process of language acquisition, one must go through the stages of hearing, babbling, and speaking. In the process of hearing, the ear gathers pieces of information from the speech waves. There is an alteration in production of a sound structure and comparison with the preliminary analysis for identification. This process continues until a sound structure that corresponds to the grammar can be mapped onto the perceived sound. This sound structure triggers the syntactic and semantic component until all levels of structure are identified and the meaning of the sentence reconstructed. The ear is able to select certain acoustic phenomena and modify the impressions according to certain patterns that are not contained in the acoustic signal. The syntactic and semantic structures also influence this selection process on many levels (Bierwisch 67-68).

Babbling is a vital process of language learning. Human infants use babbling to develop, through trial-and-error learning, the ability to produce the set of consonants found
in their own language—even deaf children. The idea that the rhythms in which words and sentences are assembled in speech and the set of rules known as grammar are at some deep level also innate helps to explain why the learning of speech proceeds so easily (Wang 101).

When a speaker is ready to speak, he adapts a thought, wish, idea, or intended message to the semantic structures which his grammar allows, selects the syntactic and phonological forms appropriate to this semantic structure, and finally innervates the speech organs according to the phonological patterns of the sentence to produce sound waves (Bierwisch 64). When he has a word in his language, the speaker knows the concept attached to the word, and he knows the constructions into which the word can enter. A complete knowledge of the word includes both semantic and syntactic knowledge relating to the word (Chomsky, C., *Acquisition of Syntax* 4-5). It has been found that a child is still mastering all the structures of his native language up to nine years of age and perhaps even beyond because active syntactic acquisition is still taking place up to this point (Chomsky, C., *Acquisition of Syntax* 121).

Listening skill is far in advance of speaking because listening comprehension of many complex utterances must be demonstrated before any intelligible speech may be produced. Children specifically acquire listening skills through an intimate relationship between language and the child's body.
Utterances from caregivers manipulate the orientation, location, and locomotion of the child's entire body. As listening comprehension skills develop, there is a point of readiness to speak in which the child spontaneously begins to produce utterances. Asher believes that the brain and the nervous system may be biologically programmed to acquire language in this sequence of listening before speaking, coupled with the mode of synchronizing language with the individual's body (Learning Another Language II:4).

Research suggests that a single competence is involved in listening and speaking. To understand how children learn to speak, we must first find out how they comprehend. Many experts believe that acquisition of language comes through comprehension. Krashen says that proficiency in a second language is accomplished through language acquisition, learning, or both. He defines acquisition as those processes occurring "naturally." He also says that acquisition is the principal avenue to language proficiency in both first and second languages and comprehension is the channel of acquisition (Met, "Listening Comprehension" 519). If, as research suggests, listening comprehension skills underlie and precede the development of oral proficiency, then instructional programs which place primary emphasis on oral skills, at the expense of aural skills, are deficient (even if they are communicative in nature). Students need to be able to understand a great deal more than they can express.
A program of second language instruction placing heavy emphasis on structured listening experiences and on the importance of listening before speaking should contribute to significant progress in the student's development of competence in the language (Met, "Listening Comprehension" 520).

There is now much evidence that infants innately recognize most or all of the more than two dozen consonant sounds characteristic of human speech, including consonants not present in the language they normally hear (Wang 99). The innate ability to identify sign stimuli present in consonants allows the infant to ignore a world full of irrelevant auditory stimuli and to focus on speech sounds. This ability starts the child on the right track in learning to decode layers of meaning buried in the complex and variable sounds of speech, and it provides an internal standard for the child to use in judging and shaping speech sounds (Wang 101).

The fact that speakers of different languages are attuned to somewhat different phonemic distinctions suggests that the influence of the linguistic environment on speech perception is powerful. We perceive speech categorically—we are aware of distinct phonemic categories rather than continuous variation in each acoustic parameter (Wang 117-118). In developing rules for combining basic elements of language, a child hypothesizes the most general rules, and
successively narrows them down by the addition of more precise rules applying to a more restricted set of sentences. This process of refining rules of internal grammar by learning increasingly detailed subrules continues until approximately age ten (Wang 134).

There is also evidence that long before infants can speak and understand, they are particularly sensitive to the acoustic distinctions crucial to the comprehension of speech. This evidence increases the likelihood of the existence of a set of inborn mechanisms that are specialized for speech perception. As the linguistic environment created by a child's parents and companions interacts with his inborn perceptual mechanisms, the child retains and sharpens only those perceptual capacities corresponding to phonemic distinctions in the parental language but loses the ability to detect distinctions not found in the native language. The best example of the innate perception mechanisms occurs in infancy, as a child learns his parents' language. It is clear that an infant is born with many building blocks of later speech perception and comprehension of speech. The adequacy of the mechanisms is seen in the agility and speed with which a child assimilates into the world of language (Wang 126-27).

Children dissect a language into its minimal separable units of sound and meaning; discover rules for recombining sounds into words, as well as the meanings of individual
words and the rules for recombining words into meaningful sentences; and they internalize intricate patterns of how to take turns in dialogue (Wang 131). Children's command of grammatical structures usually approaches that of adults around age ten. A mature speaker of a language has internalized an intricate and highly complex set of rules constituting the grammar of his native tongue. During a child's period of language acquisition, he must construct a similar set of rules characterizing those of his linguistic environment in order to ready himself for both speaking and understanding (Chomsky, C., Acquisition of Syntax 1-3).

A child learns a language by stages: first he learns to understand and produce utterances, by beginning with individual words and then going to structures of increasing complexity and finally assimilating in stages the grammar of the language. He really constructs the grammar, since a child must deduce the regularities of the sentences he hears for himself (Bierwisch 71). A child has the remarkable skill of being able to analyze a language completely. Most children can complete the best part of the language acquisition process by the age of five years. In order to learn a word, a child must first associate sound with meaning in two stages. In the rapid stage, they assign new words to broad semantic categories. In the slower stage, they must work out distinctions among words within a semantic category (Wang 151).
The average child produces his first word at about age one. By the time he reaches age four, distribution of parts of speech in his conversation approximate that of adults and he has mastered the grammatical structures of the language (Donoghue 282-83). Most experts believe that there is little danger to a child who has had five or six years to learn to speak his native tongue, to confuse a second language with his mother tongue (Donoghue 13). Stern also says that there are no psychological reasons why a second language should not be started at any age during the nursery and primary years of education (11).

It is commonly known among psychologists and people in related fields that linguistic abilities originate in the left side of the brain (Wang 72). This is the location of the well-known site called Wernicke's area, which is so central to the process of language production. The underlying structure of an utterance arises in Wernicke's area and is transferred to Broca's area, where it evokes a detailed and coordinated program for vocalization. The program goes on to an adjacent face area of the motor cortex, which activates the appropriate muscles of the mouth, the lips, the tongue, the larynx, and so on (Wang 77). Wernicke's area also plays an important part in comprehension of the spoken word. A sound must pass through this area to be understood as a verbal message. Writing a word in response to an oral instruction requires information
to be passed from the auditory cortex to Wernicke's area to the angular gyrus (Wang 77).

Asher believes that an infant deciphers the meaning of language in the right hemisphere since this hemisphere expresses itself by listening to a command and performing the appropriate action. In contrast, the left hemisphere expresses itself by talking since this is the verbal hemisphere. The left hemisphere of the infant cannot speak, and only observes language causing actions in the infant and others until it is ready to attempt to talk (Asher, Learning Another Language, II: 24).

Asher further believes that nature's design continues to operate when an individual begins to learn a second or third language. Logically, any instructional program teaching another language should structure its content especially for the right hemisphere (Learning Another Language, II: 24). In his research, Asher found that when students acted or observed a model act in training, the input was to the right brain. To retrieve the input, the maximum retention occurred when the performance measure also played to the right brain. If we input to the right brain but later ask the left brain to retrieve the information, the results will be significantly less than if both input and output are from the right brain (Learning Another Language, II: 10). There are very different ways to communicate with each side of the brain, as we can see from
the illustration on the following page, based on Asher's research.

It is commonly known that foreign languages are most easily learned before puberty, as the human brain is best suited to language learning during that time period, but the exact optimum age is somewhat difficult to pinpoint due to the differing opinions on the subject (Wang 149). Psychologists have shown that the earlier one begins learning a foreign language, the more easily and lastingly it is acquired. Some experts feel that the simultaneous acquisition of a foreign language by a child along with his native language has a detrimental effect on speaking and intellectual development. Many believe that children should only learn a foreign language after they have successfully consolidated knowledge of their native language, which would be at about ages eight to ten (Belyayev 33-4).

There are, however, opposing views on this subject. For example, Stern says that "the common fears that a second language is detrimental to the development of the first language, to intellectual growth, or to general school attainments are not supported by current evidence" (Stern 110). In the May 1956 meeting of the Modern Language Association, it was determined that the ages of four to eight are the best times to begin continuous learning of a second language. During this time, the brain seems to have the greatest plasticity and specialized capacity needed for
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acquiring speech (Andersson 45). Andersson also says that by the age of five, a child has completely assimilated basic language skills and is capable of understanding anything said by those around him and of saying anything with perfect pronunciation and intonation. At this point, he would speak almost as well as the adults in his environment. He can easily learn one or more languages at the same time that he learns his own.

It does seem that age ten is the dividing line. Before this age, speech habits in the first language are not so fixed as to interfere seriously with the learning of new speech habits (Andersson 40-44). Donoghue maintains that the ideal age for beginning instruction in a second language is at birth. He also says that ages four to eight are optimum considering language learning in relation to schooling, with best performance expected at ages eight, nine, or ten. Before age ten, speech habits of the first language are not so fixed as to interfere seriously with the learning of new speech habits (Donoghue 11).

Since the 1960s, there have been some encouraging research reports. It is no longer clear that the development of cerebral dominance is directly related to language acquisition. There are now arguments supporting the case that lateralization of the brain is firmly established much earlier than puberty, at least by age five, and that the preconditions for lateralization may be present at birth.
There may be two different developmental courses for the two
different kinds of language processing, one completely
lateralized to the left hemisphere by puberty and the other
much earlier in life. This would mean that certain aspects
of language are not entirely lateralized to the left
hemisphere until later in life, perhaps by puberty. There is
little doubt that children show left hemisphere dominance
for much of the language function well before puberty
(Krashen and Terrell 73-76).

There are two ways that a child (or anyone) learns a
second language. The first is called coordinate
bilingualism. This process takes place by interacting with
the speakers of the foreign language with little or no
reference to the first language. Here, the language systems
are kept distinct and separate. The second method is known
as compound bilingualism, where the child learns the foreign
language as a formal system parallel to, and explained in
terms of his first language. This is what classroom
instruction is more typically arranged for. The student
develops this compound system through experience in fused
contexts where one language depends substantially on the
same neurological components as the other (Donoghue 272-73).

If a state or a school system decides to implement a
FLES program, decisions must be made on the proper way to go
about teaching the foreign language. To many language
teachers, the pattern of first language learning represents
an ideal to be followed in the teaching of the second language (Stern 11). James Asher believes that the method of "brainswitching" is the secret of acquiring another language, any language, at any age (Asher, Brainswitching 242).

Brainswitching is a skill to communicate more effectively by alternating information processing through the right and left hemispheres of the brain. It has been shown that each hemisphere of the brain can process information independently. Other studies also suggest that each side of the brain is sensitive to different input coming into the sensory receptors. Each side of the brain may see, hear, and understand different messages coming from the outside. Ordinarily, both sides of the brain alternate at high speed to process information. We are almost instantly brainswitching. Also, inter-hemispheric communication is usually too fast for us to register in awareness. Each hemisphere also seems to be decoding different messages. Not only is the decoding different, but the hemispheres are in communication with each other across the corpus callosum (Asher, Brainswitching 11-12, 31).

In schools, the dominant method of foreign language teaching makes use of left brain input. For example, students repeat spoken phrases, memorize dialogues and grammar rules, translate printed words, and engage in other antiquated methods of foreign language instruction. The
problem with this method is that human beings are not made to acquire any language through the left brain, as has already been stated. Infants acquire their first language through the right brain. Before they talk, they experience thousands of transactions where they hear instructions in a target language and respond with movement of a physical nature. These movements show that the spoken message was comprehended (Asher, Brainswitching 242-43).

According to Asher, before a child even begins to attempt to speak, he has internalized a well-developed and intricate linguistic map of how the target language works and what the words mean. This internalization of a linguistic map through "language-body" conversations prepares an infant to talk. Talk will not appear without this map. Readiness to talk will occur only when this map has expanded to a size large enough to release talk. Asher believes that understanding must be achieved through the right brain before there is brainswitching to the left brain when a child is ready to speak. Even when speaking does begin, comprehension will continue to expand in the right brain and will always be far in advance of the child's skill in talking.

If, as Asher believes, comprehension of a target language is the amazing accomplishment of the right brain, we must then decode strange noises through the right brain before the left is ready to talk. He uses the TPR (Total
Physical Response) method to accomplish this task by directing physical movements of students in the target language (Brainswitching 244-46). We will be discussing this method and many others in some detail at a later point in this paper in our attempts to pinpoint the best ways to teach children foreign languages.
Chapter Two
The History of Elementary School Foreign Language Education in the United States

Foreign language education in this country has its roots in the early part of the twentieth century. Before World War I, some Europeans were insisting that ear training, speaking, reading, and writing should precede grammar analysis. They advocated a method using questions and answers on numerous topics where English was forbidden. One such proponent was Wilhelm Victor, a professor at the University of Marburg, Germany who advocated use of phonetics in teaching pronunciation. His ideas were brought to the United States in 1911 by one of his students, Max Walter. The basic principles of his philosophy included the ideas that speaking should come first since language is made of sounds, not letters. He proposed that connected discourse be used because expressions given should be full of meaning. He said that language should be learned as a child learns his first language and grammar should be learned inductively (Childers 32).

By World War I, national sentiment toward FLES was very negative, especially where German was concerned. After World War II, there was a resurgence of foreign language study, which many believe may have been due to the Russians' orbiting of Sputnik, (the first earth satellite launched by
the Russians in 1957), which caused a surge of interest in foreign languages (especially Russian) in an attempt to stay ahead in the race to space (Heining-Boynton 504).

After 1952, FLES grew into a national educational phenomenon in the United States after the May 2, 1952 speech of Earl J. McGrath, U.S. Commissioner of Education who made the statement at a teachers' meeting in St. Louis that the events of World War II required that immediate attention be given to providing foreign language instruction to as many citizens as possible. From 1953 to 1959 FLES enrollment spread from over 145,000 to over 1,000,000 pupils (Childers 67). This spread created a change in the number of schools with FLES programs from 680 schools to over 8,000 among city schools with all states and the District of Columbia represented (Childers 69). In 1958, the National Defenses Education Act provided funding for training of foreign language teachers, and all language programs, including FLES programs, grew. By 1960 all 50 states had FLES programs which included 1,227,000 pupils in 8,000 elementary schools but by the end of the 1960s, few FLES programs remained.

There were some landmark events taking place during this time (the 50s and 60s) which influenced our current philosophy of foreign language education for children. Some examples are: the NDEA (National Defense Education Act) created institutes for teachers of FLES around the country; prototypes of FLES curriculum materials and manuals
demonstrating the audio-lingual approach became widely available; public acceptance of the need for foreign language in elementary schools grew following the discovery that U.S. scientists and government officials could not read Russian journals prior to the announcement of "Sputnik"; teachers took more methodology and language courses to upgrade their teaching skills; and some universities began to offer advanced degrees in FLES education (including masters' and doctoral programs) (Lipton, "A Look Back" 255).

There was also research done in the 60s by school districts showing that children learned foreign languages effectively at the elementary school level and the time taken for language acquisition did not interfere with learning in other areas. Basic guidelines for FLES programs were initiated by a committee sponsored by the Modern Language Association, led by Kenneth Mildenberger, who coined the acronym "FLES" (Lipton, "A Look Back" 256).

In the 1960's, it was predicted that in the course of the next few decades, a school child would begin learning a second language at age eight and continue learning it through high school (Donoghue 4). Obviously, this plan has not come to pass. What were the causes of such drastic program decline? There were many problems with early FLES programs. There were difficulties in finding qualified language teachers and there were budget problems in securing needed funds to pay the FLES teachers. Schools had to decide
whether or not only the most gifted would receive foreign language instruction. There was also the problem of articulation—the process where a child continues to grow in linguistic abilities, without being placed with beginners at any time. For example, there were problems with the possible discontinuation of study for schools with FLES programs but no other foreign language study until high school. And for those with continuous programs, it was unclear what high schools would do about students who had graduated from FLES programs and other students who had no previous experience with the target language. For a few years after 1953, there were few syllabi, guides, and other materials to help FLES teachers (Childers 70-71).

The decline of FLES programs in the 60s can probably be attributed to many reasons. For example, there were excessive promises of linguistic fluency in too short a time; there was no careful planning or articulation of programs; there were few "qualified" teachers with few language skills and little knowledge of elementary school education, and the FLES programs were separated from the rest of the elementary school curriculum (Lipton, "A Look Back" 256). Articulation is a gradual, sequential, progression within and between levels in a given content area. Many programs started with little or no planning to include the eventual integration with junior high and high school programs (Heining-Boynton 505).
Teachers and methodologists did not consider children's learning styles when planning FLES classes. Children can tolerate only limited amounts of drill and repetition. The audio-lingual method was considered the best method for teaching children since it was known that children learn their first language by repetition of words. The boredom of excessive repetition and rote memorization and the effect of cognitive development occurring since acquisition of the native language were not taken into account (Heining-Boynton 505).

There were unrealistic and/or inappropriate goals and objectives set during this time. In the spring of 1961 for example, researchers reported the following as their findings of 62 reportedly good FLES programs: the majority of the programs did not fulfill their goals of teaching the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing); many programs emphasized aims like "world understanding" or "broadened horizons" to the extent that they were not language programs; FLES teachers perceived language as isolated lists of words when the program goal stated that the child should be able to use the language (Heining-Boynton 505).

There was also an extreme lack of qualified teachers. In the 1950s FLES teachers were most often traveling specialists, classroom teachers, college students, parents or other citizens, native community speakers,
superintendents, or principals. The specialist had little knowledge of how to teach children, although they may have had native or near native fluency. By 1960, no state required a teacher to be able to understand and speak the language he or she taught (Heining-Boynton 504).

There was often a lack of homework, grades, and evaluation within FLES programs. Many times foreign language experiences were not graded causing students to regard foreign language classes as less important and less worthy of their serious attention. FLES students from the 50s and 60s professed that they needed a sign that advancement was occurring. Also, program assessment by teachers, administrators, parents, and children was not measured, and FLES teacher effectiveness was very often not evaluated (Heining-Boynton 506).

An additional source of damage to FLES programs was the lack of parental support. When parents became concerned that no learning was taking place as their children could not translate to them what they said in the foreign language, educators would respond by saying that it was not a question of knowing or not knowing the language. The child was said to be incapable of translation since the second language was an independent means of communication which had nothing to do with English. Parental displeasure was often due to a lack of understanding of goals and objectives of the program. For example, parents, teachers, and students were
unaware of the fact that one year of FLES instruction was not equivalent to one year of high school foreign language instruction. In the 50s and 60s, it was not taken into account that older children learn language more quickly due to their advanced cognitive development (Heining-Boynton 506).

If we are to build a system for the instruction of foreign languages in elementary schools, we must determine the proper method for constructing such a system. In the next chapter, we will examine the various types of instructional programs presently in use and determine how to build a successful FLES program.
Chapter Three

Programs Types and Models for Successful FLES Programs

In this chapter, we will define the various program models currently employed in teaching children foreign languages. We will also examine the advice given by the experts on how to build a successful FLES program, and notice the example Arizona recently set in carrying out their implementation of a state mandated FLES program. There are three main types of programs presently in use. These are: FLEX (foreign language experience/exploratory programs), FLES programs, and Immersion programs.

FLEX programs are short-termed and self-contained. The length of their duration varies from a few weeks to a year. Some types introduce language through high quality language learning experience and others use English to teach children about language. Most of these "introduce students to language learning, develop awareness and appreciation of other cultures and awareness of the first language, and hope to motivate students to continue foreign language study." Approximately 40 percent of U.S. elementary schools teaching foreign languages use some type of FLEX approach (Met and Rhodes 433).

Approximately 45 percent of language programs in the U.S. are FLES programs. These programs are usually language or language and content-based, but most concentrate on the
language itself, together with its culture. There is usually
great variation in the time spent in language learning: from
fifteen minutes twice weekly, to thirty minutes daily, to
two class periods per day. Goals include: developing
proficiency in listening and speaking, a mastering the
subject content taught in the foreign language, increasing
in cross-cultural understanding, and developing limited
proficiency in reading and writing in the target language
(Met and Rhodes 434). One may expect reasonable fluency if
students receive language instruction for at least thirty
minutes per day, five times per week, for four or more years
(Lipton, "A Look Back" 256).

It is generally accepted that the primary concern of a
FLES program should begin with listening and speaking and
extend to reading and writing. These programs usually have
15 to 20 minute sessions at least three times per week
(Andersson 193). The teacher should be an expert in the
language being taught, with near native accent and fluency,
and should also be skillful in teaching young children
(Eriksson 160).

Content-based FLES programs allow for an
interdisciplinary and integrated curriculum. They draw their
objectives and practice activities directly from the content
students learn during the rest of the day. In immersion
programs, content-based instruction substitutes for subject
matter instruction in English (Met and Rhodes 438-39).
Content-based instruction has its opponents, however. Lipton cautions against it since some foreign language teachers may be teaching subjects outside their area of expertise and may not be familiar enough with current methodologies to teach these content areas in any great depth ("A Look Back" 257). Other experts however are strong supporters of content-based instruction. They assert that if the language teacher is familiar with their students' school curriculum, and teaches only lessons with themes that are familiar and interesting to him or her, and require only a limited amount of research by the teacher, the results can be most beneficial in teaching language as well as reinforcing other areas of academic skill. This holistic approach is based on the premise that when students participate in meaningful activities as they acquire language, they will acquire all four language skills as naturally as they learned them in their native tongue (Curtain and Haas 3-4).

There are several different kinds of immersion programs including total immersion, partial immersion, and two-way immersion programs. In immersion programs the regular curriculum is taught in the foreign language. The foreign language is used for the entire school day during the first two to five years. Reading is taught through the foreign language and instruction in English is introduced gradually and increased until the sixth grade, where up to half of the day is spent in English and the other half in
the foreign language (Met and Rhodes 434).

The function of immersion programs is to develop functional proficiency in the language, to master subject-content material of the school district curriculum, to increase cross-cultural understanding, and to develop achievement in the English language arts comparable to or surpassing that of students in regular classes (Met and Rhodes 434). Fluency is expected after four or more years in this type of program (Lipton, "A Look Back" 256).

Total immersion uses the target language exclusively until the English language arts are introduced (usually around the second or third grades). As much as fifty to sixty percent of the school day is spent in the native language and the other forty to fifty percent in the target language. Partial immersion uses half of the school day for subject matter instruction in the foreign language and the other half in native language instruction (Met, "Decisions" 469). In two-way immersion programs, native student speakers of the target language work with native students speakers of English allowing both groups to become proficient in both languages (Met and Rhodes 434).

Articulation is of major concern when considering the implementation of any of these programs. The elementary curriculum should articulate with that of the secondary curriculum so that students continually increase in language proficiency without being placed in any class where the
instruction is beneath their level of linguistic competency. Cultural experience should also contribute to the children's understanding of the people whose language they study. Program planners should know and make use of the curriculum of other subject areas in planning the scope and sequence of their programs and in developing the appropriate language learning activities (Met and Rhodes 436). If planning for the junior and senior high school level is not an integral part of planning for the elementary level, the lack of articulation will be extremely detrimental to parents and students alike. The students will become dissatisfied, disillusioned, frustrated, and bored.

There is also a need for articulation within the elementary programs themselves. For example, a program beginning in the sixth grade requires planning for one year of study, while programs beginning in kindergarten require planning for concept and skill building throughout the next seven years (Met, "Decisions" 471-72).

Availability of qualified staff is of critical concern. The future expansion of elementary school language programs is seriously endangered by the lack of human resources.

If we were to mandate that every student in this country be involved in an elementary school language program beginning tomorrow, an adequate teaching force simply would not be available (Met, "Decisions" 473). The kind of teacher needed is determined by the type of
program offered. For example, an immersion teacher should be trained in elementary content areas rather than in the foreign language itself, since foreign language teachers view the language as a skill to be acquired rather than a means of learning other subjects. In contrast to the FLEX teacher the FLES teacher should be highly proficient in the language being taught, while both teachers need knowledge of child development and the basic school curriculum so that their classes may be integrated with the other subjects that their students are studying (Met, "Decisions" 472).

Financial resources are also of large concern. How much teacher time is available, the possible need for additional staff, and the amount of time spent on materials to support the program must be taken into account. All three programs have start-up costs while FLEX and FLES usually need a specialist over and above the usual staffing. Since the immersion teacher is also the regular classroom teacher, no additional staffing is required (Met and Rhodes 436).

Material resources must also be taken into consideration. They should be appropriate to the content and approaches found in other subject areas of the elementary school curriculum. Material for FLEX programs often come from social studies programs, while FLES programs may use some of the same resources with additional materials used to teach language skills and vocabulary. Subject matter materials in the target language must be provided for
immersion programs. Materials intended for use by native speakers of the target language used in other countries may be suitable for use by immersion programs, but differences in curricula may cause problems. Also, partial immersion students may not be able to achieve the high levels of language proficiency required to handle materials written in the target language (Met, "Decisions" 472-73).

It is important to realize that no one program is right for all school systems. Each program can be effective, but each will lead to different outcomes. Goals and objectives will influence grade level decisions. For example, a program intended for orientation to foreign language study might be sensibly offered at the sixth grade level as a preparatory experience for the junior high school program. In contrast, a program aiming at high proficiency in the four language skills (listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing) needs an early start--preferably in the primary grades and implies that developers plan for a long and articulated sequence of study. The language to be taught will also influence the choice of the model program, since there are not always readily available resources for certain languages. It is also important to realize that "there is no way any child is going to become fluent in another language by hearing it twenty minutes a day, five days a week for a year or two." Fluency is a goal that only immersion programs have truly been able to achieve. FLES and FLEX programs are
simply not geared to delivering the level of language proficiency produced by total and partial immersion, since students in immersion programs spend more time exposed to the target language than they do in FLES or FLEX programs (Met, "Decisions" 470-71).

There is much to be considered when starting a program of foreign language education in an elementary school. Heining-Boynton has devised a program checklist for practitioners and administrators which includes the following suggestions: teachers should have high levels of foreign language competence and teaching expertise, programs should have reasonable and written goals and objectives, curricula should be age appropriate and meaningful for the elementary school learner, teachers and programs should be evaluated at least once a year, and parental and communal support should be actively solicited (509).

Arizona could be examined as a modern example of how a state goes about beginning some type of FLES program. The Arizona Elementary Foreign Language Task Force outlined these characteristics and issues contributing to a good elementary foreign language program: coordination, commitment, integration of foreign language instruction with other subjects, clearly stated program goals and instructional principles, articulation, grades and evaluation, funding and legislation, methods of implementation, and decision of the language to be taught
The following teaching models were presented to the teachers: TPR, The Natural Approach, webbing and storytelling exercises, Krashen's hypothesis on second language acquisition, cooperative learning models, and combining techniques. Arizona has a goal to develop a cultural component by working towards the goal of attaining linguistically competent and culturally sensitive teachers as the state prepares for the implementation phase. To confront the problem of articulation the task force team consulted with administrators and instructors from all levels for input, including elementary, middle school, and secondary school teachers. This process provided an exchange of expertise and is most efficient in utilizing state resources. The task force recommended that the language instruction be culturally relevant and integrated into the curriculum while taking into account young learners' cognitive development and principles of first and second language acquisition.

To solve the problem of evaluation, the task force recommended that a school district and a state have a plan to evaluate a program's success in terms of goals and objectives. The level of foreign language proficiency in students is of prime interest. Teachers would modify teaching techniques based on assessed outcomes of linguistic proficiency and cultural awareness goals at each grade level.
as achieved by students collectively and individually. The task force also stressed the importance of administration and faculty development of "a systematic, reliable instrument for rating the program's progress" and suggested the questionnaire developed by Heining-Boynton as a model. The task force believes that these procedures will provide information to comparable districts nationwide and will help avoid mistakes causing the decline of FLES programs in the 60s (Vigil 538).

To give the reader an idea of the kind of checklist Heining-Boynton has designed for use by FLES practitioners and administrators, an adaptation of the checklist has been included on the following page.
HEINING-BOYNTON CHECKLIST

1. Do the FLES teachers possess a high level of foreign language competence in speaking, listening, reading, writing, culture, and in pedagogy?

2. Do the FLES teachers have an equitable work load?

3. Does your program have written goals and objectives?

4. If so, are these goals appropriate and reasonable?

5. Are the teachers, administrators, and parents aware of them?

6. Is the curriculum age-appropriate and meaningful?

7. Are the children engaged in a variety of activities to meet their differing learning styles?

8. Is the program well-articulated both within and beyond the elementary school setting?

9. Do the students receive some kind of evaluation?

10. Do they receive grades on their report card for the foreign language?

11. Are the teachers evaluated at least once yearly?

12. Is the program evaluated at least once yearly?

13. Is parental and community support solicited?

This checklist is an adaptation of the one that appears in Heining-Boynton's article "Using FLES History to Plan for the Present and Future", Foreign Language Annals, 23, No. 6, 1990.
Chapter Four
How to Teach Foreign Languages to Elementary School Students

There are many older and current theories as to how one should go about teaching a foreign language with each expert having his or her own opinion. We will examine a few of these theories here of both past and present day use. This examination will give us a brief overview of the general theories affecting FLES instructional methodologies, which will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. We will also look at the importance of including the study of culture and how to go about including it in a FLES program.

Belyayev has stated that lessons should have a practical, not theoretical, character. The aim of teaching is practical mastery of the foreign language. Class time should be filled with speech activity in oral and written forms. There should be exercise in non-translating use of the language. All elements of the language should be used actively, creatively, and productively by the students. Pupils should be taught foreign means of expressing thoughts, through custom and habit formed by practice in using the foreign language (Belyayev 224-25).

Teaching aids can be aural, visual, sensory, motor, or can consist of objects, action, external aids based on perception, or internal aids based on activity of memory and
imagination. The visual principle is especially important since there is psychological evidence that children remember what they see better than what they hear. The foreign language teacher should make use of all kinds of descriptive plans and diagrams which should call the students' memory and imagination into play (Belyayev 110-15).

The decisive factor governing full assimilation of a foreign language is linguistic practice--speech in the foreign language in all its forms and basic processes. When developing active speech, the teacher must ensure that students concentrate on thoughts expressed rather than on the linguistic characteristics of speech (Belyayev 220-22).

Many professionals involved in foreign language teaching do not recommend translation. Translation often fails to assist the correct understanding of foreign words, and gravely hinders this understanding because words of the foreign and native language often stand in a relationship of subordination or of partial coincidence with each other (Belyayev 150).

Stern advocates exposing children to the foreign language in real life situations excluding the use of the native language, since this method is how the child learned the native language. This exposure should be matched by systematic learning. Vocabulary and structures should be taught under careful selection. Primacy should be given to the oral aspect--listening and speaking before reading and
writing. Emphasis should be given to repetition of patterns of expression which are constantly modified by substitution of different patterns. New structures would be based on established vocabulary and new vocabulary on established structures (Stern 85-88).

Many teaching experts believe that storytelling is an effective technique when used to develop listening skills. By using books, films, and even video tapes, the teacher can facilitate language acquisition by exposing students to a wide range of language used in context. A listening center should be an integral part of any language development program. New vocabulary should be introduced by the teacher, and students should interact physically with the vocabulary in some way. Vocabulary building activities should require language comprehension, not production: the student should be able to comprehend, not vocalize, in order to participate in the activity (Met, "Listening Comprehension" 521-23).

Donoghue endorses the unit plan as an approach to FLES teaching. This framework includes areas of objectives, content, instructional materials and resources, suggested activities, and evaluation (226). In contrast, Andersson believes in FLES teaching in stages. For example, according to him the first stage of language learning should be entirely by ear. Lessons should be daily, and about fifteen to twenty minutes long. The teacher should judge at what point reading and writing should be introduced without harm
to the audio-lingual learning, which should be continued throughout. At the intermediate stage, structure and vocabulary should be enlarged and lesson time extended to twenty to thirty minutes per day. Reading and writing should be introduced if they have not been already at this third stage. It now only remains for the junior and senior high schools to give the student control of grammatical terminology and usage (Andersson 164-66).

Dramatizations of scenes and stories emphasize real-life communication quality of language by means of a simple activity. They have two types: known and unknown. In a known drama, children act out a unit they have studied. An unknown drama is not already familiar to the children and should first be introduced by choral response, pattern drills, or other method, just as if it were a new teaching unit (Eriksson 26-29). Pattern practice is a type of drill on some structural patterns basic to the language, which should consist of dialogue or be based on some concrete reality, like a group of objects or some kind of large reproductions, such as charts or pictures. The "question-answer" technique is useful and valid only with known material and has its greatest value in developing easy conversation on topical subjects. It may be used in many ways, such as: teacher to class, teacher to individual students, group of students to each other, or individual to individual (Eriksson 23-26). Drills should be used in pronunciation and contrasting
sounds. The choral response method is very important to students who hesitate to practice pronunciation without the cover of group recitation. This method consists of choral repetition first by the entire group, and proceeds to a stimulus eliciting an automatic response from the group. Later the teacher may progress to small group interaction and ultimately, individual response (Eriksson 22-23).

The use of computers in the foreign language classroom has long been acknowledged. Computers can be especially useful in the task of learning new words. Learning new words through the context of reading material is more difficult than learning them through interaction with a person. In most conversations, visual information supplements the linguistic information which cannot be obtained from the printed page (Wang 154). The average child in grade school needs immediate access to information about the meaning and use of words. It is important to provide information while the reader still wants it. Dictionaries often compound the interruption with misunderstood information for the grade school child. A tutor is needed to immediately detect and resolve lexical misunderstandings (Wang 157). If we present the reading material to the student by a computer capable of answering questions about meanings of all words in the material (including their use in appropriate context), and capable of pronouncing the word and explaining it, or showing pictures indicating what the word denotes in the
context, then the child will not lose interest so easily. It has been shown that providing information when wanted can significantly improve children's grasp of unfamiliar words, as demonstrated by their ability to recognize meanings and write acceptable sentences incorporating new words (Wang 157-58).

Other methods of FLES instruction include the following: dialogues, scenes, dramatizations, pattern practice, "question-answer" sessions, drill techniques, and choral response. Eriksson claims that simple conversations, dialogues, and short scenes are more meaningful in context than isolated questions and answers. They provide participation in a foreign culture enabling children to absorb cultural implications.

The teaching of culture in elementary school foreign language programs has always been of concern to both administrators and teachers. In the 1994 Central States Conference which discussed national standards in foreign language education, there was much discussion on the inclusion of culture in contextual instruction (Phillips and Draper 5). According to Donoghue, there are two main purposes of cultural instruction: cross-cultural communication and cross-cultural understanding. This kind of communication demands a comprehension of the spoken and written language, an ability to elicit the potential friendliness of the foreign community, and the talent to
represent good in one's own culture without irritation at the differences between cultures. Also, elementary school children need cultural content for proper use of language or they will supply American connotations to foreign concepts and patterns, rendering some cultural behavior as illogical or unnatural (Donoghue 87-89).

There are three broad resources for studying a cultural environment: direct experience, simulated experience through audio-visual representation, and simulated experience through reading material (Donoghue 92). For example, students can read about lives of national heroes, men of science, or other notable people. Geographical figures and their folklore, juvenile literature of a foreign country, lifestyles of foreign children, or studying other aspects of native life are approaches to scientific, historical, geographic, or literary aspects. A teacher must devise ways in which students may "live", "feel", "think", "evaluate", and "act" so far as possible as do the foreign peoples whose ways they are studying (Eriksson 71).

Eriksson has stated that culture can be taught in two ways: implicitly or explicitly. Culture is used implicitly in the teaching of the language by subordinating it to the language patterns, which gives it social impact. Slides, films, pictures, and objects can be used as the focal point of a lesson or unit so that the teacher teaches culture explicitly (73).
There are, of course, many ways to teach culture in the modern foreign language classroom. Rosenbusch advocates use of the TPR method in her model global units used to teach global issues to students in elementary schools just beginning the study of a foreign language. She says that "the teacher's use of the language and the students' comprehension of it are maximized through TPR and Natural Approach methodologies" (132). The teachers participating in the piloting of her global units in 1989 and 1990 demonstrated understanding of the value of global education for FLES students in their teaching, in their written projects, and in comments evaluating global units (Rosenbusch 134).

Other language experts have endorsed the use of food to allow students to experience culture. When food related activities are used as an organizing principle of a lesson or course, authentic materials, unique behaviors, and sensory stimuli can be used to stimulate culture and encourage language practice. Preparing, tasting, and discussing food provide enriching activities which easily gain students attention and enthusiasm. The activities should be situated historically so as to provide the origin, evolution, or significance of items or behaviors. Good sources for this type of information include interviewing native speakers, examining illustrations, or viewing video and film (Abrate 32-33).
Ingrid Padial, foreign language Instructor at the University of Tennessee at Martin, has used many innovative and creative techniques to include the teaching of culture in her experience teaching children foreign languages. For example, she teaches the names of the months and of the days of the week in the target language, the seasons and climates in the countries where the target language is spoken, and the holidays celebrated there (Padial 30). She teaches children about the native fruits, vegetables, and popular meals enjoyed by native speakers of the target language in their respective countries (34-35). She also advocates teaching children about native behavior patterns in the foreign language being taught (such as greetings and behaviors among people who meet each other, how to be polite using the target language at dinner tables and in restaurants, and how to have conversations on the telephone with speakers of the target language) (42-43).

Some experts believe that culture should be taught by first studying local and regional examples of the target culture before progressing to examples from foreign countries. It would be helpful if culture topics were introduced twice in a spiral form: first in a way appropriate to students with limited linguistics abilities and immature social outlooks and later, in a manner with graded degrees of difficulty for students who are more linguistically and socially mature. Cultural activities
should also be presented through communication activities rather than as a series of facts. There is a considerable amount of debate concerning whether cultural lessons should be conducted in the target language or in the native language. Teachers should consider the abilities of their students and if they decide to teach culture in the native language, they should remember to eventually connect the presented information back to the target language (Flewelling 134-36).

In a paper presented at the 1994 Central States Conference, it was recommended that cultural insight be taught through meaningful discourse rather than teaching a foreign language in addition to culture, as has been the more traditional methodology. Students need to develop a highly sophisticated use of language where they can question, affirm, speculate, and understand that words have more meaning than the dictionary gives (Fischer 76).
Pros and Cons of FLRS Methodologies of Today and Yesterday

There are many recommended features and methods of foreign language instruction at the elementary school level, from audiolingualism, to the Natural Approach, to Suggestopedia, to TPR. In this chapter, we will be examining some of the advantages and disadvantages of concepts from earlier times to present day. This chapter will also note why some methods seem to be more successful than others.

First, there is the grammar-translation method. With some variation, this method usually consists of grammar explanation by use of simple sentences, bilingual vocabulary lists, reading selections emphasizing grammar rules and vocabulary lists, and practice exercises to use the grammar and vocabulary. These classes are usually taught in the student's first language and include translation from one language into the other and back again (Krashen, Principles 127).

Next we will examine the audio-lingual method. Here the lessons begin with a dialogue which the student is usually expected to mimic and memorize what he or she hears. The dialogue is usually followed by pattern drills which are sometimes explained to describe what was practiced (Krashen, Principles 129-30). The basic philosophy of this methodology states that language performance consists of a set of habits.
in the use of language structures and patterns. Classroom material consists of new material presented in the form of dialogues which represent real communication, pattern drills to make the structures taught in the dialogues a part of unconscious habit, and guided conversations where the student tries to apply the newly acquired structures (Krashen and Terrell 14).

There were many problems with this method. Because the students were not allowed to see how the sounds were written, they invented their own methods of orthography. Once they were allowed to see the written form of their utterances, transfer of pronunciation errors often occurred. Students also only repeated what they were hearing without truly understanding what they were saying, and therefore, were not communicating (Krashen and Terrell 15). Reading and writing were postponed for at least the first 100 hours of instruction, therefore many students spent at least one year without reading or writing. A 1969 study revealed that there is the strong possibility of correlation among the four language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening). In this study the experimental group, who had reading and writing introduced to them after one day of listening and speaking, showed significant superiority when tested in listening comprehension over the control group, who had no reading and writing for one year (Lipton, Handbook, 107).
The cognitive-code method attempts to help students in all four language skills. Here, the lesson often begins with rule explanation in the student's first language with exercises intended for conscious rule practice. Activities are employed to provide practice in meaningful language situations and may include dialogues, games, role playing, etc. (Krashen, Principles 132-33).

In the direct method, all classroom language is the target language. The aim of this method is for the students to determine, on their own, the rules of the language. Accuracy is important in this method because student errors are corrected with the rule later being explained in the target language (Krashen, Principles 135).

The Natural Approach was developed by Tracy Terrell at the University of California at Irvine for the purpose of teaching languages to university and high school students, but can be adapted for use with elementary school students. Here, the teacher speaks only in the target language with students being allowed to respond in either the first or second language. The goals of this method are mainly "semantic" with the purpose of enabling the student to discuss concepts, carry out tasks, and resolve problems (Krashen, Principles 137-38).

Krashen's Input Hypothesis says that language is acquired through comprehensible input appropriate to the language learner's capability. We find here a clear parallel
with the kind of "care-taker" speech (language modifications used by adults in talking to young children) that one experiences in acquiring their first language. This kind of speech does not attempt to teach language because the learner is silent until ready for language production. This hypothesis is supported by Asher's studies done on the TPR method of second language instruction where a physical movement is used to demonstrate comprehension of commands. It was also discovered that listening to oral commands combined with physical action increased listening achievement and caused a carryover to other second language skills (Met, "Listening Comprehension" 520).

The Input Hypothesis, as developed by Krashen and employed in the Natural Approach, states that language is acquired by understanding input that is a little beyond our current level of competence. This hypothesis assumes that reading and listening comprehension are of primary importance, and that the ability to speak or write fluently will occur naturally after time. This hypothesis allows for a silent period where the language learner does not vocalize or vocalizes very little (Krashen and Terrell 32-37).

The main hypothesis of this theory states that language acquisition occurs only when messages are understood and is based on what we hear and understand. When applying the theory to elementary classes, comprehensible input must be supplied. We obtain comprehensible input when we understand
what we hear or read in another language (Krashen and Terrell 1). The first principle of the Natural Approach states that comprehension must precede production. This means that the instructor always uses the target language, that the focus of the instruction must always be interesting to the student, and that the instructor must always help the student to understand. Another principle of this method is that production must be allowed to emerge in stages which typically consist of response by nonverbal communication, one word, a few words, a sentence, or more complex discourse. This means that the student is not forced to speak before they are ready and the focus of all classroom activities are organized by topic, not grammatical structure (Krashen and Terrell 20-21).

When employing the Natural Approach, the educational goal is to acquire the ability to communicate with native speakers of the language. Students must first learn to comprehend, since the communicative ability is based on acquired knowledge. Speech and writing will emerge as the acquisition process further develops. When students of their own accord are producing speech, their errors are not corrected, so as not to interfere with their learning processes. Most of the classtime will be spent in activities which provide input (Krashen and Terrell 58).

The Suggestopedia method involves small group meetings of several hours length and consists of three parts: review,
presentation of new material, and a final portion consisting of two parts itself, active seance and passive seance. The review is done with traditional conversations, plays, and games. New material is introduced by dialogues, which the teacher reads during active seance while the students engage in deep rhythmic Yoga breathing. The students follow along while the teacher reads the text and hold their breath when the foreign language section is being read and mentally repeat the sections to themselves. In the passive seance section the teacher reads the dialogue while the students meditate and listen to baroque music (Krashen, Principles 142-43).

In the process of developing the Total Physical Response method (TPR) of foreign language teaching where students learn a foreign language by responding physically to the instructor's commands in the foreign language, Asher formulated a first trial learning hypothesis stating that the longer the exposure time required for a task to be learned, the greater the difficulty one will have later in retaining the task. He believes that the optimal conditions for learning is in one-trial on the first exposure to the information to be internalized. Input to the left brain is a slow, multiple exposure process because the left brain "resists" the novel. Input to the right brain is a pattern which is understood usually in one exposure (Asher, Learning Another Language, I: 7-8,13). The traditional left-brain
approaches in foreign language instruction have not been successful in most cases and have caused high-stress learning with short-term retention. Evidence from Asher's 25 years of research shows that brainswitching from the left to the right brain to teach foreign languages is quick learning with low stress and long term retention because using the "language-body" conversation process is how infants acquire their first language (Asher, Brainswitching 260-62).

There are several ways to get the left brain to open the door on the right brain to let the information flow in unimpeded. One way is body movement: the student's body is the best ally for transmitting and receiving messages on the first try. Another is the use of the metaphor: finding and creating appropriate metaphors is, along with dramatic acting, one of the most valuable skills any teacher can acquire. Finally, the TPR instructor should remember to extinguish all critical responses to students because they are so self-critical that additional criticism is counterproductive (Asher, Learning Another Language III: 6-7).

With this kind of right brain instruction, students can immediately read the foreign language in print after a certain amount of language is acquired through "language-body" conversations. Soon students will be able to utter commands to direct the movements of others. These steps show transfer-of-learning from comprehension to reading and from
comprehension to speaking (Asher, *Brainswitching* 254-56).

The reason that children and adults can achieve understanding of a second language through the imperative faster than an infant acquiring its first language is that while the infant's responses are limited to a few primitive behaviors, the student has a vast network of complex behaviors that can be evoked in response to directions uttered in the target language. Therefore, the understanding of language that took the infant thousands of hours to achieve can be condensed into a few hundred hours of training for the student acquiring a second language (Asher, *Learning Another Language II*: 19).

There are many advantages to this kind of instruction. For example, students are able to internalize a foreign language in large segments rather than in a word-by-word method. They show skill at being able to understand immediately any recombination of elements. This skill of comprehending novelty is the essence of fluency. There is a maximum, positive transfer-of-learning which is a critical feature of any language learning strategy (Asher, *Brainswitching* 252-53).

TPR is also a sound method when judged by linguistic standards. Because noises from a speaker's mouth followed by a body movement allow the learner to immediately decipher the meaning of the noise, many levels of language awareness are employed, including phonology, morphology, syntax, and
semantics. The patterning of the target language is
internalized in such a way that the learner is easily able
to reorganize constituents of the language in order to
understand novel sentences (Asher, Learning Another
Language, I: 30).

When using the TPR method, it is important to realize
that students should not be rushed into early vocalization.
Asher demonstrated by various experiments that people
focusing only on comprehension skill using language-body
learning strategies outperformed people attempting to
comprehend and then pronounce the utterance in the target
language (Learning Another Language, I: 35). An individual
will rapidly decipher the language code when the language
causes changes in the student's behavior by entering the
right hemisphere. When talk appears, the student has reached
the point of understanding how the target language works and
what it means. The talk will not be perfect but will
gradually shape itself in the direction of the native
speaker (Asher, Learning Another Language, II: 25).

The TPR method works especially well with young
children. Since TPR is stress-free and fast moving, there is
a keen level of motivation. Since there is no translation,
children think in the target language. Asher suggests that
only a few new vocabulary items be introduced at a time.
These items should be manipulated with commands until they
are well internalized. He also suggests about 30 minutes of
instruction at any one time for kindergarten and elementary school children up to the sixth grade (Asher, Learning Another Language, III: 26,43-44).

There are many ways to incorporate the TPR methodology into the foreign language classroom. Since commands are the primary way that the basic knowledge of a second language is introduced in the TPR approach, the teacher first models for the students the commands addressed to them. The idea is to synchronize the motor behavior of the students with the listening of the command. As students progress in the comprehension of the language code, more complicated commands are presented to the students. After a certain level of mastery is achieved (approximately ten hours of presentation), role reversal takes place and the students address the commands to the teacher or to other students (Garcia I:2).

TPR also teaches grammar. Cabello points out that grammar is involved in the use of the imperative. For example, when using present tense commands, students continue performing the action until the teacher terminates the action or gives another command (44-45). Past tenses can also be taught by commanding a student to perform the task, then pausing and reporting on the action in the past tense and emphasizing the verb associated with the past action (Cabello 95). The instructor can also emphasize the different verbal endings as he or she speaks and then while
the students are performing the action, make them respond using the correct verbal endings (Cabello 69).

Reading and writing are by-products of the TPR approach. After students achieve a substantial amount of comprehension skill through several hours of commands, they are presented with the written version of what they have internalized. Usually the students can understand the written form even though they have never seen the form before. This phenomenon is one example of an instance involving positive transfer-of-learning from comprehension to reading and writing (Garcia I:4).

Ingrid Padial, aforementioned instructor of foreign language at the University of Tennessee at Martin, has many years of experience teaching second languages to all ages. Her book, Spanish Can Be Fun, is designed to teach children in the third, fourth, and fifth grades. She suggests class meetings of three to four times per week, with about 30 minutes of instruction being given at any one time. She believes that early ages are the best time to begin foreign language learning since the "human brain has a plasticity at this time and a specialized capacity for acquiring speech which is lost later in life." She also advocates the teaching of foreign languages in elementary schools because of the large numbers of children capable of being reached (Padial ii-iii).

Padial endorses Asher in his TPR methodology of
language learning, but also uses various other methods in teaching children foreign languages. She believes in Belyayev's idea of "the conscious practical method" which includes listening, reading, speaking, and writing. She endorses his view that language learning should start with oral speech, followed by writing. Her book is filled with instructions on how to include all the following in foreign language education for children: use of cognates, repetition, memorization, TPR with manipulatives to eliminate translation, gestures, voice inflexion, enunciating and intoning clearly, and use of visual, listening, and speaking aids. She also stresses the importance of parental involvement, and includes a section in each of the lessons in her book for their participation (Padial i-iv).

As we have seen from Padial's example, there are many aspects of elementary foreign language teaching that can be successfully incorporated into the modern classroom setting. It is important to keep in mind that no one program or teaching methodological style is going to be best in any certain school system. Teachers and administrators alike must decide on attainable goals and the ways to go about successfully achieving them. We will discuss this topic in greater detail in the following conclusive chapter.
Conclusion

The Future of Elementary School Foreign Language Programs in the United States

Elementary school foreign language programs in the 90s are at an all-time high, however there is some disagreement over the precise numbers of students currently enrolled. Met and Rhodes report that 22 percent of elementary schools in the United States currently offer foreign languages, meaning that approximately one out of every five elementary school students has the opportunity to learn a foreign language (433). J. David Edwards, executive director of the JNCL (Joint National Committee on Language) reports in the 1994 JNCL annual survey, The Impact of Educational Reform: A Survey of State Activities, that about 4.5 percent of the nation's public elementary school students are studying a second language. As of 1994, this survey also indicated that of the 49 states that are in the process of developing content standards for elementary school instruction, 40 have included foreign languages (8). Gladys C. Lipton, however, disagrees somewhat with these figures and believes from her own research that about ten percent of our nation's elementary school students are receiving foreign language instruction (Personal Interview).

Accurate enrollment figures are difficult to obtain as there is really no way to precisely determine the numbers of
students involved in such programs, due to the lack of national standards. The chart on the following page reveals 1990 enrollment figures in U.S. public and private schools. Notice that the percentages of students involved are still relatively low in virtually all states appearing here.

There are many concerns that must be reckoned with if elementary school foreign language instruction is to grow and prosper in the United States. Support for these programs must be gathered and maintained from the professional language community including parents, school administrators, and program coordinators (Met and Rhodes 435).

Specific program types have specific needs that must be addressed in the coming years if success is to be a reality for these programs. For example, expansion of immersion programs should be a priority for foreign language professionals for two reasons. First, immersion students have the highest level of language proficiency when compared to students of any other program type. Immersion is also extremely cost effective because there are usually no additional staffing costs. In a 1986 survey done by Dr. Gladys C. Lipton, less than five percent of the school districts responding to the survey reported having total or partial immersion programs with most schools having various types of sequential FLES or FLEX programs (Lipton, Handbook 8-9). In a national survey done by the Center for Applied Linguistics in 1987, 98 percent of the respondents to the
## 1990 Foreign Language Enrollment Figures in U.S. Public Elementary Schools, Grades K-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>FRENCH</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
<th>ITALIAN</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>LATIN</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>PES</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>410,111</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64,035</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIF.</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8,924</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,833,056</td>
<td>13,619</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105,364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,079,792</td>
<td>107,848</td>
<td>9.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,192</td>
<td>25,192</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAI'I</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>95,625</td>
<td>9,899</td>
<td>10.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>261,044</td>
<td>13,427</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>59,505</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,608</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>447,352</td>
<td>72,216</td>
<td>16.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>117,849</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>848,833</td>
<td>12,677</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINN.</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>427,485</td>
<td>7,217</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISS.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>282,118</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85,330</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>152,398</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. MEXICO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160,210</td>
<td>7,863</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>16,238</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4,219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>59,171</td>
<td>1,363,269</td>
<td>82,151</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. CAROL.</td>
<td>29,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99,543</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>600,573</td>
<td>131,053</td>
<td>21.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>272,685</td>
<td>5,435</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. CAROL.</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,914</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>355,850</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,770</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>1,916,411</td>
<td>19,295</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56,252</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC.</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,889</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>428,826</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>131,880</td>
<td>6,877</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>7,457</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>340,746</td>
<td>54,403</td>
<td>12,935,519</td>
<td>548,389</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obtained from the Center for Applied Linguistics
PES = Public Elementary Schools
FL = Foreign Language
survey had FLES- or FLEX-type programs, with only two percent of the programs being of immersion type (Lipton, Handbook 9). It should be kept in mind, however, that immersion programs do strain the already limited supply of qualified teachers. While one immersion teacher can provide instruction for only 20-50 students, a FLES teacher can help 200-300 students (Met and Rhodes 438). 1995 enrollment figures from the Center for Applied Linguistics for total and partial immersion programs appear on the following page.

There is also a need to expand the number of languages being offered. Spanish and French currently dominate enrollment. Some less commonly taught languages that are more difficult for English speakers to learn should be introduced as early as possible at this most crucial time when learners are more receptive to the challenge of language learning and the ability to master pronunciation is at its greatest. Latin programs should also be increased since they can provide expansion of the knowledge of the classical world and that of the English language through the study of Latin roots, mottos, and other colorful English expressions (Met and Rhodes 439).

The ever-present obstacle of teacher resources must be solved if FLES programs are to remain a part of the American educational system. In our country, few college students preparing to be teachers are highly proficient in a foreign language because too few students begin studying a foreign
## 1995 Total and Partial Immersion Language Programs in U.S. Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Elem. Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 states and 60 Districts 127 Schools

Washington, D.C.

language early enough to become fluent (Met and Rhodes 438). Yet, we cannot find the human resources to teach these potential FLES teachers while they are still in elementary school themselves!

We also need to find a way to get a national priority to train teachers of FLES (Lipton, "A Look Back" 257). There is currently an increase in trained teachers which still does not meet the current anticipated demand for teachers in the next decade. There is also a shortage of teacher trainers with the proper knowledge, skills, and experience needed to train others (Met and Rhodes 437). Teacher preservice and inservice training programs are in great demand. These programs need the combined planning efforts of teachers, specialists, and supervisors. Teacher-preparers should continually renew their knowledge of elementary foreign language teaching (Met and Rhodes 435-36).

It is most obvious that technology will continue to play a critical role in elementary foreign language instruction. For example, video and interactive videodisc have great potential for bringing authentic experiences to the classroom, especially when connecting the learner to real linguistic and cultural atmospheres is a remote possibility. Studies have actually shown that video instruction stimulates comprehension and retention when coupled with textual readings. Distance learning (interactive televised instruction) creates learning
experiences for large numbers of students while addressing the problem of teacher shortage (Met and Rhodes 440). Many schools have enjoyed the enrichment gained from foreign pen-pal exchanges via the Internet, which can be used to increase the amount of authentic communication in the target language. Through involvement in a cultural and societal newsgroup, students can converse with native speakers about current issues relating to the target culture. An apparent development of composition skills and increase in motivation has been observed in students participating in courses using computer network services (Coronelos 528-31). Through use of video, students receive the same information twice--the presented information becomes more meaningful to them, and a great deal of cultural information is retained (Herron 424-25).

Articulation is yet another issue of utmost importance. It is imperative that school systems with elementary programs for foreign language study decide from the very conception of their programs that their students will have the benefit of a well articulated sequence of study enabling them to continue and increase in their language proficiency at the junior high and high school levels. Students of varying levels of fluency should never be placed in classrooms together. Addressing and acting upon these points is the only way that any FLES program will have any lasting benefits for the students.
Many experts recommend that there be more emphasis placed upon certain topics of research and evaluation in the future. For example, the many variables of FLES study should be observed such as, the length, duration, and frequency of the class meetings, the number of contact hours of instruction, and achievement and language learning objectives. Teacher variables should also be taken into account and aspects such as language proficiency, type of training, and native vs. non-native speakers should be debated (Met and Rhodes 441-42). We need more research done on the learning process itself in order to study how well children learn the language in each model type with guidelines for success being determined in each. There is a need for more standards to be set to evaluate the students' progress. In FLES and FLEX programs, evaluation in all four language skills and cultural knowledge must be ongoing with listening checks for comprehension, oral tests for the ability to answer and ask questions, and reading and writing tests. Culture tests are needed to check students' understanding of cross-cultural similarities and differences. Because immersion programs often test the content of the school's curriculum more than evaluating the four language skills and cultural understanding, there is a need for development of special evaluation procedures for these programs (Lipton, Handbook 198).

As the 1994 Central States Conference reported, The U.
S. Department of Education has funded a national standards project for foreign languages. Standards are being developed for grade levels, delivery standards are being drafted for the schools, national teacher certification standards are under way, and content and performance standards have been funded (Phillips and Draper 2-3).

If all states had some sort of mandated program, our country would be on its way to being better prepared to face the worldwide linguistic challenges of the future. In recent years, the only states with mandated programs were Arizona, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and North Carolina, with priorities for mandates being set in Texas, Hawaii, New York, and other states (Lipton, Handbook 3). There are currently several national organizations with special interests in promoting and improving the progress of FLES programs on a national scale, such as ACTFL (American Council on Teaching Foreign Languages), NNELL (National Network for Early Language Learning), and ALL (Advocates for Language Learning), but there is a need for more state-wide standard setting organizations. For example, although there are many FLES pilot programs in many major Tennessee cities (such as Memphis, Knoxville, Nashville, Oak Ridge, Chattanooga, etc.), there is no one organization keeping track of them all! (Deschenes, Personal Interview).

In conclusion, it is this author's opinion that the future of an American society which is well-adjusted with a
world community depends upon the survival and success of FLES programs. Communication will always be needed as long as there is human interaction on this planet, and there will always be human interaction as long as there are humans to interact with one another! Language is an intrinsic part of what it means to be human and when only one out of every five members of a society can speak a language other than their own, survival in terms of acceptance of cultural diversity becomes precariously threatened. Successful, healthy, and profitable relations with other countries, including competition, hinges upon linguistic ability. While it is this author's view that no one program model or teaching method is "perfect", there are certainly some methods which are astonishingly successful (such as TPR), while other methods have been proven harmful (such as translation). It would therefore be ridiculous for colleges and universities to continue to ignore the incredible need for certification and higher degrees in FLES education. Whatever the way, and whatever the means, it is clear that the earlier one begins learning a foreign language, and the sooner one begins teaching a foreign language--the faster the world will start to become a better place for us all.
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