

□ THE J.E.T.T. FEATURE

J.E.T.T. Reader Profile Survey

The Editors of *J.E.T.T.* want to thank everyone who completed and returned our survey. It is our hope that the results of the survey will enlighten us about who we are, where we have been, and where we are likely to go in the decade of the 1990's and beyond. Because we received an equal number of surveys completed by men and women, we have set up the profile as a comparison. The survey was randomly and anonymously administered. Because board members—although readers—control IALL, we did not include them in our random sample. Instead, we included readers who are served by this publication, not those who serve it. Please note, percentages are rounded and often exceed 100% because in a number of instances more than one of the items profiled was applicable to particular readers.

% of Females	Profile Item Surveyed	% of Males
Highest Degree Earned		
0%	A.A.	0%
10%	B.A.	19%
57%	M.A.	30%
2%	Ed.D.	9%
25%	Ph.D.	32%
6%	Other	11%
*Technical certification, foreign degrees not translatable into the above-mentioned		
Year in which Highest Degree Was Earned		
0%	1940-1950	0%
8%	1951-1961	13%
13%	1962-1972	23%
47%	1973-1983	49%
33%	1984-1989	15%
Highest Degree Earned at:		
24%	Private Institution	23%
76%	Public Institution	77%
Additional Credit Hours Beyond Highest Degree		
45%	Yes	51%
39%	No	45%
6%	Currently Enrolled	2%
10%	Planning to Enroll	2%
Year of Birth		
10%	1922-1932	19%
22%	1933-1943	43%
47%	1944-1954	26%
18%	1955-1965	15%
2%	1966-1976	0%

% of Females	Profile Item Surveyed	% of Males
Racial/Ethnic Background		
0%	American Indian	2%
0%	Asia/Oriental	2%
4%	Black/African American	2%
94%	Caucasian (Not Hispanic)	94%
2%	Hispanic	0%
Primary Employing Agency		
2%	K-12 Public School	6%
2%	K-12 Private School	3%
0%	Junior/Community College	2%
0%	Technical/Vocational School	0%
53%	State University/College	64%
4%	Business/Industry	4%
0%	Federal Government	2%
2%	State Government	0%
39%	Private University/College	21%
Nature of Occupation (Most Applicable)		
10%	General Administration	9%
4%	Services Coordinator	1%
4%	Consultant	2%
5%	Researcher	2%
4%	Teacher (K-12)	6%
4%	Program/Product Developer	2%
0%	Student	0%
53%	Director, Language Lab	57%
26%	Instructor/Professor (Higher Ed)	38%
Areas of Experience (All areas where your expertise is significant enough to help others)		
24%	Apple Computers	28%
31%	Macintosh	36%
47%	IBM-PC family/compatibles	57%
0%	Xerox Computers	4%
4%	Computer Simulations	2%
4%	Desktop Publishing	21%
22%	Media Center Automation	15%
48%	Video/Audio Technologies	60%
33%	Interactive Technologies	36%
12%	Other	19%
*DEC, Digital, IBM Mainframe, & Commodore; Pedagogy		
Salary Range (Annual U.S. \$)		
10%	Less than \$18,000	6%
27%	\$18,000-\$24,000	13%
31%	\$25,000-\$30,000	26%
22%	\$31,000-\$37,000	21%
6%	\$38,000-\$48,000	15%
4%	\$49,000-\$55,000	13%

% of Females	Profile Item Surveyed	% of Males
--------------	-----------------------	------------

Salary Range (Annual U.S. \$) continued

0%	\$56,000-\$65,000	2%
0%	\$66,000-\$80,000	4%
0%	\$81,000-100,000	2%

Position/Title

6%	Supervisor	9%
49%	Director	43%
18%	Coordinator	9%
0%	Department Head	9%
0%	Professor	11%
8%	Associate Professor	15%
4%	Assistant Professor	0%
2%	Instructor	4%
4%	Lecturer	6%
12%	Other	15%

*Manager, Researcher, Consultant

Years of Service in Current Position

8%	Less than 1 year	11%
8%	1 year	9%
16%	2-3 years	6%
18%	3-4 years	6%
8%	4-5 years	6%
14%	5-7 years	6%
6%	7-9 years	6%
12%	9-12 years	13%
0%	12-15 years	2%
8%	More than 15 years	40%

Curriculum Areas

53%	French	34%
43%	German	40%
45%	Spanish	40%
27%	Italian	20%
27%	Russian	21%
12%	Portuguese	9%
35%	ESL	38%
8%	EFL	17%
12%	Education	19%
* 4%	Other	23%*

*Linguistics, Pedagogy, Polish, Dutch, Norwegian, Japanese

Area in which Highest Degree Was Granted

0%	Biological Sciences	0%
2%	Social Sciences	11%
0%	Mathematics	0%
22%	Education	21%

% of Females	Profile Item Surveyed	% of Males
Area in which Highest Degree Was Granted continued		
0%	Technology	2%
4%	Arts	2%
59%	Languages	53%
0%	Engineering	6%
4%	Administration	2%
0%	Linguistics	2%
14%	Other	6%

*Library Science, Philosophy

Association Membership		
90%	IALL	100%
39%	ACTFL	28%
33%	CALICO	45%
2%	ASCD	4%
14%	AATF	6%
6%	AATG	11%
11%	AATSP	10%
27%	TESOL	23%
20%	Other	34%*

*MLA, AECT, regional foreign language associations, CSC, ASID

IALL Membership		
14%	Less than 1 year	19%
20%	1 year	13%
24%	2 years	19%
8%	3 years	6%
14%	3-5 years	6%
8%	5-10 years	9%
4%	10-15 years	27%
2%	Charter	2%
* 4%	Other	0%

*Not a member; plan to join

Responsibilities/Duties of Position		
49%	Teaching	68%
69%	Purchase Equipment	70%
69%	Creating Programs/Projects	64%
57%	Allocation of Resources	55%
59%	Hiring/Firing Personnel	60%
18%	Determine Curricular Policy	21%
55%	Managing Budget	21%
76%	Choosing Equipment	83%
57%	Managing Department/Unit	73%
*14%	Other	0%

*Research, Tutoring, Clerical, Sales Representative

% of Females	Profile Item Surveyed	% of Males
What Disturbs You or Makes You Most Unhappy About Your Job		
45%	Not enough pay	21%
25%	Not enough status	4%
12%	Too many hours	11%
14%	Too much work	15%
2%	Not enough leave	4%
18%	Lack of personnel	34%
37%	Inadequate facilities	36%
0%	Fringe benefits	2%
10%	Supervisor	6%
22%	Other	17%

*Lack of funding, lack of cooperation, lack of appreciation, lack of trained personnel

What Are the Best or Most Gratifying Aspects of Your Job		
4%	Salary	23%
12%	Fringe benefits	26%
8%	Time off	15%
55%	Personnel/Colleagues	53%
61%	Student interaction	49%
49%	Responsibilities	43%
49%	Place of employment	45%
33%	Teaching	49%
20%	Research	23%
* 6%	Other	6%*

*Autonomy, satisfaction, travel

Languages You Speak in Addition to English		
8%	None	9%
57%	French	43%
8%	Italian	9%
29%	German	34%
55%	Spanish	40%
4%	Russian	9%
8%	Portuguese	9%
0%	Arabic	2%
4%	Japanese	6%
16%	Other	19%

*Dutch, Swedish, Tigrinya, Korean, Chinese, Afrikaans, Serbo-Croatian, Finnish, Latvian, Polish

Your Present Location		
29%	Northeastern U.S.	25%
12%	Southeastern U.S.	10%
2%	Northwestern U.S.	4%
8%	Southwestern U.S.	10%
33%	Midwestern U.S.	17%
8%	Western U.S.	13%
6%	Canada	4%
0%	Mexico	0%
2%	Overseas	17%

% of Females	Profile Item Surveyed	% of Males
Size of Community Where You Work		
0%	800 or fewer people	2%
4%	1000-1500	2%
8%	1500-5000	2%
0%	5000-10,000	6%
14%	10,000-20,000	2%
20%	20,000-50,000	13%
16%	50,000-100,000	17%
16%	100,000-500,000	25%
10%	500,000-1,000,000	25%
10%	Over 1 Million	6%

Foreign Countries You Have Visited		
6%	None	6%
90%	European	77%
12%	South American	23%
6%	Pacific Rim	23%
12%	Central American	23%
14%	African	15%
8%	Middle Eastern	13%
8%	Far Eastern	26%
2%	Australia	8%
24%	Other	23%

*New Zealand, Soviet Union, Scandanavia, Mexico, Canada

Profile Statement	Agreement	
	% of Females	% of Males
There really hasn't been true integration of technology across the educational environment; we've simply attached or added technology to our classroom lessons.	53%	54%
Integrating technology into lesson plans means more work for the teacher not less; technology in the classroom is just something else in addition to everything else.	24%	31%
There are no rewards for integrating technology into the subject matter in terms of tenure, promotion, or salary; why should we do more work if there are no rewards for doing so.	12%	19%
The quality of education has little if anything to do with whether technology is used or not; using technology makes virtually no difference in the quality of teaching or learning.	8%	6%
The most important element in education is the teacher; good teachers use technology well, and poor teachers use it poorly.	57%	67%

Profile Statement	Agreement	
	% of Females	% of Males
The use of technology in education and elsewhere is driven by the motivation to make money; it has little if anything to do with improving the quality of teaching and learning—take a look at the courseware if you don't believe it.	2%	4%
Technology per se does not motivate students to learn as vendors would like us to believe; motivation is within the student—something he or she brings to the classrooms.	16%	27%
Those of us in education who are suffering from "techno-lust" rarely are as obsessive about the lust of teaching.	2%	2%
Technology can help learners learn more quickly, provided it is properly integrated; passive viewing—whether in large groups, small groups, or individual— is not interactive learning.	80%	79%
I really don't have much "say" about what goes on; basically, I just see to it that the place keeps functioning.	22%	8%
I determine policy in my area: what I say "goes."	18%	25%
I have the best situation in the world; my expertise is valued by my colleagues and taken into consideration when policies are made and changed.	43%	42%
Working with technology has its drawbacks; people tend to think of you as an extension of the "machine."	24%	17%
As a teacher, I don't feel that technology adds anything to teaching and learning; as a matter of fact, I think it subtracts (or limits) the most important aspect from teaching, namely, the human element.	0%	2%
Since research does not prove that technology makes any difference in learning, I am for eliminating it from the classroom.	0%	0%
I am a teacher first and an administrator of a learning center secondly; I am of the opinion that administrators of learning centers should also have a background in education, preferably being or having been classroom teachers.	45%	40%
As a teacher, I find it difficult to communicate with the people at the learning center; they have all the technological answers but don't understand my pedagogical questions.	0%	0%

Profile Statement	Agreement	
	% of Females	% of Males
As a classroom teacher of foreign languages, I feel the interaction between my students and me in the target language is sufficient to help them learn; technology just gets in the way of that interaction.	0%	0%
The primary function of an organization like IALL should be to keep its members informed about what's happening in learning laboratories, technology, and education.	88%	85%
IALL claims to be international in scope. Yet, the IALL conference at MIT seemed very national to me; if the "I" in IALL stands for "international," we should make greater effort to include our international members.	35%	27%
As a teacher, I find learning laboratory directors and administrators at conferences (both national and international) to be overly busy and to have a tendency to use jargon and technical terms. Teachers may not have the latest technology buzzwords at their beck and call, but some of us are interested in using technology in our teaching and would appreciate help doing so.	4%	17%
As a new learning lab director, when I joined IALL, it would have been nice if IALL had given me (and all new lab directors) a free lab kit.	35%	13%
As the only professional organization specifically concerned with learning laboratories, language labs, and the integration of technology, IALL should sponsor national and regional seminars and workshops throughout the year in order to show teachers how to effectively integrate technology into the classroom.	76%	50%