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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Should foreign language be an integral part of instruction in a school system?

If the above question canot be answered in the affirmative, there is no basis for this study. If the answer is not negative but positive in relation to the beneficial results to be obtained from the study of foreign languages, then it is incumbent upon the school administrators to insure that the greatest benefit be derived in the limited time allotted to this important discipline.

For those living in the United States, almost every facet of daily life is permeated by forejgn cultures and foreign languages, particularly since the advent of television and economical air travel. It is also evident from data provided by the United States Department of Labor that the number of vocational offerings requiring foreign languages has greatly increased in the past fifteen years. In a publication sponsored by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Develoment, an affiliate of the National Education Association (NEA), the following statement was made regarding foreign language study and vocational opportunjeties:

Career opportunities including employment abroad will lead to increased enrollments in foreign
languages. Possibilities for such employment and the need for more intercultural understanding underline.. 1 the importance of stressing communication skills . . .

In The Teaching of Modern Languages, Theodore Anderson quotes William R. Parker, who has exemined the place of foreign languages in the United States as it pertains to international tension. Parker contends that:

- . foreign Janguage study speeds and increases understanding when the desire to understand is there-speeds and increases sympathy when the germ is present - . foreign language study may, and often does, ereate the desire to understand. . . It may, and often does, prevent misunderstanding . . . foreign language.study makes possible, through better communication, the discovery of good will.

While the importance of foreign language study has been recognized by national leaders in government and industry and by educators, a tremendous problem is to be faced. The public schools are, for the most part, not producing students who have attained a mastery in one or more foreign languages.

Dr. James B. Conant was one of the first educators to draw attention to the deficiencies in foreign language study in the public school system.

The main purpose of studying a foreign language is to obtain something approaching a mastery of that language, and by mastery is surely meant the ability
$l_{\text {Edward Allen, Leona Glenn, Frank Otto, The Changing }}$ Curriculum, Modern Foreign Languages (NEA; Washington, D.C., 1968, p. 47 .
${ }^{2}$ Theodore Anderson (Editor), The Teaching of Modern Languages (UNESCO: Amsterdam, Holland, 1958), p. 12.
to read the literature published in the language and in the case of a modern language, to converse with considerable fluency and acguraey with an inhabitant of the country in question. ${ }^{3}$

He also went on to state that a two-year study of a foreign language, as it is taught in the publie schools, is not sufficient time to achieve any degree of mastery.

I have met no teachers of foreign language who felt that anything approaching mastery could be obtained by the study of a foreign language for only two years in high school. . . Four years of study . . . will yield dividends for those capable of handing foreign language.

William R. Parker sums up the inadequacy of forejgn language instruction in the United States with the statement that ". . . never have so many Americans encountered so much foreign speech with so little equipment for communication and so much depending upon communication. . ."5

The California State Department of Education has conducted a series of research projects in the field of foreign language. The most recent survey, which was conducted in 1965, revealed the following:

3James B. Conant, The American High Schocl Today (New York: Mcgraw Hill, Inc., 1959), p. 69.

4
Ibid.
${ }^{5}$ William Riley Parker, The National Interest and Foreign Languages (Third edition; Washington, D.C.: Department of State Publications. International Organization and Conference Series 26, 1962), p. 107.

In California schools about seventy per cent (of the students) end their enrollment in a foreign language within two years. Ninety per cent of the foreign language students who begin their study in the ninth grade drop out by the twelfth grade. ${ }^{\circ}$

Conant makes the following administrative
recommendetion:
The school board should be ready to offer a third and fourth year of a foreign language, no matter how few studeats enroll. phe guidance officers should urge the completion of a four-year sequence of one foreign language if the student demonstrates ability in handing foreign languages.?

William R. Parker makes a plea for foreign language instruction as an aid to international well-bejng in the following manner:

Given an atmosphere of good will, an jndividual traveling abroad can, in a sense, "get by" or "get a.long" With English, or, for that matter with sign language . . . But given an atmosphere of'global tension, which is the atmosphere in which we live today, it would seem that no nation, particularly not a nation with fxjghtening power and enviable wealth, can long "get by" without even trying to talk the other fellows language. One language makes a wall; it takes two to make a gate. That is why Americans praying for peace and seeking an increase in international understanding, now often discusg foreign language study as a means to these ends.

There appears to exist a widespread agreement that the foreign language offerings in the public school system

GJohn P. Dusel, "Why the Foreign Language Dropouts?" Foreign Language Newsletter, Vol. XIV, No. 57, p. 5.

7 Conant, loc.ejt.
8Parker, op. cit., p. 103.
should extend to at least a fourth year of study for each language. Yet, it has been found that in California 90 per cent of the students elect not to continue their study of a foreign language through the fourth year of instruction. The factors that contribute to this high attrition rate must.be questioned. Assuming that the foundation for instruction exists in the administrative policies and practices of the local school district, this researcher believed that an investigation of policies and practices relating to the foreign language program ought to be made. It is recognized that the answers to the high attrition rate in foreign language enrollment cannot be found easily. Adminjstration is perhaps only one facet of this complex problem, but it is anticipated that this study will resuit in some fruitful observations and recomnendatjons.

## I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The primary purpose of this study is to investigate administrative policies and practices which appear to be most effective in maintaining high pupil retention in foreign language programs. More narrowly, to accomplish the primary and secondary purposes it will be necessary to establish criteria with the use of survey instruments by which administrative practices of foreign language instruction may be evaluated.

Purposes. The purposes to be accomplished will include but not be limited to the following:

1. Establish administrative criteria that relate to high pupil retention in foreign language instructional programs.
2. Ascertain those administrative variables that adversely affect retention in foreign language study.
3. Develop means of discovering those facets of administration which lead to high pupil retention in foreign language instruction.
4. Prepare a list of criteria which may be used as a model for leadership in foreign language administration.
5. Derive conclusions based on findings of this study which may be the foundation for possible administrative decisions.
6. Develop a list of recommendations which will be based on the findings of this study and which may be utilized by personnel who are directly involved in administrative decisions affecting foreign language instruction.
7. Develop an instrument that can be used by administrative personnel in the evaluation of variables affecting foreign language instructional programs.

Importance of the study. The advance in technology, as exemplified by the orbiting of Sputnik by the Soviet Unjon in 1957, forced the educational community of the United States to reevaluate the entire educational system. Attention became focused upon the areas of mathematics, science, and forejgn language.

In 1958 the National Defense Efucation Act (hereafter referred to as NDEA) provided economic and administrative support for updating the teaching of foreign languages in our American schools. Much money was spent by schools for language laboratories, materials, and additional personnel to implement an extended foreign Janguage instructional program.

Instructional objectives have changed over the past ten years brought about in part by the federal impetus to increase foreign language proficiency as exemplified by the INEA. The introduction of the audio-lingual method of instruction stressing verbal communication in addition to reading and writing has called for a mastery of skills requiring a longer sequence of study. The change in instructional objectives to accomplish the requirements of the audio-lingual method of instruction necessitates extending this sequence of foreign language study to four or more years.

The educational significance of the above changes indicates that the administrative policies and practices
relating to foreign languge program play a major role in providing an instructional program that will improve the low enrollment retention at the advanced levels.

The NEA publication, The Changing Curriculum--
Modern Foreign Languages, includes a discussion of the importance of the role of the aministrator:

Foreign language educators and teachers realize that planning and implementing a successful foreign language program depend more upon the degree and consistency of top level administrative support than upon any other single factor. 9

The above statement is concerned with a successful foreign language program and, to this researcher, a successful program implies proficiency. Frank M. Grittner supports this theory by saying:

A rather high level of language proficjency is deemed necessary if foreign language study is to have significant educational value according to contemporary standards. 10

If the California public schools are losing over 90 per cent of their language students before four years of continuous study is completed, then it is necessary to investigate the administrative reasons for the attrition and to provide school districts with methods for eveluating their present administrative policies and practices in

9 Edward Allen, Leona Glenn, Frank Otto, op. cit., p. 41.
${ }^{10}$ Frank M. Grittner, Teaching Foreign Language (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), p. 77.
foreign language study.
It will also be necessary to investigate the results of administrative policy as it applies to the classroon teaching methods in order to ascertain if there is any correlation between high retention in foreign language classes, administrative policy, and clessroom technology.

Limitations. This study was concerned only with the administrative policies and their effect on the foreign language programs; it omits the significance of other interacting variables, such as detailed qualifications of the instructional personnel and the amount of commanity support for the program.

Otner limitations concern the district personal who answered the study questionnaires and who may not have been objective in providing answers. Because of these limitations, there was no feasible means within the scope of this study to determine the validity of the responses. Some of the survey questions called for an interpretation on the part of the interviewee, such as an assessment of the quality of the program and personnel.

The findings and conclusions of this study cannot be validly transferred to districts outside of the twentytwo that were selected for investigation. However, officials in other school districts will be able to investigate their own administrative structure with the guidelines herein provided.

## II. RESEARCH DESIGN

An investigation of the literature and of current research related to the problem and the need expressed by the great amount of foreign language enrollment attrition, attested to by California State Department of Faucation survey results, provided the basis for the development of the survey questionnaire instruments. These instruments were designed to elicit information from those three administrative positions which had a direct influence on the implementation of policy and procedure of the foreign language instruction program. The district administrator was selected because of his proximity to the policy-making Board of Education and the manner in which he interpreted and implemented the Board's policy. The policy established by the Board and implemented by the district administrator would appear to be a reflection of the administrative desires of that particular district.

The foreign language coordinator is responsible for the implementation of district procedure to carry out the intent of the policy-making echelon as it pertains to foreign language instruction. If the district administrative level desires in foreign language were expressed either overtly or covertly, then the procedure to implement those desires would appear to be incumbent upon the foreign language coordinator. The manner of procedural
implementation was sought by the questionnaire instrument. The head counselor is charged with advising and counseling students in course-content selection. It is he who would appear to be the person responsible for the guidelines for student selection or non-selection of foreign language. The influence expected by this sdvising portion of the school district administrative hierarchy would appear to be highly responsible for final implementation of school district foreign language instructional policy. To elicit school district policy interpretation, to ascertain school district administrative procedural methods, and to discover means of administrative implementation of interpretation and procedure was the design to which this research was conducted in the hope of providing some assistance to the increase in enrollment retention in the field of forejgn lariguage instruction. The comparative data to be obtained from those districts with a high enrollment retention and those districts with a low enrollment retention were sought as the basic means of analyses, conclusions, and recommendations. A criteria instrument was constructed for use as an evaluation device of district-wide programs.

## III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

In this study certain terms have been used within the meaning given below.

Dropouts. Denotes those stidents who, once having started the study of a foreign language, failed to continue in sequence the entire progression as offered within the school system.

High retention district. A unified school district with a foreign language continuous enroliment retention for four years in excess of 10 per cent of beginning ninth grade students.

Low retention district. A unified school district with a foreign language continuous enrollment retention for four years with less than 10 per cent of beginning ninth grade students.

Mortality, educational. 11 The extent to which students failed to complete four years of foreign language study once it has been initiated in the ninth grade.

Elementary school. Kindergarten and grades one through eight, inclusive.

Secondary school. Grades nine through twelve, inclusive.
${ }^{11}$ Carter V. Good (ed.), Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), p. 353.

Continuity. "Experience free of dead endings or blocks that remove potential of later enriching experience."l2 The unbroken line of successive foreign language instruction experjence.

Articulation. The continuous and sequential progress of pupils as well as the interlocking and interrelation of successive levels of foreign language instruction from elementary through secondary schools.

FLES. Abbreviation for "Foreign Language in the Elementary Schoo1," and pronounced as a word in foreign language publications.

Administretor. Denotes those school personnel involved wjoth the interpretation of school poljcy. Refers to either the superintendent or assistant superintendent of the school district.

Foreign language coordinator. Designates the person responsible for the administration of the foreign language program and for the method of operation of the foreign language instruction program within the district. This person is also responsible for interpretation of administrative decisions affecting foreign Janguage instruction.
${ }^{12}$ Ibid., p. 127 .

Head counselor. The person responsible for the foreign language counseling which is given to students preparing for or engaged in foreign language programs. The head counselor is xesponsible for interpretation of district level policy on continuity and need for foreign language instruction.

Audio-lingual. Also known as the audio-oral and aural-oral method of instruction and is the term applied to the hearing-speaking sequence of foreign language instruction and learning.

Traditional. Refers to those methods of foreign language instruction in which greater emphasis is placed on reading, writing, and translation of language in contrast to the audio-lingual method.

Pattern practice. An oral drill wherein students are required to make changes in person, number, and tense and in which the teacher must be the model for imitation.
IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE DISSERTATION

Chapter II discusses the literature and research directly related to the problem in this study. It deals primarily with present administrative practices affecting foreign language instruction in general and with those methods and procedures specifically connected to the
schools in the State of California. Foreign language administrative methods rather than a chronological bibliography of foreign language publications are emphasized in this chapter.

Chapter III discusses the procedures utilized in this investigation which include the desjgn, distribution, and analysis of the survey instruments used for data collection.

In Chapter IV the results of the data analysis are presented.

Chapter $V$ is devoted to the interpretation of the findings with conclusions drawn and recommendations ofrered.

A bibliography and appendix complete the study.

## CHAPTIER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED IITERATURE

This chapter will be devoted to selected sections of books, articles, periodicals and dissertations which are concerned with administration of foreign language instruction in general and the administrative reasons for foreign language enrollment retention in particuiar.

Special interest will focus on the statistical dropout rate in California public high schools, continuity of foreign language classes, need for continusty of study and articulation of foreign language classes, and reasons why foreign language courses should be a required part of the curriculum rather than elective.

The statistical record of the foreign language dropout rate in California, "Foreign Language Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1968," Appendix $\mathbb{N}$, which is gathered by the California state Department of Education each year, indicates that less than 10 per cent of the beginning students complete a four-year sequence of foreign language study of one language at the high school level. The dropout rate continues in apite of the fact that many schools have a regularly scheduled four-year sequence of foreign language study in one language from the ninth through the twelfth year.

The lack of continuity in foreign language study and the administrative decisions influencing the continuity of study are the basic reasons for this investigation and to which the review of research is directed.

Robert Lado puts emphasjs on the study of foreign language when he states:

We are witnessing in our time the greatest changes in the history of language learning---changes that reach into every aspect of this time honored field of study. Formerly known by a few as a work of education, languages are now studied by people from all walks of life. More languages are studied than ever before, and methods of learning them are changing radically. ${ }^{13}$

Nelson Brooks implies that forejog language
instruction should not be a "decodjng" process where ". . . language symbols are decoded from one system to another and comprenension, meaning and value are all in terms of the student's first language. . ."14 He does not state that decoding does not have a place but goes on to opine that a student in advanced studies may find that he must get certain facts from books, periodicals, and articles that may be found only in a foreign language, and he may not have the time to learn that language. Under these conditions, the decoding process appears legitimate, efficient, and desirable.

13Robert Lado, Language Teaching (New York: McGrawHill, Inc., 1964), p. 3 .

14Nelson Brooks, Language and Language Learning-Theory and Practice (Second edition; New York: HarcourtBrace and World, Inc., 1964), p. 106.

There is a need to establish objectives in language learning. The objectives then become the working parts of the goal set by the student. If the study of a foreign language is a part of a need or a means of reaching an objective of advanced study where translation is a necessity, the decoding process appears to be the correct choice. Nelson Brooks includes the following statement concerning decoding and objectives:

There should be no illusions about the nature and results of such learning. Above all, there should be no confusion between this type of course and one that presumes to lead the student along the linguistic paths of a new language. Rather there must be the sharpest distinction between a course whose avowed objective is decoding and one whose goal is the learning of a new language. 15

Neison Brooks maintajns that:

- . . foreign language learning is a threefold process, an interplay between hearer, speaker, and situation . . . making only slight use of the mother tongue and . . . resolutely avoidjng the traditjonal analysis of grammar as well as translation from the foreign language into English . . . ${ }^{10}$

Although Brooks stated that there was a place for
"decoding," ir the student needed it to continue his
advanced study, he later says:
To see language only in its utilitarian function, to consider it only as a tool, a response to a need or a means to an end, is a mistake. Language is rather a product of the incessant symbolization process with which the mind occupies itself, whether for some practical purpose or not. ${ }^{17}$

15Ibid., p. 107. $16_{\text {Ibid. }}$ p. 118.
17Tbid., p. 227.
C. C. Fries does not decry the use of the utilitarian
function of language when he outlines his reasons for the
necessity of speaking a foreign language:
No matter if the final result desired is only to read the foreign language the mastery of the fundamentals of the language--the structure of the sound system with a limited vocabulary--must be through speech. The speech is the language. The written record is but a secondary representation of the language. To "master" a language is not necessarily to read i.t, but jit is extremely doubtfol whether one can really read the language without first mastering it orally. Unless one has mastered the fundamentals of the new language as a language--that is, as a set of habits for oral production and reception--the process of reading is a process of seeking word equivalents in his own native language. "Translation" on an exceedingly low level is all that such "reading" really amounts to. 18

The size of a school appears to be one of the variables affecting foreign language as an elective.

Grace J. Wright and Edith $S$. Greer in a study conducted under the auspices of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare found that:

> foreign language, business education, agriculture, and vocational education are usually electives and consequently their appearance. is in terms of small percentages--5 per cent or less . which was offered for ninth gradeign language fourths of the large junior and junior-senior high schools and less than half of the small schools. Pupils attending a small junior-senior high school

[^0]were more frequently able to elect a foreign language than were pupils attending a small junior high school. 19

Again, in an NEA Research Bulletin a report on "Subjects in Small High Schools" offered the idea that although 71 per cent of the schools studied offered a course in foreign language jt was discovered that:
. . . the availability of this course depended on the size of the school-foreign languages were offered in only 54 per cent of the smallest schools but in 85 per cent of the largest schools . . . a course in a foreign language was more often available in accredited than in non-accredited small high schools--four-fifths of the accredited and two-thirds of the non-accredited high schools offered a foreign language. 20

Continuity and articulation. In order that progress
in a productive manner be accomplished, it is necessary that there be continuity in course sequerse. Continuity cannot be accomplished without an articulated program with the progression that follows a pattern from incipiency to the termination of the foreign language offered to the students. In this study, the term "course" is used to

19Grace J. Wright and Edith S. Grier, The Junior High School: A Survey of Grades 7-8-9 in Junior and JuniorSenior High Schools, U.S.Jepartment of Health, Education and Welfare, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1963, p. 58.
$20_{\text {National }}$ Education Association Research Bulletin, "Subjects in Small High Schools," Vol. 40, May 1962 (Washington, D C.: Educational Press Association of America), p. 56.
denote that the foreign language discipline is divided into a sequence of one-year periods of instruction within a four-year continuum.

Fmilio Guerra, in writing about the problems of schools in relation to the population explosion, guidance, and foreign language, has this to say of continuity and articulation:

Among these problems, the one offerjng the greatest challenge, and also the greatest frustration, has been that of articulation. In the language of the educationist, articulatjon means the adjustment of relationships between the elementary and the junior high schools . . . junior high schools and the senior high schools . . . between any two schools and among the grades and subjects of those units, which will. permit pupils to make the greatest progress pgssible along a path of uninterrupted continuity. . .

Birkmaier appears to support the above when she
says:
Once committed to a basic sequence or system, a teacher does not have the right to change in the middle of a course. Today every student can expect a carefully articulated progression in the process in which he learns the language of his choice. 2 .

[^1]Again, Emma M. Berkmaier stresses the need for uniformity in procedure when she states ". . . the problem of articulation when longer sequences of study are undertaken is a crucial one." 23 others writing on the topic, such as Allen, Glenn, and Otto, stress contiruity when they refer to the break in language instruction as ". . . comparable to studying a musical instrument for four months and then abandoning it until eight months later. "24

The adminjstration of a foreign language program is usually initiated by high level administrators of the school district. The articulation and continuity plus ${ }^{3 \prime}$. . planning and implementing a successful foreign language program depend more upon a degree and consistency of top level administrative support than upon any other single factor."25

The necessity for articulated teaching is stated clearly by Allen, Glenn, and Otto when they emphasjzed the need for uniformity in teaching and techniques or
${ }^{23}$ Ibid., p. 30.
24Allen, Glenn, and Otto, op. cit., p. 337. 25 Ibid., p. 41.
facing the fact that ". . . only confusion can resuit when students are required to change from an audio-lingual to a traditional approach. 126

In this connection, the chief concerns with regard to continuity are that the skills of hearing and speaking must not be permitted at any point to become dormant, that the learner be given full credit for accomplishment in these skills (traditional measurement in terms of grammar and translation are wholly inadequate for this), and that these acquired skills be fully integrated with those of reading, writing, and structure control that will of course be encountered as learning proceeds. 27

The danger inherent in lack of continuity is stressed by Meriam Goldstein as she gives emphasis to the idea that learning only to perfect speech has drawbacks:

The structural linguists, with their emphasis on the primacy of speech, on the direct approach to learning a language by speaking it, have opened the door. If the child has a chance to speak the language, he can become a fluent conversationalist. Unfortunately, if he stops there he is just as handicapped as the one who can read a printed page byt cannot speak or follow a talk on radio or television. 28

26 Ibid. $\quad 27_{\text {Brooks }}$ op. cit., p. 117-118.
28Meriam B. Goldstein, The Teaching of Language in Our Schools, (New Y rk: The MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 31 .

The public might well be made cognizant of the need for foreign language planning. This may be done by use of such pamphlets as the one published by the National Education Association Department of Foreign Languages. 29 Use of such material at Parent-Teacher Association meeting's will help explain the nature of the forejgn language program and its objectives.

Foreign language teachers and guidance counselors should have access to such publications as the one by Ilo Remer which provides guidelines to selection and continuity in forei.gn language. 30

Articulation is such an important factor that it wes brought to the attention of educators by recommended policy statements of the California Liaison Committee on Foreign Ianguage wherein they stated that:
. . . California schools and colleges must adopt common objectives in the teaching and learning of foreign language and that there must be acceptance of a curricular continuum which would serve as the basic guideline for language instruction from the earliest fevel of study through the teacher-training program. 31

29National Education Association, "Should My Child Study a Foreign Language," Washington, D. C.

30Ilo Remer, "A Handbook for Guiding Students in Modern Foreign Language," Bulletin EO 27018, No. 26 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1963).
${ }^{31}$ John P. Dusel (ed.), What Next in Foreign
Language? Proceedings of the Santa Barbara Conference, San Diego, Foreign Language Council of San Diego, 1968, p. 51.

Finocchiaro relies on structure to regulate the foreign language program. Structure, according to Finochiaro, will be established by situation, frequency of use, demonstrability, simplicity, and contrast with Fnglish. She believes:

- . a careful plan will make provision for teaching all the important structures at some logical point in the four-year program. I.t will provide for continuity and the reintroduction of situation, vocabulary, and grammar at each succeeding level of learning.

It will take into account the language program at the secondary school to which the children will probably be admitted. If the children will enter an advanced level at the secondary school, it is imperative that teachers and administrators at both levels be aware of each other's programs. 3 '

Administration. In a study wherein comparisons are used for control and experimentation and submitted to statistical methods of analysis, it should be remembered that this nation is composed of fifty states, each with its own right of control over education. Within the state there is control at the county level with its own board of education, and at the district level through the district board of educatior. Administration, then, would appear to be of prime concern with regard to the direction of the foreign language program according to the sources hereafter quoted.

32 Mary Finocchiaro, Teaching Children Foreign Languages (New York: McGraw-Hilil, Inc., 1964), p. 57.

In an article written by Eugene Youngert entitled "What Makes a School Good?"33 the question raised by the title is answered jn part by the following testing of three factors considered significant:

1. Consistently good schools tend to be in communities that know the value of good education, that want good education positively, and that are willing to pay for good education whether or not they are well off financially . . .
2. Communities that have consistently had good schools have consistently elected able citizens to their boards of education . . .
3. Communities that have consistently good school. systems have consistently provided able executive and administrative leadership of their schools . . . 34

Using Youngert's third criterion of a "good school" it would appear that the administrator is the leader and decision-maker and that any extrapolation of foreign language mortality indicates that it is the result of poor executive and administrator leadership. This assumption would be erroneous, according to the following authors who believe that educational success is a combined effort toward common goals.

For instance, Donald D. Walsh states ". . . administrators at all educational levels throughout a single geographical area should agree on which foreign language

33Eugene Youngert, "What Makes a School Good?", The AtJantic, October 1964, (Boston, Massachusetts: The Atlantic Monthly Company) p. 72-73.

34
Ibj.
should be offered at each level . . ."35
Walsh goes on to say that this agreement is necessary in order that one junior high school will not ". . . institute instruction in a neglected language that the senior high school wishes to neglect."36 Although the above quote deals with articulation, walsh indicates there must be agreement among the various administrators in oxder that articulation and continuity exist. The chief administrator could not be blamed entirely if a subordinate chose to disregard the other schools in the system and instead inj.tiated his own method of foreign language instruction.

In his Envestigation of articulation of foreign
language programs, Parrot found that administrative support was composed of three groups: the opposed, the disinterested and disheartened, and the proponents. His conclusion was ". . . the efficacy of a foreign language program was in direct proportion to the administrative support it received." 37

35 Joseph Michel, Foreign Language Teaching--An Anthology (New York: MacMillan Company, 1967), p. 349.

36 Ibid.
37Arthur Granville Parrott, "Criteria for Evaluating Foreign Language Program Articulation Between Elementary and Secondary Levels" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1967) p. 151.

The leadership of administrators must be a coordinated effort instead of regulation, Grieder, et. al, states that "the leadership function includes (1) planning; (2) research; (3) advice and consultation; (4) coordination; and (5) public relations. 138

It is coordination that is important within administrative positions. The interpretation of program policy that the foreign language coordinator receives from the district admjnistrator may be reinterpreted by the head counselor who will in turn institute a foreign language advisory service that may or may not be in keeping with the achievement goal as established in the policy set by the local bcard of education. This point is subsequently elaborated.

Grieder states:
. . . even today some superintendents do not think of curriculum as an appropriate subject in school administration and they consider supervision and improvement of instruction as lying outside their sphere. . . 39

38Calvin Grieder, Truman M. Pierce, William E. Rosenstengel, Public School Administration (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961), p. 52.

39 Ibid., p. 190.

The superintendent needs help and many ". : . prefer employing curriculum and instructional officers and retaining themselves . . . other aspects of administration. "40

While the preceding statements by Grieder may explain some lack of administrative continuity, it should be stressed that coordination and policy interpretation should be understood by all employed personnel. There should not be a lack of coordination because of democratic leadership.

A statement from the school principal level which may apply in all areas of administration is that ". . . abdication of responsibility or laissez-faire leadership results in anarchy or chaos. " 41

According to Kenneth R. Brown, Instructional Services Executive of the California Teachers Association, Burlingame, California, in discussing Senate Bill. 1 (1968 Legislative Session), and quoting Senator Miller: ". . . the state doesn't have them (local boards) strait-jacketed any more;" therefore, it would appear that boards of education have some prerogative relative to change and some leeway in determining curricular continuity.
${ }^{40}$ Ibid.
${ }^{41}$ Paul B. Jacobson, William C. Rines, James D. Logsden, The Fffective School Principal (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-lall, Inc., 1963), p. 88.

He also noted that ". . . district boards are not required to introduce curriculum change . . . but that now the claim cannot be made that state curriculum law prevents change. 142

At the district level, there is usually an administrative position which directs the implementation of all pupil personnel activities. The person in that position is an administrator of guidance, he is the "head counselor" and as such is responsible for the interpretation of district policy relating to the guidance field.

Guidance facilities in the school setting can be designed for jndividual attention or as a blanket to cover all counseling situations. In actuality the guidance program is the result of district policy and its purpose will be regulated by the administrative personnel in charge. The guidance program should reflect the policy of the district and perform its function on that basis. Guidance is ". . . vitally related to every aspect of the school--the curriculum, the methods of instruction, disciplinary procedures . . . and community relations. 143 As

42 Kenneth R. Brown, "A New Challenge in Curriculum Development," CTA Journal, October 1968, p. 42.

43 Arthur E. Traxler, Techniques of Guidance (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945), $\frac{1}{3}$.
counselors are part of instructional methods, they are vitally concerned with placement of foreign language students and should work closely with foreign language coordinators and other administrative personnel.

The chief or head counselor is in an administrative position, and his interpretation of district policy will affect placement articulation, continuity, and coordination of the foreign language program within the district.

The position of the foreign language coordinator is also an administrative position which requires interpre-tation of district policy. The coordinator of foreign languages should be responsible for coordinating the programs throughout the district to obtain the maximum of articulation and continuity on a district-wide basis. It is up to the coordinator to insure that language, instruction, program, and policy are coordinated.

The foreign language coordinator is an administrator who should have a background that will enable him to provide assistance when needed. Emilio L. Guerra states:

Forejgn language instruction is a highly specialized field, requiring the kind of supervision that supervisors without a forejgn language teaching background, are unable to give. Every school should be able to avail itself of adequate on-the-spot supervispry assistance for its foreign language program. 44

$$
{ }^{44} \text { Guerra, op cit., p. } 511 .
$$

The foreign language coordinator is faced with many problems of administration including staffing. His problems are magnified by the shortage of qualif'ied personnel. The shortage of teaching personnel is one category problem which appears to face most foreign language administrators. One way to get around this, according to Roman C. Pucinski, is to utilize trained teachers from other lands. He goes on to say, "I doubt that we can train enough teachers to staff a.11 the various classes demanded by our society in coming years. ${ }^{145}$

California has, by legislative action (Assembly Bil.1 206, 1968 Session) instituted a program which follows the advice of Pucinski. This program, called the Sojourn Teacher Act (California Zducation Code Section 13273.5, added by statutes 2968, Chapter 1447) specif'ies that school districts may contract with qualified teachers from foreign countries to teach as regular teachers in the district. The contracts are for one year; however, the foreign teachers may renew the contracts for an additional year. These teachers must return to their own countries at the end of two years.

The Bilingual Education Act, introduced by Senator Ralph Yarborough (Senate Bill 428, 1967 Session), which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, amended by Public Law 89-750)

[^2]was designed to ". . . provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual. American education programs . . . ${ }^{146}$ In time, this Act will assist in the preparation of bilingual students as future foreign language teachers; however, at present it is of little help to the foreign language coordinator as recipients of the Act will not be employable until they have completed their education.

One federally financed program that may have an immediate effect and be of assistance to the foreign language coordinator is the NDEA. Under the provisions of this Act an institute was held at the University of the Paciric in Stockton, California, in 1964, at which Spanishspeaking teachers were exposed to foreign language instructional material and training. Observed results indicate that the participants were very responsive to the procedure and are a potential source of Spanishlanguage teaching personnel. Administrators and foreign language instruction planners should recognize that ". . . it is evident that not nearly enough attention has been accorded to this already existing pool of human resources. ${ }^{47}$
$46_{\text {Francesco Cordasco, "The Bilingual Education Act," }}$ Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. II, October, 1969, p. 75.

47 John P. Wonder, "The Bilingual Mexican American as a Potential Teacher of Spanish," Hispania, Vol. XLVIII, 1965. The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, 1965, p. 97-98.

The foreign language coordinator has a position which indicates that his entire function is the fulfillment of foreign language needs. He must realize that memory is involved, that a break in continuity will perhaps break the chain of retention.

A theory of David Kretch is that learning is a two-stage memory process and involves chemical reactions to make it a long term memory. The first stage brings about a short-lived electro-chemical process which decays, but if the learning process continues, the second stage is chemical in nature and serves as our long-term memory. 48 If there is any credence in this theory it further enforces the idea that there should be at least four years of foreign language instruction to assure what Kretch calls the second stage--that of learning process being chemical in nature and serving as our long-term memory. Kretch envisioned a future which might possibly curtail the time needed for effective language instruction when he stated, "in the not too distant future (educators) may well be talking about enzyme-assisted instruction, protein memory consolidators, antibiotic memory repellers." 49 Kretch

48David Kretch, "The Chemistry of Learning," Saturday Review, January 1968, p. 48.

49 Ibid.
speaks of the future, but foreign language coordinators must plan for the present.

Innovation in administration can be an answer to some of the problems of foreign language programs. The United states Office of Education under provisions of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 finances innovative programs. Many foreign language programs throughout California are funded under this Act. The administration of standardized tests is one means of evaluating foreign language instruction. Two such standardized tests were created and instituted in Modesto, California, and are an example of innovation in foreign language study funded under this Act. 50

According to some authoritative sources, innovation in administration can answer some of the problems, aithough there must be willingness on the part of all members of a team to make an attempt to change. If administration is to be a contributing factor to the decrease in foreign language mortality, it will have to be in the areas of coordination, articulation, and effort at cohesive continuity. The thought is summed up by J. Lloyd Trump

[^3]in the following quote:
A given innovation or experiment can succeed only to the degree that related limiting factors are eliminated. You cannot alter one part of a spider's web without changing the rest of the web. 51

Limitations of previous Iiterature. The majority of books and articles which refer to the forelgn language programs have alluded to the lack of specific means of administrative direction in foreign language instruction. A comprehensive view of the problems of foreign language articulation may be perused in Parrot's dissertation, 52 which, however, only refers to the need for administrative responsibility to insure program suecess.

The majority of relevant studies have neglected the specific role of the administrator in all aspects of foreign language instruction. Rather, they have stressed the shortcomings of foreign language programs with regard to such aspects as continuity, articulation, and teaching procedures. Emphasis has been placed on the need for language as a base of international understanding, and most writers are adamant in their insistence that there is a great need for increased foreign language instruction. The literature does not clearly identify the administrative procedures necessary to increase the retentive power of foreign language programs.
$51_{\text {Richard }} T$. Miller (ed.), Perspectives on Educational Change (New York: Appleton-Century Croft, 1967), p. 61.
${ }^{52}$ Parrott, op. cit., p. 25-45.

Nowhere in the literature has this researcher found means or criteria for an assessment of foreign language program administration--an assessment which could result in possible correction of ineffective district level administrative procedures responsible for reduced foreign language enrollment.

Summary. There appears to be unanimity of opinion in the quoted research that the study of forejgn languages has an important function in providing a means of increasing communication, if the concentration is placed lipon the listening, speaking, reading and writing sequence of language learning. This is not to indicate that there is no place for the "decoding" process--the learning to read and write without previously learning to speak the language. It is brought out that continuity and articulation are necessary, if efficient and productive learning is to be accomplished. In order to insure continuity and articulation taking place, there must be administrative leadership that spans policy making to classroom program implementation. One source states that the efficacy of forejgn language programs is in direct proportion to the administrative support they receive. There is a preponderance of literature that indicates the need for close cooperation and coordination among those administrative positions which are directly responsible for the implementation of school district policy. There is a plethora of literature that
testifies to the importance of the district office level, the forejgn language coordinator level, and the head counselor level being administratively responsible for the decisions that affect continuity and articulation of foreign language instruction and, thexefore, are directly involved in the administrative reasons that affect enrollment retention and attrition in forejgn language instruction.

## CHAFITHR IIT

## METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, an overview of the methodology of the investigation will be presented and will be followed by a discussion of instruments used in the questionnaire survey and the method of data analysis. An explanation of the criteria to be developed from the results of the questionaire survey will be given. In addition to the statistical analysis of the survey instruments, there is an analysis of intercorrelated guestions of the thaee instruments used. Finally, there is a description and a statistical analysis of classrom ouservation by the investjgator, which is used as an evaluation of subjective answers given by respondents to the bnree survey instruments.

The rationale for the research herein reported was influenced by the foilowing sactors which attempt to verify the investigator's choice of subject matter and his reasons and ability for the selection thereof:

1. A background in foreign languages of the investigator
2. A background of foreign language teaching of the investigator
3. An expressed need for the investigation by representatives of the Cajifornia state Department of Education
4. An offer of a partial financial grant from the Office of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA)
Schools to be included in the research were selected following perusal of data gathered by the foreign Language Office of the California State Department of Education and two groups of eleven school districts were chosen for study. Group I required the following criteria:
5. Districts with a rate of attrition of 90 per cent or less in the continual study of one foreign language from grade nine through grade twelve.
6. Those districts with an enrollment of 400 or more students in the ninth grade.
7. Those districts which had a continuous and progressive foreign language program in grades nire through twelve for four years preceding the 1966 state survey.
8. Those districts which were so geographically located that their selection would give area representation to the entire state.
9. Those districts which were unified districts in existence for four years or more.
10. Those districts which employed a foreign language supervisor or coordinator.

Group II was selected for a comparison study according to the same criteria as Group I with the exception of item $l$ which is as follows:

1. Districts with a rate of attrition of more than 90 per. cent in the continual study of one foreign language from grade nine through grade twelve. The 90 per cent cutoff criterion was determined from data received by the California State Department of Education in 1966 which reported the mean rate of attrition in continuous foreign language study throughout the state to be 90 per cent.

## I. RESEARCH DESIGN

As previously stated, this study was designed to ascertain, by means of questionnaires and observation, the foreign language instruction policies and procedures devised and implemented by district administrative personnel in 22 selected school districts within the state of California. Comparative data gathered from the districts involved were analyzed in order to obtain conclusions that may indicate some administrative variables responsible for the high forejgn language attrition in some districts and high foreign language retertion in other districts. Conelusions reached were used as the basis for recommendations found in Chapter $V$.

Questionnaire development. The initial survey included the development and administration of three instruments. A questionnajre was developed for use with personnel in each of the following administrative positions:

1. School district administrator, which included the district superintendent or a person delegated by him to complete the questionnaire
2. Foreign language coordinator
3. Head counselor

Each questionnaire was developed by the researcher. The methods utilized for the development of the questions in each instimment were as follows:

1. Questions identified and/ox elicited from research of the literature.
2. Information gathered by consulting with experts in the field of foreign language study.
3. Suggestions offered by faculty members at the University of the Pacific.
4. Professional experience on the part of the investigator.

The questionnaire developed for the district administrator consisted of 25 items; the one for the foreign language coordinator contained 26 items; and the third instrument, for the head counselor, included 13 items. Each questionnaire was directed toward identified areas of coneern in policy and procedural practioes.

Statistical analysis of the questionaire data. The data gathered from the three questionnaires were analyzed according to each tem response. The statistical treatment used to determine critical response items was the test of Significance of the Difference Between Means for Independent Samples. 53 The level of signjficance was noted when items reached the .05 level and above. The comparison groups were designated as high retention group and low retention group. The data in Chapter IV are so organized.

Intercorrelated questions. In addition to an analysis of each item in each quastionaire, a statistical analysis was completed of correlated questions in the three questionnaire instruments. the Chi Square with varied degrees of freedom (DF) was the statistical method of analysis used. The varied DF was necessitated by the lack of a uniform number of items. These data pertain to items eliciting similar content responses and were compiled to ascertain continuity of response. The items vary with combinations of responses from the district administrator, the foreign language coordinator, and the head counselor.
Cl.assroom observation. A statistical analysis of the classroom observation was made on the responses recorded

53 Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education (David McKay Co., Inc., 1966), p. 223.
by the writer on the Mathied instrument (Appendix M). These data were analyzed using Chi Square analysis with one (l) degree of freedom. The Chi Square figures were then compared to the Chi Square Distribution Table. ${ }^{54}$. Where personal observation was impossible questions were not marked. The .05 level of confidence was considered the minimum for statistical reliability.

Item analysis. The initial set or questions in each of the previously described instruments were validated by four respondents in each of the three categories: district administrator, foreign language coordinator, and head counselor. Their reactions and suggestions relative to the validity of the inatruments were incorporated. The completed questionnaires were then submitted to the chaiman of the researcher's doctoral committee and the coordinator of foreign languages for the State of California, for additional critique.

On the basis of the preceding each instrument was again revised and resubmitted to four administrators in each category for final evaluation. The instruments, as shown in Appendices D, F and H, were approved by the chairman of the doctoral committee and the state coordinator
${ }^{54}$ Henry $I_{1}$. Alder and Edward B. Roessler, Probability and Statistics (San Francisco; London: W. H. Freeman and company, 1960), p. 280-281.
of foreign language programs prior to the actual research herein reported.

## II. METHOD OF DATA ACCUMULATITON

Selection of respondents was based on the criteria as outlined on page 40 and this investigator utilized the prerogative of choice in selecting geographical areas that appeared to give representation on a state-wide basis. The selection of counties submitted to committee representatives and state employees for final approval were Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Imperial, Kern, Los Angeles, Marin, Napa, Orange, Scoramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbaro, Santa Clara, and Stanislaus, as indicated on the state map in Appendix C.

Questionnaire items were selected according to the procedures set forth on page 42 . Each item in each questionnaire was selected to elicit information that would meet the following criteria:

1. Would come within the job scope of the individual.
2. Would elicit responses that would reflect present practices or beliefs.
3. Would need no elaborate additional explanation.
4. Covered policy practice and procedure envisioned by the respondents.
5. Called for responses reflecting administrative judgment and decisions.
6. Elicited interpretation of policy and procedure. 7. Required knowledge of practice and procedure. Selected districts were contacted by telephone and official letters (Appendix B) from the State Department of Education. Districts which agreed to participate were then contacted by telephone and a schedule, mutually agreeable to the school district personnel and the researcher, was established in order to conduct interviews wi.th all participants and to arrange for class visits without need for recourse to a return visit.

The preceding was then followed by an actual on-site visitation. Travel was by automobile and airplane with an estinsted figure of 6,000 miles needed to complete the research.

On-site interviews were conducted in person with the respondent in possession of a questionnaire. The researcher asked the questions and recorded the answers. In many instances the respondent used documents to verify answers.

Twenty-two foreign language classes of 50 minute duration in "grades nine through twelve were visited with the express purpose of recording the subjective impressions of the researcher. The form used to record these impressions was one developed by G. Mathieu entitled "Checklist of What the Audio-Linguai Teacher Should Not Do" (Appendix J). In addition to the recorded subjective
impressions, two ancillary purposes of the visitations were:

1. To reecord actual conditions of classroom operation as an example of the results of the particular district administration of the foreign language program.
2. To form the basic background material for the development of a new checklist which might be used as a criteria or evaluative instrument for classes of foreign language instruction.

The rationale for the classroom visits, the recording of observation data, and the development of a criteria or checklist is to provide an added means of evaluating the results or administrative policy and practice with respect to foreign language progroms. This evaluation should, in addition, provide a means whereby administrators may instigate reforms where necessary of present classroom practices and generate administrative policies that reflect improved foreign language instruction methodology.
III. SUMMARY

In this chapter the rationale for the subject matter selection was explained by the expressed need of the Foreign Language Department of the California State Department of Education; the federal interest, as evidenced by the guidelines for financial assistance under the NDEA; and the investigator's background in foreign language and foreign
language teaching experience. Data sought were elicited by means of three survey instruments designed by this investigator for the purpose of ascertaining those administrative variables which may be responsible for high enrollment retention in foreign language instruction. The actual investigative means are explained as a personal interview with the selected administrators involved. An explanation is given for the inclusion of classroom observation as producing insight into the actual practice that is performed as a result of administrative decisions in the discipline of foreign language instruction. The methodology, as outlined in this chapter, was the basis used for the acquisition of data that produced the findings and resultant eonelusions.

## CHAPTER IV

## FINDTNGS OF THE SIUDY

Findings of the study are presented in this chapter in three sections. The first section deals with the statistical results of the recorded data of the three research questionnaires. Each of the questionnaires is discussed separately and the suiosequent data are organized according to the questions asked of the district administrator, the foreign language coordinator, and the head counselor.
*. Inasmuch as the sample numbered less than 30, the statistical tool used in the first part of the chapter is the Significance of Difference Between the Means of Small Samples.

The second section of this chapter presents a statistical analysis and discussion of the intercorrelated questions of the three study questionnaires. Questions concerning the responses given by the district administrators, foreign language coordinators, and head counselors are not all included in each of the intercorrelations. Inasmuch as the three questionnaires did not always contain similar items, the statistical tool used was the Chi Square, using Yates correction because of the small sample, and one degree of freedom.

The third section of this chapter deals with the statistical findings of classroom observation in which the Mathieu checklist was used as a recording device. The Chi Square formula, with Yates correction and varied degrees of freedom, was used to ascertain correlation among question items. Items not used, due to lack of opportunity for observance, were recorded as 0.000 .
I. ITEM ANALYSTS OF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

The statistical results, listing only affirmative responses and subquestion heading replies to each question of the three instruments, are included in Appendix E for the distrjct administrator; Apoendix $G$ for the foreign Janguage coordinator; and Appendix I for the head counselor. The above procedure was utilized to eliminate the necessity of including 64 separate tables which, in the opinion of the researcher, would have added difficulty in readability and continuity. The discussion and analysis of each item are presented in the order of questions. The statistical results included in Appendices $E, G$, and $I$ may be used for verification. Statjstical significance will be mentioned only when it is at or exceeds the .05 level.

District Administrator Questionnaire

Twenty-one administrators responded to the
questionnaire, 11 from the hich retention sample and 10 from the low retention sample. In some cases, items on the questionnaire were not completed by respondents in the other sample groups, which resulted in the number of responses to some questions being less than the total of twenty-one. The items and responses follow:

Board of Education policy. Item 1 of the questionnaire read:

Does the district have a written Board of Education policy on foreign language instruction? Yes___ No_.

If yes, does it encourage a four-year sequential program (grades 9-12) for all students who may benefit? Yes_No_.

Approximately 50 per cent of the respondents in both the high and low retention districts gave affirmative responses to the first part of the question. Of those giving an affirmative answer to part two, approximately 75 per cent encouraged a four-year sequential program.

The responses to item 1 indicate a majority of the districts with a written board of education policy on foreign language instruction also believed a four-year sequential program to be necessary.

Qualifications of foreign language teachers. Item 2 of the questionnaire read:

Is there a district policy on foreign language qualifications? Yes__No_.

If yes, what are the qualifications? Please list (Example: Fluency, Major, etc.)

Approximately 30 per cent of the districts surveyed did have a policy on foreign language teacher qualifications. The majority, 54.5 per cent, of the high retention districts required fluency and a major in foreign language. The low retention group favored a major in foreign language with a minor in foreign language as the second most popular requirement. Fluency in the language taught appears to be the only distinguishing point between those districts with a high retention and those with a low retention in foreign language instruction.

Continuity and articulation. Item 3 of the questionnaire read:

Does the district policy provide for foreign language continuity and articulation by a uniform method of instruction in all schools within the district? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$ -

If yes:
If no:
K-8
9-12
audiolingual
_traditional
——combination


Approximately 80 per cent of the high retention group and 70 per cent of the low retention group had policy provisions for a uniform teaching technique. As the responses indicate, 70 per cent of the high retention groups and 60 per cent of the low retention groups used a uniform teaching. technique. For those districts that did not have a
policy for a uniform teaching techinique, the "audiolingual" method was the most popular. In the elementary schools (K-8), 20 per cent of the high retention group and 30 per cent of the low retention group used this method. In the secondary school (9-12) program, the "combination" method (audiolingual and traditional approach) was most frequently used at 30 per cent in both the high and the low retention groups. Of interest is that neither the high nor the low retention groups with a policy on continuity and articulation selected the "traditional" method of instruction. For those districts without a uniform teaching procedure, there was a scattered use of the "combination" method at both the $\mathrm{K}-8$ and $9-12$ grade levels.

Supervisory practices. Itern 4 of the questionnaire read:

Has one person been delegated the responsibility by the superintendent for the foreign language program at 11 grade levels? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$ .
If yes, please answer the following:
a. Title
b. Qualifications required (Fiuency, Major, Minor) 1. 2.
c. Other duties, if any (teaching, curriculum coordinator, etc.)

1. $\qquad$ per cent of time per cent of time $\qquad$
Approximately 45 per cent of the high retention districts responded in the affirmative (as did 30 per cent
of the low retention districts) concerning item number 4. In other words the figures indicate that more than half of the districts did not delegate foreign language responsibility to a person on a full time basis.

Titles for the position were varied, with "Supervisor of Foreign Language" and "Coordinator of Foreign Language" as frequent designations. Qualifications required for the position indicate that 45 per cent of the high retention districts (compared to 20 per cent of the low retention districts) placed the most value on "fluency". A "major" in foreign language ranked second with the high and low retention districts approximately the same at 36 per cent for the high and 30 per cent for the low retention groups respectively. In summary, there appear to be more districts without one designated person in charge of the foreign language program and when one person is assigned, the majority of the districts require "fluency" in a language and a "major" in the field of foreign language.

Policy related to language selection by students. Item 5 of the questionnaire read:

Is there a district policy which allows students to elect foreign language instruction in the ninth grade? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$ .

If yes, please indicate:
All students with a passing grade in eighth grade foreign language?
_ Only students with an A or B grade?


A unanimous agreement (100 per cent) is revealed from both the high retention districts and the low reterition districts which allow students to elect foreign language instruction at the ninth grade. The second part of the question reveals the actual meaning of the allowance to select. In other words it reveals the restriction. Fifty per cent of both groups allowed "students with a passing grade" in eighth grade foreign language instruction. The second criterion to question number 5 concerned those "students with an $A$ or $B$ grade" in foreign language. This criterion was significant at the .05 level with 54.5 per cent of the high retention districts compared to 10 per cent of the low retention districts. This indicates that the high retention districts were more in favor of a high letter grade as a basic requirement for continuing foreign language instruction. It is interesting to note that criterion three, which referred to "students in college preparatory course," was selected by 10 per cent of the low retention group and by none of the districts with a high retention. The last criterion in this item referred to leaving the matter of a student's electing to enroll in a foreign language to the "discretion of the counselor." For example, several of both the high and the low retention
districts relied on the counselor to make the decision. From the response to this item, it could be said that in the high retention districts a student could eiect a foreign language at the ninth grade, if he passed the eighth grade course with an $A$ or $B$ and had the permission of the school counselor.

Instructional time. Item 6 of the questionnaire read:

Is there a district policy on the minimum amount of class timefor those students taking foreign language instruction? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
If yes, please indicate:
A. If daily, how many minutes per day? K-8, 9-12
B. If not daily, how many times per week? K-8, 9-12. How many minutes per day? K-8, 9-12
C. Do they meet each semester?

Alternate semester? $\qquad$
D. Other (explain).

Both high and low retention districts favor a minimum amount of class time with 100 per cent for the high and 90 per cent for the low retention districts. The average time spent daily in foreign language instruction was approximately 37 minutes at the K-8 level for both high and Jow retention districts. Grades 9-12 averaged approximately 5l. minutes for both groups. There were no recordable amounts registered in response to parts $B, C$, and $D$ of the above question. It may be noted that each district favored less than 40 minutes daily for grades K-8 and approximately 50 minutes for grades 9-12 with daily
class time required by both groups.

Teachers in-service provisions. Item 7 of the questionnaire read:

Is there a district policy permitting foreign language teachers to travel at district expense to meetings, seminars, workshops, etc.? Yes_No $\qquad$
If yes, does this include? Who may authorize?

- A. Inter-district $\qquad$
———B. Inter-county
C. Inter-state
——D. Out-of-state
———E. Foreign countries
——F. All of the above


Travel at district expense is favored by 100 per cent of the high retention districts and 90 per cent of the low retention districts.

The second part of the question concerns the travel distance permitted. More than 70 per cent of the high retention districts allowed "inter-district," "intercounty," and "intra-state" travel; 9.1 per cent of these districts permitted "out-of-state" travel, and 18.2 per cent permitted travel to "foreign countries." Respondents in the low retention group indicated that 90 per cent of the districts allowed travel to "inter-district" and "inter-county" regions; 60 per cent allowed "inter-state" travel. None of the districts represented in the low retention group allowed travel to "foreign countries," although 40 per cent allow "out-of-state" travel--300 per cent more than the high retention group.

In summary, it would appear that both groups favor travel within the state. The low retention districts allow more "out-of-state" travel than do the high retention districts, but do not approve of travel to "foreign countries."

Teachers in-service training provisions. Item 8 of the questionnaire read:

Do the foreign language teachers in the district meet regularly to discuss problems of instruction? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
If yes, Do all teachers attend (when possible)?
Do all department heads attend
(when possible)?
If yes, do the elementary teachers meet separately from secondary teachers? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
Approximately 90 per cent or both groups had provisions for foreign language teachers to meet on a regular basis to discuss problems of instruction. In 81.8 per cent of the high retention districts, all of the teachers of foreign language and 100 per cent of the department heads attended such meetings. In the low retention group, 90 per cent of the teachers and 90 per cent of the department heads attended the meetings. Approximately 80 per cent of both groups responded that the elementary and secondary teachers met separately. In summary, response to the question indicates that foreign language teachers meet on a regular basis, generally with the
department heads, and that separate meetings are held for elementary and secondary staff members.

Student placement. Item 9 of the questionnaire
read;
When the students enter the ninth grade, is there a district policy for their placement into foreign language courses according to level of proficiency? Yes $\qquad$ No

If yes, please indicate the method (s) of placement. A. Standardized tests B. Teacher recommendation
———B. Teacher (explain)
Statistics indicate considerable variance in response to the first part of the question on placement according to proficiency. There is significant difference at the . 05 level between the high and the low retention districts, with 63 per cent of the high and 100 per cent of the low retention districts stating that such a policy exists. The second part of the question concerns method of placement; 9.1 per cent of the high and 20 per cent of the low retention districts use "standardized tests;" "teacher recommendation" ranks highest at 54.5 per cent for the high and 80 per cent for the low retention districts. It would appear that thase districts with a low retention record have a policy for placement according to proficiency as rated and recommended by the teacher. Under "other" were listed "grades" for the high retention districts and "counselors" for the low retention districts as thirdchoice selections.

Class size. Item 10 of the questionnaire read:
Is thexe a district policy on the minimum class size to continue foreign language instruction grades 9-12? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$
If yes, what is the minimum? Please indicate amount.
—— First year Fourth year. Second year $\square$ Fifth year Third year - Sixth year

Thirty per cent of the high and 30 per cent of the low answer in the affirmative with regard to existence of a class-size policy. The second part of the question, concerning minimum class size indicates little difference between the two groups with an average of 16 minimum for the first four years in the high and a 17.5 minimum for the low. The difference comes at the fifth and sixth years when the low retention group did not list size of classes held, while the average for the high retention was 19 for the fifth year and 20 for the sixth year. The main comments received by the researcher on this question were that the cost of classes with fewer than 15 students did not sufficiently benefit enough students to justify teacher expense.

Administrative effort to continue classes below
minimum enrollment. Item 11 of the questionnaire read:
Will the administration provide transportation
from one school to another to combine classes
if: a school falls below the minimum at a particular level in a foreign language class?
Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$

Approximately 50 per cent of each group would transport students from one school to another. For those districts that would not transport students to combine classes, the reason given most often was lack of justification for transportation costs. Money, then, appears to be the motivating reason for dropping foreign language classes when there is insufficient enrollment.

Teacher salary provisions. Item 12 of the questionnaire read:

Do foreign language teachers receive added remuneration? Yes $\qquad$ No

If yes, check basis. Ratio Index Flat Rate Amount given

There was no district in the high retention group and only 10 per cent in the low retention group that allowed added remuneration for foreign language teachers. In some of the low retention districts team teaching was the basis for an increase in salary.

Shortage of teachers. Item 13 of the questionnaire read:

Is there a foreign language teacher shortage in this district? Yes $\qquad$ NO

If yes, indicate the reason.
A. Lack of funds
——B. Lack of available qualified employee applicants
$\ldots$ C. Other (explain)

Data indicate 9.1. per cent of the high and 20 per cent of the low retention districts had a shortage of foreign language teachers. Both groups gave the reason for the shortage as a lack of "qualified" teachers; neither group selected "lack of funds" as the reason for the shortage. Asked if they had considered increasing the salary of foreign language teachers, the consensus among the respondents was that to do so would cause "teacher trouble." Added duty was the only criterion stated which would increase teacher salary.

Foreign language as added dutjes for K-8 teachers.
Item 14 of the questionnaire read:
Is foreign language instruction a part of the duties of the teacher in the classroom in grades K-3 (where offered)? Yes __. No ___

If yes, do the teachers receive special in-service education in preparation? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$ If no, does the district employ a traveling foreign language teacher specialist within a school? Yes __ No _ District? Yes __ No $\qquad$
Sixty per cent of the high and 77.8 per cent of the low retention groups have foreign language instruction as part of the regular classroom duties at the $K-8$ level. The second part of the question asks whether their teachers received special in-service preparation. All of the respondents in the low retention group answered affirmatively while the high retention affirmative
response was 87.5 per cent. For those districts in which teachers at the $K-8$ level did not teach foreign language, 100 per cent of both hjigh and low retention districts had specialists within the school. While 100 per cent of the low retention group had specialists within the districts, only 83.3 per cent of the high retention group were thus staffed. It may be observed that if a foreign language is taught, it is taught in the majority of schools by the classroom teacher or a traveling specialist. One of the most frequent reasons given for the above practice was "we satisfy the requirement but could do a better job wi.th added pay on an A.D.A. (average daily attendance) basis." It would appear that there is a shortage of foreign language teachers at the $K-8$ level or a lack of effort to provide them without remuneration from the state.

Use of paraprofessional personnel. Item 15 of the questionnaire read:

Does the district employ paraprofessionals
(aides) to assist the foreign language teachers in $\mathrm{K}-8$ ? Yes_No_ $9-12$ ? Yes_ No

If yes, please indicate the reason.
A. To assist in instruction
B. Fluent in the language being taught
C. Used only for mechanical assistance (setting up equipment, etc.)
D. Other (explain)

Over 50 per cent of the high and only 33 per cent of the low retention districts used paraprofessionals at
at the K-8 level. For grades 9-12; over 50 per cent of the high retention and 40 per cent of the low retention groups used them. How these people were used is asked in the last part of the question, and 54.5 per cent of the high retention districts using this help dja so for "instruction" and "mechanical assistance" while only 20 per cent of the low retention districts using this personnel did so to "assist in instruction" and used 50 per cent for "mechanical assistance." It would appear that those districts in the high retention group that use paraprofessional aides made greater use of the aides' ability in instruction than did the districts in the low retention group. When the ajdes were used for instruction, it was reported to this researcher that the aides were of the ethnic group represented by the language being taught, and that the aides had added cultural "flavor" to the instructional method being used. The aides were also able to assist in individual instruction on a one-to-one basis. "Mechanical assistance" included setting up equipment and doing routine clerical work to relieve the teacher.

Effect of the Casey Law K-8. Item 16 of the questionnaire read:

Would the repeal of the mandated (Casey Law) foreign language requirement affect the foreign language curriculum in grades $K-8$ ? Yes $\qquad$ No $\qquad$

If yes, would it:
A. Eliminate foreign language?
B. Offer foreign language on an elective basis?
C. Restrict foreign language to an ability basis?
D. Curtail the amount of time allowed?
E. Other (explain)

Indications are that repeal of the mandated foreign language instruction law would certainly affect the $K .-8$ curriculum. Two--thirds of the high retention districts and 100 per cent of the low retention districts responded affirmatively. How the repeal would affect the foreign language program in the districts surveyed is suggested in the response of 45.5 per cent of the high and 60 per cent of the low retention groups that the program would be removed from the mandated curriculum and offered as an elective. Only 10 percent of the low group would eliminatie the subject; none of the high group would do so. At least 40 per cent of the low retention districts would "curtail the amount of time" devoted to the subject, while only 9 per cent of the high retention districts would follow suit.

Repeal of the mandated foreign language program would bring about a change but not eliminate the program in its entirety. Repeal would place the program on an elective basis, with student choice being the determining factor. Statements were made to this researcher that "foreign language is not for everyone," and more time could
be devoted to "needed subjects." Again, the subject of adequate funds was a determining factor in desire for repeal of the mandate.

Effects of the Casey Law 9-12. Item 17 of the questionnaire read:

```
Would the repeal. of the mandated (Casey Law) foreign language requirement affect the foreign language cirriculum at the secondary level (9-12)? Yes
``` \(\qquad\)
``` No
``` \(\qquad\)

If yes, would it result in:
A. More classes?
——B. Smaller classes (per teacher)?
C. More languages?
D. More teachers?
E. Other (explain)

Fifty-four and one-half per cent of the high retention group and 11.1 per cent of the low retention group believed that repeal of the Casey Bill would affect the foreign language program in grades 9-12. Response to the second part of the question reveals that 36.4 per cent of the high retention districts felt that repeal of the Casey Bill would result in more classes in foreign language. The low group had no recorded response to this question. This item was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Those districts which have a record of high retention of foreign language students evidently believe that the removal of the mandatory foreign language program in the elementary. schools would result in greater emphasis at the high school level. Some administrators remarked that
the students were discouraged by the language at the lower level and thereby lacked incentive to select it at the higher level. This question supports the desire indicated in question 16 to make forejgn language an elective in kindergarten through grade eight.

Opportunity for selecting forejgn language at K-8
level. Iten 18 of the questionnaite read:
Does the district advocate increased foreign language opportunities in the elementary school (K 8) on an elective basis? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Thirty per cent of the high and 50 per cent of the low retention districts would allow increased elective prerogative at the \(\mathrm{K}-8\) level. This coincides with question number 16 where both high and low groups believed that a repeal of the mandated program of foreign language instruction would result in having the program on an elective rather than a mandated basis. It must be noted that, as in question number 16, the high retention districts were less in favor of foreign language in the elementary school being an elective, or as in this question, as increasing the elective opportunities.

Endorsement of mandated foreign language programs at \(K-8\) level. Item 19 of the questionnaire read:

Does the district administration endorse the provisions of the mandated foreign language program in the elementary school? Yes__ No \(\qquad\)

If no, what are the objections?
A. Insufficient number of qualified teachers
B. Excess financial burden
C. Crowded curriculum (required subjects)
D. Unnecessary at the elementary level ( \(\mathrm{K}-8\) )
E. Other (explajn)

Only 36.4 per cent of the high retention districts were in favor of the mandated program; 44.4 per cent of the low group endorsed the provisions of the mandated program. The reasons given for lack of endorsement shows "crowded curriculum" to be the most popular response for the high ( 63.6 per cent) and "excessive financial burden" as second most popuiar reason. The reason given most often by the low retention group was "excessive financial burden" (33.3 per cent) and "crowded curriculum" was the second most frequent reason given (22.2 per cent). Of interest may be that the high retention districts again desired a greater amount of restructure at the \(\mathrm{K}-8\) level than did the low retention districts. Within the high retention districts, 36.4 per cent declared foreign language unnecessary at the K-8 level, whereas only 12.5 per cent of the low retention districts considered it unnecessary. The recorded main objections of the high group to the K-8 foreign language program were listed under "other" as "not for all," "unrealistic," and "object to mandate," while only "object to mandate" was recorded for the low group. The high retention districts appear to place more emphasis on the foreign language program at the 9-12 grade levels.

\section*{Increasing foreign language program at K-8 level.}

Item 20 of the questionnaire read:
Would the district administration advocate increased foreign language instruction at the elementary level ( \(\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{-}\) ) if there were greater flexibility in choice of subject matter allowed at the district level? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, what subject(s) would be deleted or restricted to permit increased foreign language instruction?
A.
B.
C. D.

The low retention groups were significantly in favor (. 05 level) of increasing foreign language instruction at the K-8 level, if greater flexibility were permitted in subject matter selection. The high at 30 per cent and the low at 85.7 per cent indicates that the low retention group believe 凤 choice of subject matter would alleviate their condition as expressed in question number 19 where the low retention group selected "excess financial burden" and "crowded curriculum" as their main objections. In the second part of the question, referring to subjects that would be deleted or restricted to increase foreign language instruction, there were isolated responses listing "physical education," "life science," and "shop."

Enhancing the mandated program if financial aid were available. Item 21 of the questionnaire read:

Would the district advocate enhancement of the foreign language program under the present mandated law if financial aid were furnished by the state? Yes \(\qquad\) No

If yes, what change(s) would be implemented? Please indicate.
A. Additional teachers
B. Added class time (mjnutes per day)
C. Added days per year
D. Additional classes (grades not now included)
E. Additional realia (supplementary materials, audio-visual aids, etc.)
F. Other (explain)

Both the high and low retention districts would increase the foreign language program if financial aid were furnished by the state. In 70 per cent of the high retention group and 80 per cent of the low retention group the response was in favor of an increase in the benefits of foreign language instruction. The most popular response to the item regarding changes that would be implemented wes "adaitional teachers;" 60 per cent of the high and 80 per cent of the low retention groups gave affirmative responses to that item. The second most popular response was in favor of "additional classes;" 60 per cent of the high group and 70 per cent of the low retention group so responded. Although "teacher shortage" was not listed as critical in question number 17 by either the high or the low retention groups, it now becomes most important as a change to be desired.

Extending foreign language at the secondary level with additional financial aid. Item 22 of the questionnaire read:

Would the district advocate, and put into effect, greater forejgn language opportunities at the secondary level (9-12) if additional financial aid were available? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, would the change be implemented by:
.__ A. Greater flexibility as to those allowed
in foreign language study?
B. Increase in teacher pay?
C. Employment of more teachers?
D. Smaller classes?
E. Increased supervision?
F. Increased articulation between elementary ( \(K-8\) ) and secondary (9-12)?
G. Other (explain)

The majority of both groups would extend the secondary foreign language program; 90.9 per cent of the high and 100 per cent of the low retention districts gave affirmative responses to thjs question. In explaining how they would extend the secondary program, the high retention group indicated that they favored "smailer classes," "increased supervision," adding "greater flexibility" to student enrollment criteria, and "employment of more teachers." .The low retention group indicated very strongly that they would make classes smaller (80 per cent compared with 36.4 per cent of the high retention group). Their other choices of the low retention group were "employing more teachers," "increasing supervision," and "adding greater flexibility" to student enrollment. The least popular choice for both groups was "increase in teacher pay."

Cost for foreign language inistruction. Item 23 of the questionnaire read:

What is the estimated cost per A.D.A, for Poreign language instruction (including administration) in the district? K-8 9-12

Would the above A.D.A. funds be sufficient to implement an improved foreign language program? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, would the district advocate increased opportunities in foreign language if the amount were provided? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If no, on the cost being sufficient, what amount would you recommend per A.D.A. to continue or increase the benefits of foreign language? K-8 9-12

Average figures from only 30 per cent of the districts of the high retention groups were received and these figures range from nineteen to seventy-four dollars per A.D.A. at the K-8 level and sixty to ninety-eight dollars at the 9-12 level with the average for \(K-8\) at forty-six dollars and 9-12 at seventy-nine dollars per A.D.A. The rest of the question was not answered as all the remaining districts reported that their districts did not calculate instructional costs per discipline on this basis. There were no estimates available of the cost of increasing the benefits of foreign language instruction at either the K-8 or 9-12 levels.

Restricting the number of languages offered. Item 24 of the questionnaire read:

Does the administration believe that a more productive and efficient foreign language program would result from a restriction of foreign language instruction to one language? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, what language would be advocated? Indicate the reason(s):
A. Availabiljty of teachers?
B. Ethnic environment?
C. Greater possibility of actual use?
D. Increased articulation from elementary to secondary?
E. Increased possibjlity of foreign language instruction continuity and proficiency?
F. Other (explain)

If no, how many languages does the administration advocate to constitute a desirable foreign language program? Please list in order of preference.
A.
 D.


Statistics indicate a negative attitude in respect to restriction of the foreign language program to one language. Only 10 per cent of the low retention group named the Spanish language and gave as the reasons the "availability of teachers" and "increased continuity and proficiency." In the third part of the question, which requests order of preference for language instruction, 90 per cent of the high and 80 per cent of the low retention group listed Spanish as a first choice. French and German are second and third choices for both groups; of the high group 90 per cent named French and 100 per cent named German as third choice. In the low retention group, 80 per cent selected French and 70 per cent selected

German second and third choices, respectively. Although neither group advocates restriction to one language, they are unanimous in selecting Spanish as first in choice.

District philosophy for foreign language instruction,
9-12. Item 25 of the questionnaire read:
What is the district philosophy for the instruction of foreign language in the secondary schools (9-12)?

Check any that apply:
A. Preparation for college entrance?
B. Preparation for college study?
C. Improvement of human relations among the various ethnic groups in the community?
D. Improvement of human relations among the various ethnic groups in the world?
_ E. Improvement of world understanding?
F. Raising the cultural level?
\(\cdots\) G. Raising the cul
This item showe how the district administrators perceive the district philosophy on foreign language instruction. All of the choices were selected by at least 6.0 per cent of the respondents in each group. The order of preference was as follows: (A) high retention groups-to "raise the cultural level," 100 per cent; "preparation for college entrance," 90.9 per cent; "preparation for college study," 72.7 per cent; to "improve human relations around the world," 72.7 per cent; to "improve human relations in the community," 63.6 per cent; (B) low retention group--to "improve human relations around the world," 90 per cent; to "raise the cultural level," 70 per cent; to "improve world understanding," 70 per cent; to "improve
human relations in the community," 70 per cent; "preparation for college study," 70 per cent. The high retention districts selected "raising the cultural level" as first choice (100 per cent) with "preparation for college" as second choice ( 90.9 per cent), showing a preference for the academic virtue. The low retention group placed more emphasis on the "fmprovement of human relations around the world" ( 90 per cent). All other categories selected by the low retention group placed in the 70 per cent bracket which would appear to relegate the academic aspect to being less important than do those districts who have a higher retention of foreign language students.

Summary of district administrator questionnaire.
There is unanimity of opinion of respondents in both high and low retention districts that there should be a fouryear sequential foreign language program that would specify foreign language teacher qualifications. Both groups agree that continuity and articulation of the foreign language program is enhanced by the use of the audiolingual method and that there should be one person at the district level responsible for the instructional program. Both groups support teacher in-service training provisions and travel within the state. Teacher in-service training sessions should be attended by teachers and supervisors. Student placement at level of proficiency
appears to be generally determined by teacher recommendation. Response to questions relating to minimum class size is not conclusive, nor is there unanjmity of efforts to combine classes of low enrollment; with regard to the latter, personnel and finances are the regulatory agent. Neither group indicated any desire to recruit foreign language teachers by increasing their salary; they registered no concern regarding a great lack of qualified. personnel.

At the K-8 level, it is generally assumed that the regular classroom teacher will provide foreign language instruction in eddition to other duties. The mandated foreigh language program has not been a benefit to either group, and i.ts repeal would result in foreign language being made an elective at the \(K-8\) level and would result in more classes at the 9-12 level. More classes are not advocated at the K 8 level by either group because of crowded curriculum and excess cost, nor would either group increase the instruction if there was more flexibility in subject matter costs. Both groups would enhance the foreign language program in grades \(K-8\) and 9-12 if financial aid were provided by the state by hiring additional teachers, increasing the number of classes, making smaller classes, and increasing supervision. Both groups are vague with regard to A.D.A. costs of the foreign language program, but neither group wants to attempt improvement of foreign
language by restriction of the program to one language. Although both groups list Spanish as first choice, there is a close agreement on French and German in that order of preference for second and third regard. Even though district philosophy on foreign language instruction was subjective, it is noted that the high retention group places value on the academic aspect of foreign language to a greater degree than does the low retention group, who, instead, rate the "improvement of human relations around the world" in first place.

Foreign Language Coordinator Questionnaire

Twenty foreign language coordinators responded to the questionnaire, 10 from the high retention sample and 10 from the low retention sample. As in the district administrator questionnaire, there are some items which were not completed by respondents in one or the other sample group, and the resulting number of responses may be less than the amounts listed above. The items and responses follow.

Title. Item \(l\) of the questionnaire read:
What is your title?
This question brought varied responses ranging from "department head" to "coordinator of foreign languages." There appears to be no uniform designated title given to
this position.

Additional duties. Item 2 of the questionnaire read:

Do you have other duties in addition to coordinating foreign language instruction?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, please indicate:
A. Foreign language teacher? Per cent of time?
B. Other instruction (class time) duties? Per cent of time?
C. Other supervision duties? Per cent of time?
D. Other (explain)

Foreign language coordinators in both high and low retention districts have other duties, with the high group responding affirmatively at the 60 per cent level and the low group at 70 per cent. There was unanimity in the answers given by both groups as to what the duties consisted of: "other supervision," 40 per cent; and "foreign language teaching," 30 per cent. Even the most affluent district had other duties for the coordinator to perform.

Method of instruction. Item 3 of the questionnaire read:

What method of instruction is used in the foreign language program? Please indicate.

K-8
9-12
Audiolingual
\(\square \quad\) Traditional
\(\square \quad\) Combination


Eighty per cent of both groups indicate use of the "audiolingual" method of instruction at the K 8 level. At. the 9-12 grade level, 70 per cent of the high and 80 per cent of the low retention sample said they used the "audiolingual" approach. It is interesting to note that no district in either sample used the "traditional" approach at either the \(\mathrm{K}-8\) or the \(9-\mathrm{l}\) - level; however, there was slight use made of a "combination" of the two methods at the K-8 level in 20 per cent of the high and 10 per cent of the low retention groups, and, at the 9-12 level, the same figures of 20 per cent high and 10 per cent low prevailed.

Student piacement procedures. Item 4 of the guestionnaire read:

Is there an automatic placement to the second year in the high school program after two or more years of elementary school foreign language instruction? Yes. \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If no, do you coordinate for proper placement into secondary level by:
A. Standardized test?
B. District-made test?
C. Teacher recommendation?
D. Other? (explain)

Statistics indicate that 66.7 per cent of the high retention districts had automatic placement to the second year of language after two or more years of elementary language instruction; only 30 per cent of the low retention group had such a placement procedure. For those districts
with no automatic placement procedure, "teacher recommendation," at 33 per cent high and 70 per cent low, was the most popular placement method. "Standardized tests" were used by 30 per cent of the low retention districts for this purpose.

Different instructional methods used in K-8. Item 5 of the questionnaire read:

If there is a different method of foreign language instruction used in elementary and secondary schools, are all ninth grade students assigned to the same year of foreign language instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Results indicate that if different instructional methods are used at the elementary level, only 25 per cent of the high retention districts and 57.1 per cent of the low retention districts place them at the same level. This response indicates that consideration of background is given credance.

Incoming transfer process. Item 6 of the questionnaire read:

Are incoming (out-of-district) transfers processed the same as students concerned in question number. 5? Yes No \(\qquad\)
If students are not processed in a like manner, what method is used? Explain.

Affirmative answers to this question were received from 70 per cent of the high and 77.8 per cent of the low retention groups. When transfer students were not
processed in the same way, the method used by 20 per cent of the high and lo per cent low was by counselor recommendation. Teacher recommendation was used by 10 per cent of both groups. In general, it might be said that incoming transfers are processed on the same basis as students from within the district.

Program coordination Within the district. Item 7 of the questionnaire read:

Is the foreign language program coordinated within the district so that an inter-district transfer is automatically placed at the same level with little or no loss? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Inter-district transfers are placed at the same
level in 100 per cent of the high retention districts and in 90 per cent of the low retention districts indicating that both groups believe that they possess a coordinated articulated program of foreign language instruction.

Shortage of foreign language teachers. Item 8 of the questionnaire read:

Do you have enough qualified foreign language teachers to meet the demand of enrollment in the elementary schools? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If no, what procedure is used to limit the enrollment at the various levels of secondary foreign language instruction? Please indicate.
A. Letter grades (A, B, C, etc.) minimum
B. Achievement test. Standardized

District-made
C. Teacher recommendation
———D. Track (college preparatory)
————O. Other (explain)

Recording of the item lists the responses regarding enough teachers to meet the demand with a 60 per cent affirmative response from the high group and a 20 per cent affirmative response from the low group. When asked what methods were used to limit enrollment in those districts without a sufficient number of teachers, there was a significant difference at the .05 level between the high and the low retention groups in two of the four methods selected. Selection of "letter grades" (20 per cent for the high and 70 per cent for the low) and "teacher recommendation" ( 30 per cent for the high and 80 per cent for the low) indjcates that the low retention districts used those two methode as the means of limiting enrollment when there was an insufficient number of teachers available.

Qualifications of foreign language teachers. Item 9 of the questionnaire read:

What are the qualifications required by your office for a foreign language teacher in the elementary program (K-8)? Please indicate.
A. Major in foreign language
B. Minor in foreign language
C. Native speaker
D. Fluency
E. Other (explain)

Qualifications required for foreign language teachers at the secondary level (9-1.2)?
A. Major in foreign language
B. Minor in foreign language
C. Native speaker
D. Fluency
E. Other (explain)

The most popular response for teacher qualifications in the high retention group in the elementary grades was a "major in foreign language" at 30 per cent. "Native speaker" and "fluency" are listed second and thixd respectively at 20 per cent each. The low retention group chose a "minor in foreign language" as most popular, while "fluency" was second at 30 per cent, and a "major in foreign language" was selected by 10 per cent. The same question for the secondary qualifications finds a "minor in foreign language!" Iisted at 60 per cent for first choice of the high retention districts with a "major in foreign language" in second place at 50 per cent and "fluency" third at 30 per cent. The low retention group gave equal weight to a "major" and "minor" at 50 per cent each and "fluenoy" as third choice at 30 per cent. It may be noted that the low retention group placed a "minor" as first choice for grades \(K-8\) while the high retention districts did the same for grades 9-12. There appears to be a correlation between this item and item 2 regarding additional duties. Other qualifications are necessary due to foreign language being only part of the duties of the teacher.

Program continuity. Item 10 of the questionnaire read:

Does your foreign language program move sequentially through elementary and into
```

secondary with the same type of material for
each foreign language offered (same book series,
language lab, etc.)? Yes__No_
If yes, are the teachers included in the
selection? Yes_No
If no, please indicate method of selection:
A. By your office?
B. By the district administration?
C. By out-of-district personnel. (county)?
D. By individual schools?
E. By teachers?
F. Other? (explain)

```

This item shows the response regarding sequential use of materials for each foreign language offered. The high retention group indicated that 80 per cent use the same type of materials for different levels of instruction. The low retention districts indicate that only 40 per cent coordinate their foreign language program by sequential materials. The second part of the question, regarding teacher inclusion in the selection of materials, shows that 90.9 per cent of the high retention group and 50 per cent of the low retention districts do include teachers in the materials selection process. In the third part of the question, regarding methods of selection used when teachers are not included, the registered response (by the low retention group) "choosing teachers" was eliminated by the statement, "If no". There was a 50 per cent answer to this. "District administrator" was selected by 20 per cent of the low retention group, and "foreign language coordinator" by 10 per cent. Both high and low retention
groups appear to believe that there is coordination and sequential material selection throughout the districts, and both groups believe teachers should be included in the material selection.

Class size. Item 11 of the questionnaire read:
What is the maximum and minimum class size for foreign language instruction?
K-8 9-12
Maximum number
Minimum number \(\quad\) Maximum number

Statistics show a 31.8 average class size at the \(\mathrm{K}-8\) level as a maximum and a 16.5 minimum for the high retention districts. The low retention districts show an average of 34.5 maximum and 22.3 minimum. For the 9-12 program, the average maximum was 30.9 for the high and 32.4 for the low retention groups. The minimum number for the high retention group was 17, while 17.8 was indicated for the low retention districts. It would appear that there is no great disparity between these figures and those of the district administrator questionnaire which lists 16 minimum for the high and 17 minimum for the low retention districts.

Procedures when enrollment falls below minimum. Item 12 of the questionnaire read:

When, and if, a foreign language falls below a minimum does your office:
A. Arrange to transport students to another school to combine classes?
B. Continue below minimum to insure that the students acquire the necessary instruction?
C. Drop the class?
D. Other (explain)

Seventy per cent of the high retention districts prefer to continue the class when enrollment falls below the minimum and/or "combine classes" (50 per cent). of the low retention districts, 60 per cent preferred to "combine classes," 30 per cent to "continue the class," and 30 per cent to "drop the class." It will be noted that none of the high retention districts chose "drop the class." Transportation would be arranged to another school by 30 per cent of the high and 1.0 per cent of the low retention districts. Reasons given usually involved finances and efficient use of teacher time when combining classes and/or dropping the class.

Instructional time allotted for K-8 program. Item 13 of the questionnaire read:

Do all elementary (K-8) schools in the district allot the same amount of time to foreign language instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, what is the schedule? Please indicate.
A. Minutes each day
B. Minutes per week
C. Alternated with another subject(s):


If no, which office regulates the time schedule? Please indicate.
A. District office
B. Your offfice (Foreign Language Coordinator)
C. School principal
D. Teacher
E. Other (explain)

Eighty per cent of the high and 60 per cent of the Low retention groups allotted the same amount of time in K-8 schools throughout the district. The number of minutes per day was approximately the same for both groups, 30 per cent of the high and 31 per cent of the low group. This does not vary a great deal from the amount reported by the district administrators (37 minutes). Only a few responded to. the third part of the question regarding who regulated a time schedule. If there was a time allotted difference within the district, "school principal" was selected by 10 per cent of the high group and 20 per cent of the low while 10 per cent of each group also chose "district office."

Teacher in-service provisions. Item 14 of the questionnaire read:

Does your office arrange for district-wide
in-service education, coordination, and
articulation for foreign language teachers?
Yes \(\qquad\) No

If yes, please indicate:
A. Regular schedule of foreign language teacher meetings (other than social)?
B. Workshops on a district-wide basis?
C. Expert consultants?
D. Special college-credit classes?
E. Other (explain)

Answers recorded show that 100 per cent of the high retention districts and 90 per cent of the low retention districts arranged for in-servjce education. Of the high retention districts 100 per cent arranged regular teacher meetings; of the low retention districts, 70 per cent. "Workshops" and "expert consultant" were arranged by 90 per cent of the high retention districts, while the same items were arranged by 80 per cent and 70 per cent, respectively, of the low retention group. "Special college credit classes" were rated higher by the low retention districts (40 per cent) than that of the high retention group (20 per cent). There is agreement on what constitutes order of importance for in-service trajning of teachers. There is some indication that "special college credit classes" for the low groups could give incentive to improvement of abilities in the foreign language instruction area.

District arrangements for in-service. Item 15 of the questionnaire read:

Does your office or the district make arrangements for foreign language teachers to observe other teachers and methods of instruction? Yes No \(\qquad\) Permitted at district expense? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, please indicate:
A. Inter-school


Ninety per cent of the high and 80 per cent of the low retention districts provided opportunity for teachers to observe other methods of instruction. Of those, 80 per cent of the high and 60 per cent of the low groups had expenses paid by the district. Travel was limited to the state with further breakdown as follows: "interschool," 80 per cent for the high and 60 per cent for the low; "inter-county," 50 per cent high, 60 per cent low retention groups; "intra-county," 40 per cent high retention and 50 per cent low retention; "inter-state," 10 per cent high and 20 per cent of the low retention districts. Neither group was represented in the "out-ofstate" category. The only noticeable difference between this item of this questionnaire and that of the district administrator questionnaire (item number 7) is in the "out-of-state" question where the high group had 9.1 per cent and the low group registered 40 per cent. These answers may reflect direction from the district level to the coordinator level on actual practice to be followed.

Financial aid for teacher improvement. Item 16 of the questionnaire read:

When teachers attend workshops or classes for professional improvement are they assisted by financial aid from the district? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Responses regarding whether teachers are assisted
by the district with financial aid for professional
improvement indicate that 60 per cent of the high retention districts had such a policy, while in 37.5 per cent of the low retention districts teachers received such assistance.

Teacher professional improvement. Item l'7 of the questionnaixe read:

Are the foreign language teachers encouraged to attend professional improvement instjtutes (NDEA, etc.)? Yes_No__

If yes, do they receive advancement on the salary schedule for professional improvement?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Item results present the responses regarding whether teachers are encouraged to attend professional. improvement institutes; 90 per cent of the high retention districts and 100 per cent of the low retention districts answered this question in the affirmative. The percentages are reversed for the second part of the question, regarding advancement on salary schedule for institute attendance-100 per cent for the high retention group and 90 per cent for the low retention districts. Both groups appear to be willing to encourage and acknowledge professional improvement gained by institute attendance.

Number of foreign language teachers. Item 18 of the questionnaire read:
How many foreign language teachers do you have
in the district?
Fullotime: Part-time: Per cent
Flementary

Statistics reveal that the high retention districts employed an average of 44.6 full-time teachers of foreign language at the elementary level, while the low retention districts employed an average of 83 teachers. These figures are deceptive as full-time teachers include those who had duties in addition to foreign language instruction. An average of 43.1 foreign language teachers were listed for the high retention districts at the secondary level with a 42.7 teacher average for the low retention group. These figures are also deceptive as this is an average given and the range recorded is from 17 to 63. Part-time teachers listed are averaged at 4 for the high and 15 for the low retention groups. It would appear that more teachers in the low retention districts had foreign language instruction as an added duty than have the high retention districts.

Number of native speakers. Item 19 of the questionnaire read:

How many foreign language teachers in the district are native speakers of the language they teach
(ethnic background, lived in foreign country,
etc.)? Indicate:
Elementary system (K-8)
\(\ldots\) Secondary system (9-12)
Responses on this item indjcate that 77.4 per cent
of the \(\mathrm{K}-8\) teachers and 23.2 per cent of the \(9-12\) teachers in the high retention districts are native speakers of the language they teach; 23.7 teachers at the \(\mathrm{K}-8\) level and 30.5 teachers at the 9-12 level in the low retention districts are native speakers. It is noteworthy that the greater percentage of natjve speakers are at the secondary level. Some professionals believe that the greater emphasis should be placed on beginning instruction in order to imprint correct pronounciation at the earliest opportunity in the study of foreign language.

Employment of paraprofessionals. Item 20 of the questionnalre read:

Does the district employ paraprofessional (aides) to assist the foreign language teachers?
Yes \(\qquad\)
If yes, indicate those which apply:
A. Native speakers assisting with instruction
.
B. Native speakers who do not assist with instruction
C. Used only on a non-teaching basiss (setting up equipment, etc.)
D. Other (explein)

Thirty per cent of the high and 40 per cent of the low retention districts employed paraprofessionals. Neither group used "native speakers to assist with instruction." Twenty per cent of the low retention districts reported using native speaking paraprofessionals who did not assist with instruction. These figures are
at variance with those gathered from the district administrator questionnaire, where we note (item 5) that the high retention districts reported that 54.5 per cent used paraprofessionals at the K-8 level and the low retention districts reported that 33.3 per cent of them used paraprofessionals. Although this item recorded zero percentage for both groups using native speaking paraprofessionals for assistance in instruction, those percentages recorded for a like question on the district administrator instrument are at 54.5 for the high and 20 per cent for the low retention districts. The discrepancy may be accounted for in that policy is refilected in the responses of the district administrator, While prectice is reported by the coordinators.

Desire employment of paraprofessionals. Item 21 of the questionnaire read:

If you were able to employ paraprofessionals, would you do so? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If no, indicate those which apply:
A. It is not desirable.
B. It would increase supervision time. C. It would reduce money available for other needs.
D. Other (explain)

Would you use paraprofessionals if by doing so it would not cause the district, or your department, to lose needed budget allowance? Yes _._ No \(\qquad\) The response shows that 70 per cent of the high retention and 80 per cent of the low retention groups
would employ paraprofessional.s if they could. For those districts responding that they would not employ them, the reasons given by high retention districts were: "it would reduce money available," 20 per cent; and that it was "not desirable," 10 per cent. The low retention districts gave the following reasons for not wanting to employ paraprofessionals: "it would increase supervision time," 20 per cent; and "it would reduce money available," 20 per cent. With regard to the third part of the question, 90 per cent of both groups agreed that they would use paraprofessionals if such use would not cause a loss in budget allowance. It would appear that the main reason for not using paraprofessionals is one fiscal in nature and not an academic one.

Inclusion of cultural aspects. Item 22 of the questionnaire read:

Are the cultural aspects (customs, habitation, etc.) of the language part of the regular
instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, please indicate method.
A. Special films
B. Display of realia (articles of dress, etc.)
C. Supplementary reading material
D. Visits to ethnic surroundings (trip to Mexico, ethnic restaurants)
E. Role playing
F. Other (explain)

Recorded answers show that in 100 per cent of both
sample groups the cultural aspects of the language are part of the instruction. Other affirmative responses were as follows: the use of "special films," 100 per cent of both groups; "display of realia," 90.9 per cent for the high and 100 per cent for the low groups; "supplementary reading materials," 90.9 high and 100 per cent low; "visits to ethnic surroundings," 81.8 per cent for the high retention group and 50 per cent for the low; and "role playing," 72.7 per cent for the high and 100 per cent for the low retention group. In general, it might be said that both sample groups include every listed aspect of culture as an addition to the regular instruction program, although extent of use was not recorded.

Students corresponding with foreign countries. Item 23 of the questionnaire read:

Do the foreign language classes communicate by "Pen Pal" or "Tape Pal" with foreign countries?
Yes \(\qquad\) No

If yes, at what level?
A. Elementary (K-8)
B. Secondary (9-12)
C. Both \(A\) and \(B\)

Statistics show that 70 per cent of the high and 40 per cent of the low retention districts answered affirmatively the question regarding "Pen Pal" correspondence. The grade levels for the high retention districts were recorded as fol.jows: 10 per cent at the \(\mathrm{K}-8\) level;

30 per cent at the 9-12 level; and 40 per cent at both level.s. The low retention group responded that 20 per cent had such a program at the K- 8 level, 30 percent at the 9-12 level, but zero per cent at both levels. This last item (both levels) was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence. The significant point of the last i.tem appears to be an indicated lack of coordinated effort on the part of the low retention districts.

Foreign language clubs. Item 24 of the questionnaire read:

Are there foreign language clubs in:
A. Each elementary ( \(\mathrm{K}-8\) ) school?
B. Each secondary (9-1.2) school?
C. Some elementary schools. Amount? \(\qquad\) D. Some secondary school.s. Amount? \(\qquad\)
Results from this item indicate that of the high retention districts, 10 per cent have,foreign language clubs in each \(\mathrm{K}-8\) school, 20 per cent have them at each 9-12 school, 20 per cent have them in some K-8 schools, and 70 per cent have them in some 9-12 schools. The low retention districts report such clubs as follows: 30 per cent at each K-8 school; 70 per cent at each 9-12 school; 20 per cent at some \(\mathrm{K}-8\) schools; and 30 per cent at some 9-12 schools. The extent and scope of activity for these clubs was not recorded. Suffice to say that none were marked at zero percentage.

Extra-curricular activities. Item 25 of the questionnaire read:

Are the foreign language classes encouraged to participate in extra-curricular activities (school fairs, assemblies, parades, etc.)?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Both sample groups encouraged foreign language classes to participate in outside activities. The high retention group recorded 88.9 per cent and the low retention group 87.5 per cent thus engaged. Assistance, coordination and financial help were not recorded.

Reasons for failure of students to continue language after second year. Item 26 of the questionnaire read:

In general, in California why do most students
fail to continue foreign language in the second year of instruction at the secondary level?
Please indicate by rank order of preference.
(1. for main reason, 2. next most important, ete.)
A. Too difficult
B. Different method of instruction
C. Different type of material or lack of material (audio-visual, books)
D. Lack of scheduled time
E. Advice from counselors
F. Preference for another elective
G. Not needed for scheduled secondary program
H. Other (explain)

The most popular response from the high retention districts was "advice from the counselors" (100 per cent); the language "difficulty" rated 70 per cent; "preference for another elective" at 45.5 per cent; "not needed for
scheduled secondary program," 45.5 per cent; and "different method of instruction" was selected by 10 per cent. There was no recorded response for the item "different type of material." The low retention group gave a remarkably different set of answers with "too difficult" and "preference for another elective" both rating 80 per cent. "Not needed for scheduled secondary program" rated 60 per cent; "different type of instruction" and "advice from counselors" both rated the same at 40 per cent as did "different type of material" and "Jack of scheduled time" wi.th both at 10 per cent. The notable and statistically significant item at the .05 level was "advice from counselors" with 100 per cent registered for the high retention group compared wi.th 40 per cent for the low retention group. With the exception of the item "too difficult," there is little agreement between these two groups on this question.

Summary of foreign language coordinator questionnaire. The title of this position varies with the dutjes assigned to it, which include teaching, other instruction, and other supervision. The audiolingual method appears to be the choice of the majority of both sample groups; neither chose straight traditional at either level of instruction. Each group.appears to have automatic student-placement procedures. However, the per cent of the high retention
group is more than double that of the low retention group. Teacher recommendation is the majority choice of respondents that lack automatic placement, with the per cent of low retention group more than double that of the high. On.ly the low retention group used some standardized tests for placement purposes. Different instructional methods used in K-8 influenced placement by some districts in both the high and the low groups. Procedures used to place out-of-district ninth grade students were the same as those used with students from the district elementary schools who had been instructed by different methods of instruction at the K-8 level. There was agreement between both groups that inter-district transfers were placed at the same level with no loss due to transfer.

The low retention districts recorded less than 50 per cent as having enough qualified teachers and listed teacher recommendation and letter grades as means of limiting enrollment. A major and minor in the language being taught was the main qualification for teachers at both \(K-8\) and 9-12 levels. A sequential program of instruction from elementary into secondary was recorded higher by twice the amount by the high retention districts over the low retention districts. Teachers were included in the selection of materials in 90 per cent of the high group compared to 50 per cent in the low group. Class
size does not vary appreciably between the two groups, each of which reflected a maximum of approximately 30 students. When enrollment drops, the procedures to continue the class do not vary greatly, except that none in the high retention group would drop the class and 30 per cent of the low group would. There is little difference between the groups with regard to instructional time. Each group reported an average of approximately 30 minutes per day.

Both the high and the low retention groups favor in-service meetings and district reimbursement for inservice travel within the state; neither group favored district paymert for out of state travel. This response differs with that of the district administrator to the same item. Financial aid will be furnished for workshops or classes for teachers by some districts, but the majority will increase salary if improvement is achieved in classes or workshops. The number of full-time foreign language teachers varies greatly at the \(K-8\) level; the low retention districts had almost double the amount of the high retention districts; possibly due to foreign language instruction being only a part of their duty. Nativespeaker teachers do not account for one-half of the instructional staff in either group; none of the nativespeaking paraprofessionals assisting with instruction.

Both groups would employ paraprofessionals, especially if it did not entail added cost to the budget. Including cultural aspects in the teaching process was favored by 100 per cent of both groups, of which 50 per cent or more listed cultural activities. There appears to be little coordinated effort for "pen pal" correspondence; however, there is some activity in each group, and level, with foreign language club extra-curricular activity encouraged. The one significant difference between the high and the low retention districts on this questionnaire concerns reasons for failure to continue language study after the second year. Advice from counselors is given by the low retention group in only 40 per cent of the cases but 100 per cent of the high retention group list this as the main cause of failure to continue.

Head Counselor Questionnaire

Twenty head counselors responded to the questionnaire--1.0 from the high retention districts and 10 from the low retention districts. As in the two previous questionnaires, there may be a discrepancy in the total number of recorded answers due to failure of respondents in one or the other group to respond to a particular item. The items and responses follow:

Assistance in course selection. Item 1. of the questionnajre read:

Do the counselors assist eighth grade students in course selection prior to entrance into the ninth grade? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
There was a unanimous response (100 per cent of both the bigh and the low retention groups) regarding counselor assistance for eighth grade students prior to entry into the ninth grade.

Policies for student selection of foreign language.
Item 2 of the questionnaire read:
Are all eighth grade students allowed to select a foreign language at the ninth grade level?
Yes \(\qquad\)
If yes, are they encouraged to continue with the language etudied at the elementary level?
Yes \(\qquad\) NO \(\qquad\)
If no, what are the restrictions that your district
places upon continuing foreign language instruction?
Please indicate.
A. Achievement level (by letter grade)

Minimum
B. Teacher recommendation
——C. Ability level (standardized test) Minimum I.Q.
D. Track selection (college preparation, etc.)
E. Parent objection
F. Other (explain)

Results obtained indicate that 60 per cent of the high retention group stated that students were allowed to select a foreign language at the ninth grade, while 55.6 per cent of the low group said the same. Of those districts answering the first part of the question
affirmatively, 40 per cent of the high and 30 per cent of the low groups stated that the students were encouraged to continue in the same language.

The last part of the question lists restrictions placed on continuance of a foreign language, if the answer to the fjrst part of the question was negative. The high retention group rated "achievement" 70 per cent, low at 30 percent; "teacher recommendation," 80 per cent high group, and 50 per cent low; "parent objections," 60 per cent for the high group, 20 per cent for the low; "ability level," 30 per cent high group, 10 per cent low; "track selection," 10 per cent high group, 30 per cent low group. Of the districts answering negatively, "teacher recommendation," "achievement level," and "parent objection" were the three main reasons for the high retention groups with "teacher recommendation," "achievement level," and "teacher selection" the main restrictions for the low group.

Student placement procedures. Item 3 of the questionnaire read:

Do the counselors administer foreign language proficiency tests in order to facilitate proper placement level at the secondary (9-12) school? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If no, please indicate method.
A. Automatic placement at second year in high school foreign language class (after two or more years of foreign language instruction at the elementary level).


None of the counselors in the high retention districts use tests for placement and only 10 per cent of the low retention districts use such tests. The methods used to determine placement were as follows: "teacher recommendation" (100 per cent of both groups used this method); "automatic placement" was practiced by 40 per cent of the high retention group and by 50 per cent of the low; and "level of student attainment" at the elementary. level was used as a placement determiner by 10 per cent of both groups.

There is a discrepancy between these figures and those gathered in the foreign language coordinator questionnaire (item 4), which shows that 33 per cent of the high group and 70 per cent of the low retention group rely on "teacher recommendations" and that "automatic placement" is practiced at 66 per cent of the high and 30 per cent of the low retention districts as compared with the responses given by the counselor to this item on the questionnaire.

Information provided students by counselors. Item 4 of the questionnaire read:

Do the counselors inform the ninth grade entrants that only two years of foreign language at the secondary (9-12) level is required for college preparation? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
One hundred per cent of both groups answered this question affirmatively. In the opinion of this researcher, one of the main reasons for foreign language mortality may stem from the answer given on this one question.

Counselor advisement for foreign language study. Item 5 of the questionnaire read:

In general, how many years of foreign language instruction does the high school counselor advise an entering student to take? Please indicate.
A. Minimum of two years
\(\square\) B. Three years
———. Four years
———D. Other (explein)
Counselor's advice to students with regard to the number of years to take foreign language in the high retention districts is 40 per cent "two years" with 50 per cent recommended by the low retention group. Thirty per cent of the high retention districts recommend "three years" study while 10 per cent of the low retention so state, 60 per eent of the high retention districts recommend "four years" and 40 per cent of the low recommend this. The student plan may well be set when he is informed in question 4 that only two years is required even though only 40 per cent of the districts have recommended this amount of time.

Explanation of four-year benefits given. Item 6 of the questionnaire read:

Is an explanation to outline benefits of continuing a four year course of foreign language given to the incoming student? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Sixty per cent of the high retention districts and 81.8 per cent of the low retention districts outined the benefits of a four-year course of foreign language instruction. Although a large majority of the low retention group answered affirmatively to this question, the retention figures indicate a lack of student agreement.

Procedures for dropping a foreign language course. Item 7 of the questionnaire read:

When working with the ninth graders for a tenth year program, do the counselors request a reason for the student's dropping of a foreign language?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, is the reason recorded? Yes__ No \(\qquad\)
If recorded, indicate reason(s) most frequently given.
A. Too difficult
——B. Different method of instruction
C. Different materials (audio-visual, books, etc.)
D. Did not like the teacher
E. Not interesting
F. Other (explain)

Eighty per cent of both groups do request a reason for students dropping the course; there is, however, a lack of majority in either group recording the reasons for such action. High retention districts record reasons at the
at the rate of 37.5 per cent while the low retention group records at 42.9 per cent. "Different methods of instruction" (20 per cent for both groups) and "not interesting" (10 per cent of both groups) appear to be the main reasons recorded. Only the low retention districts record "teacher dislike" at 10 per cent.

Number of students allowed. Item 8 of the questionnaire read:

Are the counselors notified of the number of students to be allowed in foreign language study?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If yes, is it for each level of instruction?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
It yes, who makes the determination? Please indicate.
A. Your office (Head counselor)
——B. District Administration
C. Curriculum Coordinator
D. Other (explain)

Statistics recorded show that 10 per cent of the high retention group and 20 per cent of the low retention group answered in the affirmative. The rest of the question is superfluous since the greater number of the counselors did not receive notification of number of students allowed and were evidently not restricted on number or entry.

Counselor grouping by ability. Item 9 of the questionnaire read:

Does the counseling staff assist in foreign language grouping of elementary students by ability?
Yes \(\qquad\) No. \(\qquad\)
If yes, do the several classes of foreign language taught by different teachers generally keep together in the amount of work they cover?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
In 88.9 per cent of the high retention districts the counseling staff assisted in foreign language ability grouping, while only 40 per cent of the low retention districts had such practices. This difference was significant at the .05 level. The second part of the question regarding amount of work covered by teachers received an affirmative answer from 62.5 per cent of the hjogh retention group and 100 per cent of those in the low retention groups who had answered affirmatively on the first part of the question.

Grouping for instruction. Item 10 of the questionnaire read:

Does the district use ability grouping for foreign language instruction in the secondary schools?
Yes \(\qquad\)
If yes, please indicate method.
A. By standardized foreigr language proficiency tests
B. By district-made tests
C. By teacher recommendation
D. Other (explain)

Recorded statistics show that 60 per cent of both groups use ability grouping at the secondary level. Other (D) methods used were "teacher recommendation" ( 40 per cent
for both the high and low districts) and "standardized tests" (20 per cent for the high retention group and 30 per cent for the low retention group). Neither group determined grouping by "district-made tests."

Teacher referral criteria requesting student drop.
Item ll of the questionnaire read:
What are the jndicated criteria used by teachers for referring students to the counselors to change a student from a foreign language course to another subject? Please indicate.
A. Lack of foreign language ability
B. Low grade point (C, D, F)
C. Student decision
D. Other (explain)
"Lack of foreign language ability" was the criterion used 1070 per cent of the high retention group and 90 per cent of the low retention group for referring students to counselors for a change in class schedule. "Low grade point" is the highest percentage for the high retention group at 90 per cent with the low group 80 per cent for the same item. "Student decision" was used in 70 per cent and 40 per cent of the high and low districts respectively. "Low grade point." for the high retention and "lack of ability" for the low have the same weight in this area.

Reason for high attrition rate at secondary level. Item 12 of the questionnaire read:

From the counseling viewpoint, what is the reason for high attrition in the foreign language program at the secondary (9-12) level? Please indicate.
A. Different method of instruction
B. College preparatory students know that only two years of foreign language are required
C. The advanced classes are too difficult
 discouraged from continuing E. Other (explain)

Reasons given for the high foreign language attrition are "different methods of instruction," 50 per cent for the high and 30 per cent for the low retention group. "Only two years needed" received 70 per cent from the high group and 50 per cent from the low group. "Advanced class difficulty" was selected by only 50 per cent of the high. retention districts while 80 per cent of the low retention districts selected this reason. The noncollege category was selected by 50 per cent of the high and 30 per cent of the low retention groups.

Characteristics of students continuing four years.
Item 13 of the questionnaire read:
In your experience, what do you believe identifies the student who continues foreign language study for the entire secondary (9-12) school period (4 years)? Please indicate.
_ A. They have high foreign language ability
B. They are college preparatory
C. They have been encouraged to continue
D. They had competent command of the foreign language prior to entry into the secondary (9-12) program
E. Other (explain)

Selections show that 100 per cent of the high
retention group and 70 per cent of the low retention group
believe the primary characteristic that identifies the continuing student is that he has been encouraged to do so. Second choice of reason is "foreign language ability," which was selected by 90 per cent of the high retention districts and by 60 per cent of the low retention districts. "College preparatory" ranks third with 80 per cent of the high retention group and 50 per cent of the low group. "Competent prior language command" is the next choice of 50 per cent of the high retention group and 20 per cent of the low retention group. Encouragement appears to be one of the keys to keeping a student in the foreign language program for the four-year sequential program.

Summary of head counselor questionnaire. There was unanimous agreement among both the high and the low retention districts that counselors do assist students in course selection prior to entrance into the ninth grade. Slightly more than half of the districts allowed students to select a foreign language at the ninth grade; less than half of those encouraged the student to continue the language studied at the elementary level. In order of preference, restrictions used to limit enrollment were: teacher recommendation, achievement level, and parent objection. The response was almost unanimous not to use foreign language proficiency tests for placement, relying instead on teacher recommendation. Automatic placement at
the second year of high school foreign language study rated second.

All districts inform the student that only two years of foreign language are needed for college preparation, but more than half recommend a four-year course. The benefits of a four-year course are explained to the greater proportion of the students; and although the counselors ask to know the reason when the course is dropped, they do not often record that reason.

Most counselors are not notified of the number of students to be allowed in foreign language classes; they do assist in abjlity grouping of potential students.

Ability grouping is used by the majority of the schools in the secondary system but most students are grouped according to teacher recommendation.

Lack of foreign language ability and low grade poinc are the main criteria used by teachers to refer students for course changes. When asked for their viewpoint on the reasons for high attrition in foreign language programs at the secondary level, the low retention group responded that advanced classes were too difficult; the high retention districts responded that students knew that only two years were required for college work. When asked what characteristic identified the student who continued foreign language instruction for the entire secondary school period,
all of the high retention districts responded that the main factor was that he had been encouraged. Seventy per cent of the low retention districts agreed. The next two most frequently stated reasons were that they had foreign language ability and that they were preparing for college.
II. INTERCORRELATED QUESTIONS

WHERE CONTENT IS SIMIIAR

This section will compare those items in the three questionnaires which request answers to items of similar content. The key to abbreviations used is as follows: DA--District Administrator

FLC--Foreign Language Coordinator
HC--Head Counselor
DF---Degree of Freedom
\(x^{2}-\) Chi square
Questions which correlate in content are identified by the computer as correlations \(A\) through \(T\) with question correlations of two or more responses, each marked with the above symbols to indicate questionnaire source. "High" indicates districets with a high retention of foreign language students; "low" indjcates districts with a low retention of foreign language students.

Table I indicates that both high and low retention districts reimburse teachers for approved travel.

TABLE I
CORRELATION A - TEACHER TRAVEL AT DISTRICT EXPENSE
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrll}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 7 & DA & 11 & 9 & 0 & 1 & 21 \\
15 & FLC & 9 & 8 & 1 & 2 & 20 \\
Total & 20 & 17 & 1 & 3 & 41 \\
\(X^{2}=2.415\) & Not significant & DF \(^{2}=3\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table II shows a low Chi Square, indicating that both high and low retention districts want teachers to meet and discuss problems and solutions.

TABLE II
CORRELATION B - TEACHER MEETINGS TO DISCUSS PROBLEMS
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{l} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 8 & DA & 10 & 9 & 1 & 1 & 21 \\
14 & FLC & 10 & 9 & 0 & 1 & 20 \\
Total & 20 & 18 & 1 & 2 & 41 \\
\(X^{2}=0.692\) & Not significant & DF & \(=3\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table III reports that the consensus is that there should be no minimum class size in order to continue foreign language instruction. It is the theory rather than practice that is accentuated at this point. Financial obligations have interfered with desire in the fulfillment of this stated objective, according to actual conversation by this researcher and personnel encountered.

\section*{I'ABLH III}

CORRETATIION D - MINIMUM ON CLASS SIZE
TO CONTINUE FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN GRADES 9-12


The district administrators are divided almost equally in both the high and the low retention districts concerning transporting studerits to another school to combine and continue a foreign language when enrollment drops. It is to be noticed that the foreign language coordinators disagree with the district administrators in both the high and low retention districts. District administrators may be reflecting policy while the foreign
language coordinators may be reflecting practice.

TABLE IV
CORRELATION E - TRAVEL TO COMBTIVE CIASSES
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 11 & DA & 5 & 5 & 4 & 5 & 19 \\
12 & FLC & 3 & 1 & 7 & 9 & 20 \\
Total & & 8 & 6 & 11 & 14 & 39 \\
\(X^{2}=21.381\) & Signigicant at .001 level & DF & \(=3\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Although significant at the . OOl level of confidence, it is noteworthy to observe in Table \(V\) that the Ioreign language coordinators in the high retention districts do not agree with the administrators on the need for additional teaching personnel.

TABLE V
CORRELATION F - SHORTAGE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{l} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 13 & DA & 1 & 2 & 10 & 8 & 21 \\
8 & FLC & 6 & 2 & 4 & 8 & 20 \\
Total \\
\(X^{2}=29.459\) & Significant at.001 level & DF \(=3\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Significance of need for special teachers in grades \(K-8\) is evident according to Table VI. As in Table V, there is a disparity to be found in FLC answers when compared to those of the DA.

TABLE VI
CORREIATION G - FOREIGN LANGUAGE A PARTT OF TEACHER DUTY IN K-8
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Question Number & Source & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { High } \\
& \text { Yes }
\end{aligned}
\] & Low Yes & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { High } \\
\text { No }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Low } \\
& \text { No }
\end{aligned}
\] & Total \\
\hline 14 & DA & 6 & 7 & 4 & 2 & 19 \\
\hline 9 & FLC & 3 & 1 & 7 & 9 & 20 \\
\hline Total & & 9 & 8 & 11 & 11 & 39 \\
\hline \(x^{2}=50.730\) & Si. & icant & . 0 & level & DF & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The use of paraprofessionals appears to be a desirable asset to the instruction of FL classes as indicated by Table VII. Some districts admit to the need for such assistance but lack sufficient finances to implement such programs. Districts that lack sufficient bilingual teachers appear to have the greater need but also lack the finances to remedy the situation.

TABLE VII
CORRELATION H - USE OF PARAPROFESSIONALS TO ASSIST IN K-8
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 15 & DA & 6 & 2 & 5 & 4 & 17 \\
20 & FLC & 3 & 4 & 7 & 6 & 20 \\
Total & & 9 & 6 & 12 & 10 & 37 \\
\(X^{2}=9.335\) & Significant at .05 level & DF \(=3\)
\end{tabular}

The corvelation reported in Table VIII is that wherein the DA questionnaire relates to election of foreign language, the \(H C\) questionnaire asks the minimum years of study advocated. The district administrators believe that foreign language courses should be elective, while approximately 50 per cent of the counselors advise only two years. As an elective, a subject will be of little benefit without encouragement and sound advice from the counseling staff.

TABLE VIII
CORRETATION I - FOREIGN LANGUAGE
AS AN ELECTIVE IN NINTH GRADE
\begin{tabular}{lcrcccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 5 & DA & 11 & 10 & 0 & 0 & 21 \\
5 & HC & 4 & 5 & 6 & 5 & 20 \\
Total & 15 & 15 & 6 & 5 & 41 \\
\(X^{2}=64.750\) & Significant at .001 level & DF \(=3\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table IX shows an agreement between DA and HC on placement of students by grouping and/or proficiency, with the low retention districts at the DA level unanimous in placement according to proficiency. Subjective observation and subsequent conversation on site indicates this to be desire rather than reality in the opinion of the investigator.

> TABLE IX
> CORRELATION J - PLACEMENT ACCORDING
> TO PROFICIENCY OR GROUPING
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 9 & DA & 7 & 10 & 4 & 0 & 21 \\
10 & HC & 6 & 6 & 4 & 4 & 20 \\
Total & & 13 & 16 & 8 & 4 & 41 \\
\(X^{2}=15.162\) & Significant at .01 & DF \(=3\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Both FIC and HC rate counseling as the main deterrent to high foreign language retention through four years of secondary foreign language study according to Table X. However, with the knowledge that this is so, the counseling staff report encouraging students who are college preparatory to select foreign language for a two year period.

TABIE X
CORRELATION K - FEASON FOR HTGH ATTRITION IN FORETGN LANGUAGE PROGRAMS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEI,
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { High } \\
& \text { Yes }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Jow } \\
& \text { Yes }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Hi.gh } \\
& \text { No }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Low } \\
& \text { No }
\end{aligned}
\] & Totial \\
\hline 26 & FTC & 7 & 8 & 3 & 2 & 20 \\
\hline 12 & HC & 5 & 3 & 5 & 7 & 20 \\
\hline Total & & 12 & 11 & 8 & 9 & 40 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{X}^{2}=29.000\) & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Significant at . 001} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(D F=3\)} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table XI reveals that the DA believe the reason for continuity through four years of secondary foreign language is for college preparation, while the \(H C\) believe it to be the result of encouragement. The fact that it is encouraged (on the surface) by HC makes the viewpoint diametrically opposed to the opinion of DA on the same question.

TABLE XI
CORRELATION L - REASON FOR FOREIGN
IANGUAGE INSTRUCITION IN 9-12
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 25 & DA & 10 & 7 & 1 & 3 & 21 \\
13 & HC & 9 & 6 & 1 & 4 & 20 \\
Totai & 19 & 13 & 2 & 7 & 41 \\
\(X^{2}=1.664\) & Not significant & DF \(=3\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Both high and low retention districts agree that they provide for articulation, according to Table XII. This is not borne out by related questions throughout the rest of the questionnaires.

TABLE XII
CORRELATION M - PROVISIONS FOR
CONTINUITY AND ARTICULATION
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
NO
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 3 & DA & 8 & 7 & 2 & 3 & 20 \\
3 & FLC & 8 & 8 & 2 & 2 & 20 \\
Total & 16 & 15 & 4 & 5 & 40 \\
\(X_{2}^{2}=1.000\) & Not significant & DF \(=3\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table XIII does not show significance between continuity and articulation, and reason for dropping out of foreign language. On the contrary there appeaxs to be unanimity between the DA and the HC that continuity and articulation do exist.

TABLE XIII
CORRETATION O - CONTINUITY AND ARTICULATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & High
Yes & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Low } \\
& \text { Yes }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\underset{\text { No }}{\underset{\mathrm{Nigh}}{ }}
\] & Low
No & Total \\
\hline 3 & DA & 8 & 7 & \(?\) & 3 & 20 \\
\hline 7 & HC & 8 & 8 & 2 & 2 & 20 \\
\hline rotal & & 16 & 1.5 & 4 & 5 & 40 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{X}^{2}=1.000\) & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Not signifiicant} & DF \(=\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Both DA and FLC in the high retention districts agree that there is a uniform method of instruction as Table XIV shows. There is a difference of opinion between what the low retention \(F L C\) reports and the answers given by the low retention DA.

TABLE XIV
CORRETATION P - UNIFORM METHOD OF INSTRUCTION
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 3 & DA & 8 & 7 & 2 & 3 & 20 \\
10 & FLC & 8 & 4 & 2 & 6 & 20 \\
Total & & I6 & 11 & 4 & 9 & 40 \\
\(X^{2}=9.000\) & Significant at .05 & DF & \(=3\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Administrative policy on specified minimum amounts of class time is reported in Table XV. There appears to be agreement in both DA and FIC responses. The reader must understand that this table represents policy which is not necessarily the same as practice.

TABLE XV
CORRETATION R - SPECIFIED AMOUNT
OF CIASS TIME REQUIRED
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total. \\
\hline 6 & DA & 11 & 9 & 0 & 1 & 21 \\
13 & FIJC & 8 & 6 & 2 & 4 & 20 \\
Total & & 19 & 15 & 2 & 5 & 41 \\
\(X^{2}=13.659\) & Significant at .01 & DF & \(=3\) & \\
\hline \hline
\end{tabular}

Although the statistical significance is high, as can be seen in Table XVI, there appears to be a difference of opinion between DA and FLC regarding travel at district expense.

\section*{TABLE XVI \\ CORRETATION \(S\) - TRAVET OF POREIGN IANGUAGE TEACHER AT DISTRTCT EXPENSE}
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{l} 
High \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Low \\
Yes
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
High \\
No
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Low \\
No
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline 7 & DA & 11 & 9 & 0 & 1 & 21 \\
16 & FLC & 6 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 18 \\
Total & & 17 & 12 & 4 & 6 & 39 \\
\(X^{2}=38.935\) & Significant at .001 & DF \(=3\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table XVII shows correlation between DA teacher travel policy with FLC attendance at institutes for professional improvement. Mhough not statistically significant, it is noteworthy that both agree to improvement of staff which jmplies district willingness to provide financial aid.

The missing tables, \(C, N\), and \(Q\) were eliminated because incorrect information was provided for computer analysis.

\section*{TABTE XVII}

CORREAATTON T - ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEACHERS TO ATMEND INSTMTUTES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Question Number & Source & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { High } \\
& \text { Yes }
\end{aligned}
\] & Low
Yes & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { High } \\
& \text { No }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Low } \\
& \text { No }
\end{aligned}
\] & Total \\
\hline \(?\) & DA & 11. & 9 & 0 & 1. & 21 \\
\hline 17 & FTC & 9 & 1.0 & 1. & 0 & 20 \\
\hline Total & & 20 & 19 & 1 & ] & 41 \\
\hline \(x^{2}=3.215\) & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Not sjgnificant} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(D F=3\)} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Aocording to the above statistical data, there are ejeven atems with significance at or above the .05 Level. of contidence, using the Chi Squere statistical tool with varied degrees of rreedon. Table XVIII shows the item category and degree of significance of those correlated questions which have a Chi Square at or above the .05 level of confidence.

TABTE XVIII
ITEM CATEGORY AND DEGREE OF SIGNJFICANCE OF CORRELATED QUESTIONS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Correla- } \\
& \text { tion }
\end{aligned}
\] & Category & Question Nunber & Source & \begin{tabular}{l}
Ch: \\
Square
\end{tabular} & Level of Confidence \\
\hline D & Minimum Class Size & \[
\frac{10}{8}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DA } \\
& \text { FLC } \\
& \text { HC }
\end{aligned}
\] & 75.707 & . 001 \\
\hline E & Travel to Combine Classes & \[
\frac{11}{12}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DA } \\
& F L C
\end{aligned}
\] & 21.381 & . 001 \\
\hline F & Foreign Language Teacher Shortage & \[
\begin{array}{r}
13 \\
8
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { DA } \\
\text { FLC }
\end{array}
\] & 29.459 & . 001 \\
\hline \(G\) & Foreign Language Part of Class Duty & \[
\begin{array}{r}
14 \\
9
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { DA } \\
\text { FIC }
\end{array}
\] & 50.730 & . 001 \\
\hline H & Use of Paraprofessionals & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 15 \\
& 20
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\frac{\mathrm{DA}}{\mathrm{Fi} \mathrm{I} C}
\] & 9.335 & . .05 \\
\hline I & Foreign Language Election at Ninth Grade & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 5 \\
& 5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DA } \\
& \text { HC }
\end{aligned}
\] & 64.750 & . 001 \\
\hline J & Proficiency Placement & \[
\begin{array}{r}
9 \\
10
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{DA} \\
& \mathrm{HC}
\end{aligned}
\] & 15.162 & . 01 \\
\hline K & Why Attrition & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 26 \\
& 12
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\underset{\mathrm{HC}}{\mathrm{FIC}}
\] & 29.000 & . 003 \\
\hline P & Uriform Instruction & \[
\begin{array}{r}
3 \\
10
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\mathrm{DA} \\
\text { ELC }
\end{array}
\] & 9.000 & . 05 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABIE XVITI(continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Correla- } \\
& \text { tion }
\end{aligned}
\] & Category & \begin{tabular}{l}
Question \\
Number
\end{tabular} & Source & \begin{tabular}{l}
Chat \\
Square
\end{tabular} & Level of Confidence \\
\hline R & Required Class Time & \[
\begin{array}{r}
6 \\
13
\end{array}
\] & \[
\frac{D A}{F I C C}
\] & 13.659 & . 01 \\
\hline S & Travel at District Expense & \[
16
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { DA } \\
\text { FLC }
\end{array}
\] & 38.935 & . 001 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Summery of Intercorrelated Questions

Correlation D indicates that there should be no minimum class size, but that instruction should be provided for a student if lack of instruction will cause a break in the continuity or articulation of the student's foreign language program.

Correlation E would have the administration provide transportation to another school within the district if class enrollment falls below the minimum for efficient operation.

Correlation F brings attention to the need to recruit additional teachers in order to insure that sufficient qualified personnel are available to conduct foreign Ianguage classes.

Correlation \(G\) would remind the districts that the teaching of foreign language is a specialty and should not be the added burden of a regular classroom teacher. That the classroom teacher can be of great influence in the continuity of foreign language is not to be dismissed. They should not, however, be expected to be a specialist in all fields because they may not be qualified either by training or experience.

Correlation \(H\) indicates a need for paraprofessionals as teacher aides. The native speaker can help to insure correct pronunciation, help with sentence structure, and
provide reading assistance, provided the aide is qualified. By itself, the aide's ability to speak the language does not insure correct foreign language instruction.

Correlation I would have foreign language courses elective at the ninth grade level in order that students may select a foreign language for reasons other than preparation for college entrance.

Correlation \(J\) indicates the need for correct placement of incoming students according to individual level. of proficiency. This will be a deterrant to the foreign language attrition brought about by the repetition of an instructional level beyond which the student may have aiready progressed.

Correlation \(K\) leaves no doubt as to the need for counselors to change from recommerdations for two years of foreign language study to recommendations for four years of study if foreign language attrition is a problem in the district. Both high retention districts and low retention districts indicate that the counseling process is one of the reasons for the foreign language dropout rate in grades nine through twelve.

Correlation \(P\) shows a need for continuity in foreign language instruction method if student interest is to be maintained. Indications are students do not want to be taught by the audio-lingual method at the elementary level
only to be changed to the traditional method upon arrival at the high school. Nelther would this same student enjoy foreign language if the books and other materials were diferent at the various schools within a district.

Correlation R would stress the need for sufficient regular class time which would allow continuity, thereby preventing the need fox complete relearning resulting from lack of sufficient class time.

Correlation \(S\) would bring attention to the need for teachers and other foreign language staff memoers to travel. Fhe only way that district travel policy would be effective is for the district to provide released time and adequate remuneration. By providing educational travel to other districts, staces, and possibly foreign countries, the district administration would insure the continued interest of staff personnel in foreign language instruction which is constantly changing in scope and content.

Table XVIII indicates the category and degree of significance for each correlated question.

IIT. CTASSROOM OBSERVATION USING MATHIEU AUDIO-LINGUAL CHECKIIST:

While visiting each district to conduct interviews With the district administrators, foreign language coordinators, and head counselors, the investigator made arrangements to sit in on at least one ciass in each district. This was not for casual observation of plant facilities but an observation of a complete period of foreign language instruction. In some districts, when time was available, there were as many as three classes visited, each with instruction in e different language.

The "Checklst of What the Audio-Tingual Teacher Should Not Do," developed by Dr. Gustave Mathiel, was used to record observation in each foreign language class visited. The checklist is composed of 27 items of which six concerned laboratory work which would not be seen at the time of the observation and thus were not reported. The entire checklist is reproduced in Appendix J. The results were compiled using the Chi Square ( \(\mathrm{X}^{2}\) ) \(2 \times 2\) with Yates Correction and one (I) degree of freedom (DF). Question numbers, the tabulated results according to high retention district and low retention district answers, and the statistical significance according to the Chi Square Distribution as listed in Probability and

Statistics 55 are recorded in Appendix \(M\). It must be remembered that this is entirely
subjective and based only on the investigator's experience and instruction received from advisors of the University of the Pacific and John Dusel of the California. State Department of Education.

This section of Chapter IV is one that must be assessed by the reader who should bear in mind that the ertire investigation of this aspect of forejgn language instruction is reported and interpreted subjectively by the researcher. The tabulation and statistical results are the only objective part. There was a serious and honest attempt ad objectivity in observation in that there were no lists available to the researcher at the time of observation which designated the standing of the district as a high or low retention district. It must also be understood that this summary js an extrapolation based on that which the researcher believes should characterize aforeign language class.

The reason for reporting these data is to show that performance at the classroom level may be one of the criteria that explain why one district may produce and retain qualified students at a higher ratio than another

55Alder, op. cit.
district. Method and personmel are reflected in the recorded checklist observations.

Chi Square statistics are reported at the .05 level a.s a minimum acceptable and at the . .001 level as the maximum recorded. The following adjudication is based on the supposition that favorable answers recorded using the Chi Square formula for signifjcance are those obtained in those districts listed as having a lower rate of decline in student enrollment.

The statistical data reported in the Appendix Indicate an overwhelming subjective rating on most items In favor oi the high retextion districts, those districts having forefg language student retention greater than 10 per cert.

Item 1-Class conducted almost entirely in English. This item was marked "yes" if the teacher and class conf'ined the use of foreign language to specified items of reading or repetitjon. This item was significant at the .001. level.

Item 2 - Class conducted in FL except for "real communication" situations. This item was marked "yes" iff the class work, such as reading and translation, was in the foreign. language but communication between teacher
and student was condueted in English. .. Thiss item was significant at the ool level.

Item 3 - Interweaving-iee, half foreign language and half English in same utterance. This item was marked "iyes" if the teacher mixed languages in the same sentence using only certain commonly known words and phrases in a repetitious manner. This item was significant at the .OJ level.

Item 4 - Students allowed to use English and/or to interweave languages. This item was marked "yes" if students used English in the classroom instruction and/or used the two languages intemittently. This item was significant at the . 001 level.

Item 5 - Straight translation exercises-foreign Ianguage to Engiish. This item was marked "yes" if students were allowed to translate foreign language on \(\exists_{0}\) verbatim basis without care for clarity of meaning. This item was significant at the . 01 leve1.

Item 6-More time spent talking about language than talking language. This item was marked "yes" if class discussions were in English and concerned explanations of method,
pronunciation, and so forth, with explanation and discussion dominating the greater proportion of class time. This item was sigrificant at the . 001 level.

Item 7 - Oral report by student in English. This item was marked "yes" if reports of forejgn language interest were made in Engish rather than the language being studied. This item was significant at the . OOL level.

Item 8 - Most of class conducted with books open. This item was marked "yes" if the class used the book sentences as the main source of vocabulary and practice. This item was significant at the . 001 leveI.

Item 9 - Pattern practice conducted exclusively with books open. This item was marked "yes" if pattern practice relied on printed material as gutuelines for response rather than teacher-student dialogue. This item was significant at the .001 level.

Item 10- Departure from text resulting in incorrect language. This item was marked "yes" if students used incorrect language when not
using textbooks. Note that in neither high nor low retention districts were students adversely affected by departure from the text. The results were not statistically significant and may indicate that departure from the text is a desirable method of instruction.

Item 11-Student mistakes allowed to go incorrected. This item was marked "yes" if the teacher did not hear, remark, or correct either a mispronunciation or incorrect word arrange-. ment. This item was significant at the .001 level.

Item 12-Misuse of exercise, such as pattern practice used for translation, or conversation as monologue. This item was marked "yes" if the teacher used sentences, which should have been used to increase proficiency, as items for display of knowledge or if the teacher had one student translate or use a dialogue as an exercise in translation or reading skill. Neither high nor low districts were affected in this area. No statistical significance was noted.
Item 13 -Impossibility for student to hear what was
said by another student. This item was marked "yes" if the teacher allowed a student to speak in an inaudible voice without bringing it to his attention. As neither group was adversely affected by this practice the item was not statistically significant.

Item 14- "Games" that waste time which could be used more effectively in language practice. This item was marked "yes" if ganes were used excessively to the exclusion of structured language practice. Usually the "games" required no great display of ability or knowledge of the foreign language being studied. This item was significant at the . 001 level.

Item 25-Class turned into "deaf and dumb" silent study period without student-teacher exchange. This item was marked "yes" if students were left on their own without teacher supervision or "feedback"
assistance. This item was significant at the . OO1 level.

Item 18-Room does not reflect culture of foreign
language. This item was marked "yes" if
the room was void or nearly vold of items of interest about the land(s) of which the language is native. Reference is to decorations, bulletin boards, posters, and so forth. This item was significant at the .01 level.

Item 19-Student allowed to engage in non-pertinent activity. This jtem was marked "yes" if class time was lost by activity not related to language study or culture. Reference is to disregard by teacher of student activity when not engaged in assigned tasks or teacher--student exchange. This item was significant at the .001 level.

Item 22- Language modeled incorrectly by teacher. This item was marked "yes" if, in the writer's opinion, the teacher was not proficient or capable either with language content and/or pronunciation. This item was significant at the .OO1 level.

Item 24- Language modeled correctly but with unclear enunciation. This item was marked "yes" If the teacher used the correct method but did not pronounce the words or patterns in a clear, understandable voice. Only one
teacher was noted with this trait. The resuit was not statistically signifjcant. Item 25 - Teacher did not move about room now and then. This item was marked "yes" if the teacher remained in one position instead of moving among the students to maintain interest. Reference is to stilted manner of content presentation and lack of confidence without notes or reference material on a podium or desk. This item was significant at the . OOL level.

Item 27-Teacher speaks with students, who echo or respond. This item was marked "yes" if the class content consisted almost entirely of set phrases or patterns and provided no opportunity for deviation from pre-taught or designated answers and responses. This item was significant at the . 001 level.

Summary
On the list of reported recorded answers to the checklist observation* there is indication that (1) a class should not be conducted entirely in English; (2) the foreign language being studied should be used as much as

\footnotetext{
*Checklist statements corresponding to Appendix J
}
is feasible; (3) "interweaving" of languages should not be used by the teacher or by the student; (4) the students should not translate word for word but should derive coherent meaning; (5) a teacher should not devote an excessive amount of time to discussion of the language if this discussion results in insufficient time for instruction; (6) students should make reports in the language being studied with attention being given to vocabulary usage at the normal class level; (7) class should not rely on an open book for every segment of the teacher-student exchange; (8) pattem practice should not be by "book" answers which result in answer delay; (9) mistakes of the students must be corrected at the time they are made if the student is to benefit; (10) time wasting games that do not improve language ability should not be condoned as a regular practice if they are a deterrant to forejgn language instruction; (11) student interest would be increased by the use of the foreign language being studied, indicating that the students are allowed freedom to have an exchange of ideas or discussions on a face-to-face basis with the teacher: (12) the classroom should reflect the culture of the foreign language being studied, have items of interest on display, and have color appeal which would indicate that foreign language is other than a mundane subject matter; (13) student activity should be pertinent to foreign language subject matter; (14) teachers assigned to foreign
language instruction should be restricted to those capable of such instruction and who have foreign language ability; (15) the teacher should move about the room in an animated manner to indicate language mastery and confidence as well as to prevent a dull presentation thereby increasing class participation; and finallys. (16) the student should not be taught to echo but to use the language as it is being learned. The studert should use what he has learned.

The above extrapolation is on only those items which were significant at the .05 level or above. It should be noted that there were four items listed as not significant. These items are those on which both high and low retention districts agreed: : (I) in neither did departure from the text result in incorrect usege of the language; (2) neither misused pattern practice as a translation exercise or a conversation dialogue as a monologue: (3) neither allowed a student to talk or repeat in such a manner that other students could not hear; and (4) nejther had teachers who modeled correctly but did not enunciate clearly.

The summary as given above with the statistical significance recorded, plus observation and experience of the investigator gives impetus to a suggested checklist for classroom observation. This suggested checklist, recorded as Appendix \(K\), is not meant to imply that the "Checklist of What the Audio-Lingual Teacher Should Not Do"
developed by \(M r\). Mathieu, is in any way in error or that it is not adequate for recording purposes. The suggested checklist is one which could apply not only to the audiolingual teacher, but to forejgn language teachers in general. The suggested checklist would not be possible Without use having been made of the work of Dr. Mathieu.

\section*{CHAFIER V}

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine which administrative policies and practices in the foreign language program of certain unified school districts Jed to a retention of student enrollment after the second year of study of a designated foreign language.

The need for this study is evidenced by a survey conducted by the California State Department of Eiucation which revealed that 70 per cerit of the students enrolled in ninth grade foreign language classes end their enrollment in foreign language within two years. Moreovex, 90 per cent of the students who begin their study in the ninth grade terminate foreign language enrollment before the twelfth grade.

Review of the literature revealed that many authors believe foreign language study is either a decoding process, wherein the main purpose is to gain sufficient foreign language knowledge to be able to satisfy a particular purpose, such as translation, or that it is a method used to learn a foreign language for purposes of communication which is not limited to speaking, but includes the other two requirements--nearing with comprehension, and writing with ability of expression. The literature revealed that
continuity and articulation of foreign language classes are a prime requisite to foreign language learning; and district administration, the policies and procedures of implementation, are the deciding factors in the outcone of foreign language classes.

The methodology employed in this investigation was a normative survey by questionnaires prepared for use with the district administrator, foreign language coordinator, and the head counselor of the district. The sample consisted of twenty-two unified school districts in geographic locations selected to give statewide representation. Each district chosen met the design of unification, jears of continuous foreign lenguage offered, and required amonts of entering students in the ninth grade. Fach guestionnaire for each of the three ahove mentioned administrative official.s was filled out by the researcher in a face-to-face interview in which each participant was asked to give data and/or opinion on jtems relating to the district policies and procedures for administering the forejgn language program. In addition, the researcher spent a minimum of one full class time in foreign language instruction \(j n\) each district visited. Each questionnaire was designed to elicit information unique to the position being investigated.

Classroom observation was recorded on an instrument

suggested for such use by the California State Department of Bducation's foreign language coordinator. Questionnaire data received were prepared for computer analysis in a manner required by the director of the data processing center in Stockton, California, as were the data received from classroom observation. Statistical procedures were implemented to ascertain the degree of difference between the methods employed by districts with a high foreign language enrollment retention and districts with a low forejgn language enrollment retention. Classroom observation recorded data were processed to indicate the degree of statistical correlation between high and low retention districts and classroom efficiency rating data as recorded on the justrument used at the time of observation.

The findings of the study were presented in three sections. The first section dealt with the statistical results of data received from the questionnaires used in interviews with district administrators, foreign language coordinators, and head counselors, who, for the purpose of this study, are classified as administrative personnel. Analysis of data accompanies each item of each questionnaire. The second section of the findings is a statistical reporting of questions on each questionnaire wherein the data requested is similar in content. The data for each jntercorrelated question is then analyzed according to
statistical data presented in accompanying tables: The third section of the findings dealt with the data obtained from classroom observation. The meaning of the items is discussed and the statistical signifjcance is recorded.

\section*{I. CONCLUSIONS}

The conclusions are arranged according to the sequence in which they were presented in Chapter IV.

Questionnaire items.
1. Mandated foreign language programs are not favored without additional funds provided by the State of California,
2. Uniformity in textbooks, matexiais, and method of instruction is deemed necessary to maintain student interest in foreign language study.
3. Counselor advice that students need only two years of foreign language instruction fox college preparation is a detriment to many students, who will drop out of the foreign language class even though they know a fouryear sequence of instruction is available. It would appear that this practice must be discontinued if foreign language enrollment retention is to be increased.
4. The audio-lingual method of instruction is favored by both the high and low retention groups. This instructional method places the emphasis upon communication rather than in depth technical study which might be preferred at a later date when communication proficiency is achieved.
5. There is near unanimous agreement that inservice travel restricted to the boundaries of the state is beneficial to teacher growth.
6. Student placement at the level of proficiency is advocated; however, most districts agree that teacher recommendation is the best method to be used to ascertain proficiency.
7. Teachers should be included in curriculum material selections.
8. Continuity and articulation are desjred objectives, and the audio-1ingual method of instruction will enhance the achievement of these objectives.
9. There is a shortage of native speakers of the language being taught, although there is no indicated shortage of foreign language teachers available. The majority of the districts surveyed require a major or minor in the larguage of instruction.
10. Dintrict-level administrators are not willing to provide additional remuneration for foreign language teachers. There is no need for this added expense if" district policy on qualification of teachers is achieved.
17. CuI.tural aspects of the ethnic group of the language being taught should be emphasized. Such emphasis could increase understanding and provide some insight into the background of those people with whom the student may want or need to communicate.
12. Bilingual paraprofessionai aides would be utilized if their use would result in no additional increase in the budget.

Classroom observation. Districts with a high forejgn language enrollment retention conduct foreign language instruction in a more efficient and productive mamer than those districts with a low foreign language enrollment retention. This observation is based on a statistical analysis of data recorded in the classroom, using the instrument selected for this study (Appendix M).

\section*{II. RECOMMENDATIONS}

The following recommendations are suggested for use by school personnel who are or may be participating in
administration of foreign language instruction programs. The suggested recommendations are the results of conclusions reached by the data received from this investigation and apply to the school districts involved. Extrapolation may be used for school districts which have characteristics similar in scope to those districts selected for this study.

The recommendations are arranged by category and not by priority of importance.

School district policy.
1. Fach district board of education should have written policies which clearly outline the goals, objectives, and expected results to be achieved in the foreign language program. The written policies will give direction to the administrative and instructional staff in implementing the program to accomplish the goals and objectives.
2. District superintendents, foreign language coordinators and head counselors should be unified in their approach to the administration of district policy on foreign language instruction. The lack of unanimity in administrative direction may result in consequences similar to those which result from lack of continuity and articulation; loss of the full benefit of
foreigh language experience and a weakened foreign language retention.
3. Foreign language teachers should be included in making policy decisions affecting foreign language instruction. The inclusion of teachers may insure the feasibility of classroom implementation of an adopted policy and may provide added strength to administrative requirements and evaluative critique.

Administration.
4. District administration shouid institute and be responsible for the majntenance of foreign language continuity and articulation throughout the school district. As a result of this the student will realize the full benefit of experience and will be able to achieve greater proficiency in a foreign language. The lack of study continuity or method and procedure axticulation will weaken student retention in the foreign language program.
5. The board of education, administrators, and teachers should confer on the adoption of a textbook and curriculum framework, audio-visual and other equipnent and material which are uniform throughout the district for each level
of forejgn language instruction. The use of supplemental material should be at the discretion of the teacher. This added materiall should supplement, not supplant, the adopted material and curriculum framework. Uniformity and commonality af books and materials will ease the assimilation of in-district transfers.
6. The district adminjstratoxs should appoint or employ one qualified certificated staff member to coordinate foreign language instruction on a district-wide basis. It will be the responsibility of this person to achieve uniformity in procedure and expected results in the fulifilment of district objectives.
7. District employment of foreign language teachers should be based upon the results of language proficiency examinations both written and oral. The prime criterion for employment should be ability to speak the language of instruction wi.th such a proficiency that would be accepted by native speakers of that language. A background of foreign language courses obtained to satisfy the requirements for a foreign language teacher credential, while desiraole, may not result in obtaining the most qualified teaching personnel.

An efficient and proficient teacher may well be a deciding factor in maintaining student interest and resultant accomplishment.
8. The employment of native speakers for foreign language instruction should have a high priority in teacher recruitment endeavors. Bilingual teachers employed as teachers of other subject matter should be encouraged to apply for foreign language teaching positions. A native speaker may provide background in the cultural aspects of the language as well as expertise in pronuncjation.
9. The employment of bilingual paraprofessionals is advocated to assist foreign language teachers in the performance of instructional duties, as a resource person to provide native cultural information and an additional conversational figure with whom the students may relate. Aides may also provide the means for individualized instruction either as a primary source or by relieving the teacher of routine duties whereby additional time may be spent assisting students.

Instruction.
10. The length and frequency of meetings of foreign language classes should be uniform throughout
the district in order that advancenent within the prescribed course of study is consistent. This may best be achieved by stated objectives with a standard time schedule of achievement. 11. Necessary small classes should be continued if at all possjble. Transportation within the school district should be provided to combine classes when lack of instruction will bring about a break in the continuity or articulation of the students' foreign language program.
12. Teacher travel to foreign countries, especially the country of the language being taught, should be encouraged and salary increment credit allowed. Experience received by the teacher should be disseminated district-wide as an incentive to participation by other foreign language personnel.
13. Teachers should be encouraged to observe methods of instruction in other foreign language classes, aittend workshops, foreign language conferences, and information seminars. The district should provide released time, cost remuneration and salary increment credit for participation.
14. Teachers and students should have latitude in travel and time should be allowed for field trips to available areas where the culture of the language may be observed.
15. Literature from the country of the language of study should be available for those stuaents in advanced status and as supplemental material for regular class use. The djfficulty level of the literature should be commensurate with the level of proficiency of the particular class of instruction.
16. Foreign language clubs, pairing of pen and tape pals, and other types of inter-cultural activity should be encouraged by the teaching and administrative personnel. The interest aroused by cultural paríicipation may carry over to classroom desire for achievenent and inter-cultural participation.
17. The selection of a foreign language should be elective or optional for the student at the ninth grade level. Foreign language academic background should not be mandatory for college bound students. There are many students who lack interest in the study of foreign language and they should not be penalized to the extent that they will fail to achieve an academic goal.
18. Counselors should encourage students to elect foreign language instruction for reasons other than college entrance. Foreign language proficiency may provide opportunities that are

germane for reasons other than advancement to higher education. The cultural factor is sufficient to warrant continued study throughout high school.
19. The minimum of a four-year sequential program in one foreign language should be advocated by the counseling staff. Counselors should be cautioned against informing foreign language students that a two-year foreign language course of study is sufficient for advanced education. Two years of foreign language instruction may be a minimum requirement for entrance to some colleges but there is no basis for the assumption that a twoyear course of foreign language study will prepare the student to utilize his foreign language ability. High-level proficiency may well be the means of increased employability.
20. The placement of students in foreign language levels of instruction should be by proficiency and not by grade level. Placement by proficiency should affect those students matriculating from the elementary grades as well as in-district and out-of-district transfers. Method of assessment should be a coordinated function by administrative and instructional staff on a district-wide basis.

Evaluation.
21. Evaluation procedures should be established in cooperation with the instructional staff for assessing the foreign language programs.
22. Administrators should evaluate the district-wide programs with the assistance of an instrument that includes reliable criteria to indicate the degree to which the school district meets known requirements for efficient program performance. The instrument in Appendix I may be used as a nucleus for development of evaluative criteria. 23. Foreign language instruction should be regularly evaluated by administrative personnel to ascertain the degree of instructional proficiency. An instrument for recording method of instruction, class activity and general room appearance is included in Appendix K .
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DEPRRTMENT OF EDUCATION
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\section*{gAY ll. JOKRSON}

Aesociate Supormendent; Chat. Division of Public school Adminisitrition

WILSON C. RILES
Directur of Conipansatory Eituruiton
DONALD E. KITCK

Mr. John T. Chandler 39 Gateray Court Stonkton, Californja

Deax lir. Chandjer:
This letter confirms your agreement to provide professional consultant services for the Bureau of National Defense Education Act Adminjstration.

Description of services: Thvestigation of Foreign Language
Droponts in Calfornda.
Location: Work out of headquarters in 22 school districts.
Dates: \(\qquad\)
Total Amount: \(\qquad\) Fee \$ \(\qquad\) Travel Allowence \(\$\) Emenses only not to

In response to Federal Internal. Revenue requirements we are directed to identify and report certain payments made to individuals and partnerships. These reportable payments include fees for consultant services. Allowances for travel and per diem are not reportable. In order to comply with this requirement, please fill in your Social Security number on the attached form and return it with one copy, signed, of your letter of acceptance. No receipts will be required.

Immediately upon completion of your services, please sign and return the orfiginal and two copjes of the enclosed Paynent Voucher. After the signed voucher is received by this office, approximately four to six weeks is required to process it and issue a warrant.

Sincerely,

J. William May, Assistant Chief Bureau of National Defense Education Act Administration
I hereby accept the conditions of this agreement.

Signed: \(\qquad\)
JWM: pa
Enclosures
NDEAA12672000
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Associate Sumannendent; Chist. Eiviston of instraction
ray H. Johnson
Assoziate Suprtitmendat Chic! Division of Pubite Shionl Aaminatrat:on

WILSON C. BILES
Director of Compensatory Fouction ARCHIE L. MEPIERRS.N

Actine Chisef.
Division of lligher Education
April 24, 1968
fast surveys conducted by the ofidee of foreign Lamguage Procroms, California State Department of Educetion, concerning foreigr language enrollment in the schools oit this state have shon an enrollment loss In excess of gos on a state-vide basis betmeen grades 9 and 12. N. John 4 , Chander is assisting our ofidee in the getherinc of infomation on foreign language dropouts. In oruer to facilitate the Gethering of this intomation, it fill de necessary for fre chander to visit wersonally each of the scnool systens chosen for fhis study.

Your distrjet has been selected because it is one of the districts thet hus been successiul in maintaining an opportunjty for students to participate in a four~year sequential program in at jeast one foreign lenguage, Your cooperation and assistance in aiding wr. Chsnalex in the deta gathering will be greatly appreciated.

With your permission, Mr. Chander will need information from
Administretion, your Foreign ranguage Cooidinator, and Supervisor op Counseling. Tro copies of this letter are being enclosed wioh you may care to givo to then. yould you be willing to perticivate in this stuiy? br. Condier mill telephone you Guring the first beek in ray for your ansuser.

Yours sincerely,


JDD:ts
Enclosure
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\section*{,}

Return to:
Foreign Language Programs
State Dept. of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814
STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE DROPOUTS IN SELECTED CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

\section*{District Administration}

Does this district have a written Board of Education Policy on foreign language instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, does it encourage a four year sequential program (grades 9-12) for all students who may benefit? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Is there a district policy on foreign language qualification?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, what are the qualifications? Please list. (Example: Fluency, Major, etc.)
A.
B.
C.
D.

Does the district policy provide for foreign language continuity and articulation by a uniform method of instruction in all schools within the district?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES:
If NO: K-8
\(9-12\)
Audiolingual
Audiolingual \(\qquad\)
———Traditional
———Traditional Traditional \(\qquad\) Combination \(\qquad\)
Has one person been delegated the responsibility by the Superintendent for the foreign language program at all grade levels? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, please answer the following:
A. Title
B. Qualifications required. (Fluency, Major, Minor, etc.)
1.
2. \(\qquad\)
3.
4.
\(\qquad\)
C. Other duties, if any. (Teaching, curriculum coordinator, etc.)
1. \(\qquad\) Percent of time \(\qquad\)
5. Is there a district policy which allows students to elect foreign language instruction in the ninth grade? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, please indicate:
\(\qquad\) All students with a passing grade in eighth grade foreign language?
Only students with an A or B grade?
Only those students in a college preparatory course?
At the discretion of the program counselor?
Other (Explain)

Is there a district policy on the minimum amount of class time for those students taking foreign language instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, please indicate:
A. If daily, how many minutes per day? \(\mathrm{K}-8\) 9-12
B. If not daily, how many times per week? K-8 \(\mathrm{K}-8=9-12\)
\(\qquad\) How many minutes per day? \(\qquad\)
C. Do they meet each semester? Alternate semesters?
D. Other (Explain)

If NO, what are the variations?
Discretion of foreign language coordinator. Discretion of the principal. Other (Explain)

Is there a district policy permitting foreign language teachers to travel at district expense to meetings, seminars, workshops, etc.? Yes_ No \(\qquad\)
If YES, does this include: Who may authorize? (Title)
A. Inter-district
B. Inter-County
C. Inter-state
D. Out-of-state
E. Foreign countries
F. All of the above
8. Do the foreign language teachers in the district meet regularly to discuss problems of instruction? Yes_ No

If YES:
\(\qquad\) Do all teachers attend (when possible)?
Do all department heads attend (when possible)?
If YES, do the elementary teachers meet separately from secondary teachers?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
9. When the students enter the ninth grade, is there a district policy for their placement into foreign language courses according to level of proficiency? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, please indicate the method(s) of placement.
A. Standardized tests
B. Teacher recommendation
C. Other (Explain)
0. Is there a district policy on the minimum class size to continue foreign language instruction in grades 9-12? Yes_ No \(\qquad\)
If YES, what is the minimum? Please indicate amount.
\(\qquad\) First year
Fourth year
Fifth year
Sixth year Second year Third year Sixth year

Will the administration provide transportation from one school to another to combine classes if a school falls below the minimum at a particular level in a foreign language class? Yes_No \(\qquad\)
. Do foreign language teachers receive added remuneration?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, check basis.
\(\qquad\) Ratio Index
Index used
\(\qquad\) Flat Rate
Amount given
13. Is there a foreign language teacher shortage in this district? Yes No \(\qquad\) If YES, indicate the reason.
\(\qquad\) A. Lack of funds
B. Lack of available qualified employee applicants
C. Other (Explain)
14. Is foreign language instruction a part of the duties of the teacher in the classroom in grades K-8 (where offered)? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\) If YES, do the teachers receive special in-service education in preparation? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If NO, does the district employ a traveling foreign language teacher specialist within a school?

Yes_ No District? Yes_ No _ _ _
15. Does the district employ para-professionals (aides) to assist the foreign language teachers in K-8? Yes__ No__ 9-12? Yes__ No \(\qquad\)
If YES, please indicate the reason.
A. To assist in instruction
B. Fluent in the language being taught
C. Used only for mechanical assistance (setting up equipment, etc.)
D. Other (Explain)
6. Would the repeal of the mandated (Casey Law) foreign language requirement affect the foreign language curriculum in grades \(\mathrm{K}-8\) ? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\) If YES, would it:
A. Eliminate foreign language?
B. Offer foreign language on an elective basis?
C. Restrict foreign language to an ability basis?
D. Curtail the amount of time allowed?
E. Other (Explain)
7. Would the repeal of the mandated (Casey Law) foreign language requirement affect the foreign language curriculum at the secondary level (9-12)? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, would it result in:
\begin{tabular}{l} 
A. More classes? \\
B. Smaller classes (per teacher)? \\
C. More languages? \\
D. More teachers? \\
E. Other (Explain) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Does the district advocate increased foreign language opportunities in the elementary school ( \(\mathrm{K}-8\) ) on an elective basis? Yes_ No \(\qquad\)
Does the district administration endorse the provisions of the mandated foreign language program in the elementary school? Yes__ No___

If NO, what are the objections?
A. Insufficient amount of qualified teachers
B. Excess financial burden
C. Crowded curriculum (required subjects).
D. Unnecessary at the elementary level (K-8)
E. Other (Explain)

21. Would the district advocate enhancement of the foreign language program under the present mandated law if financial aid were furnished by the State? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, what change(s) would be implemented? Please indicate.
A. Additional teachers
B. Added class time (minutes per day)
C. Added days per year
D. Additional classes (grades not now included)
E. Additional realia (supplementary materials, audio-visual aids, etc.)
F. Other (Explain)
24. Does the administration believe that a more productive and efficient foreign language program would result from a restriction of foreign language instruction to one language? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, what language would be advocated?
Indicate the reason(s):

A. Availability of teachers?
B. Ethnic environment?
C. Greater possibility of actual use?
D. Increased articulation from elementary to secondary?
E. Increased possibility of foreign language instruction continuity and proficiency?
F. Other (Explain)

If NO, how many languages does the administration advocate to constitute a desirable foreign language program? Please list in order of preference.
A.
B.
\(\qquad\)
C. \(\qquad\)
D. \(\qquad\)
E. \(\qquad\)
F. \(\qquad\)
5. What is the district philosophy for the instruction of foreign language in the secondary schools (9-12)?

Check any that apply:
A. Preparation for college entrance?
B. Preparation for college study?
C. Improvement of human relations among the various ethnic groups in the community?
\(\qquad\) D. Improvement of human relations among the various ethnic groups in the world?
E. Improvement of world understanding?
F. Raising the cultural level?
G. Other (Explain)
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\section*{APPENDIX E}

Affirmative Responses to Questionnaire by District Admjnistratore of High and Low Retention Districts

AFFTRMATTVE RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS OF HIGH AND IOOW RETENTION DISTRICTS
Item
1. Board policy on FL instruction \(54.5 \% \quad 50.0 \%\)
(a) four-year sequential program \(\quad 71.4 \quad 80.0\)
2. Teacher qualification
(a) fluency
(b) major
(c) minor
3. Continuity and articulation
(a) audiolingual
(b) traditional
(c) combination

4. Supervisory practices
(a) qualification, fluency
5. Student selection of FL
(a) all students passing 8th
grade FL
(b) only students with \(A\) or \(B\)
(c) only students in college
preparatory
(d) at discretion of counselor
6. Instructional time
(a) minutes, \(K-8\)
(b) minutes, 9-12
100.0
37.4
\(51.2 \quad 51.4\)
7. Teacher in-service travel provisions
(a) inter-district
\begin{tabular}{rr}
100.0 & 90.0 \\
81.8 & 90.0 \\
81.8 & 90.0 \\
72.7 & 60.0 \\
9.1 & 40.0 \\
18.2 & 0.0 \\
1.8 .2 & 0.0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Item & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { High } \\
\text { Retention }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Low } \\
\text { Retention }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
8. Teacher in-service provisions \\
(a) all teachers attend \\
(b) all department heads attend \\
(c) elementary teachers meet separately from secondary
\end{tabular}} & 90.9\% & 90.0\% \\
\hline & 81.8 & 90.0 \\
\hline & 100.0 & 90.0 \\
\hline & 81.8 & 80.0 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
9. Student placement \\
(a) standardized tests \\
(b) teacher recommendation
\end{tabular}} & 63.6 & 100.0 \\
\hline & 9.1 & 20.0 \\
\hline & 54.5 & 80.0 \\
\hline 10. Class size & 36.4 & 30.0 \\
\hline 7I. Administrative effort to continue classes below minimum erirollment & 55.6 & 50.0 \\
\hline 12. Teacher salary provisions & 0.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline 13. Shortage of teachers & 9.1 & 20.0 \\
\hline (a) lack of funds & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline (b) lack of qualified applicants & 9.1 & 20.0 \\
\hline 14. Foreign language as added duties for K-8 teachers & 60.0 & 77.8 \\
\hline (a) special in-service education & & \\
\hline preparation & 87.5 & 100.0 \\
\hline (b). yes, within school & 100.0 & 100.0 \\
\hline (c) yes, within district & 83.3 & 100.0 \\
\hline 15. Use of paraprofessional & & \\
\hline personnel in K-8 & 54.5 & 33.3 \\
\hline (a) use of aides in 9-12 & 54.5 & 40.0 \\
\hline (b) to assist in instruction & 54.5 & 20.0 \\
\hline (c) fluent in language being & & \\
\hline (d) taught & 9.1 & 0.0 \\
\hline (d) used only for mechanical assistance & 54.5 & 50.0 \\
\hline 16. Effect of the Casey Law & 66.7 & 100.0 \\
\hline (a) eliminate FL & 0.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline (b) offer FL on elective basis & 45.5 & 60.0 \\
\hline (c) restrict language to ability & 0.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline (d) curtail amount of time & 9.1 & 40.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Item \(\quad\) Righ \(\frac{\text { Rotention Retention }}{}\)
17. Effect of Casey Law, grades 9-12
(a) more classes
\(54.5 \%\)
\(11.1 \%\)
36.4
0.0
0.0
0.0
0.0
c) more languages
9.1.
0.0
(d) more teachers
\(30.0 \quad 50.0\)
K- 8 level
\(36.4 \quad 44.4\)
20. Increasing \(\operatorname{TH}\) program at the K-8 level
30.0
85.7
21. Enhancing mandated program if financial aid were available
(a) additional teachers
70.0
80.0
(b) added class time
(c) added days per year
(d) additional classes
60.0
20.0
80.0
10.0
30.0
(e) additional realia
60.0
0.0
70.0
22. Extending FT at secondary level
with additional financial aid
\(90.9 \quad 100.0\)
(a) greater flexibility in students enrolling in classes
\(27.3 \quad 30.0\)
(b) increase in teacher pay 0.0
10.0
(c) employment of more teachers
(d) smaller classes
e increased supervisjon
27.3
40.0
(f) increased articulation
36.4
38.2
80.0
18.2
20.0
23. Cost for FL instruction
24. Restricting number of languages offered
0.010 .0
(a) Desirable program order of preference
\begin{tabular}{lrr} 
(1) Spanish & 90.0 & 80.0 \\
2 French & 90.0 & 80.0 \\
(3) German & 100.0 & 70.0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Item & High Retention & Iow
Retention \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{25. District philosophy for FI} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{instruction (9-1.2)} \\
\hline (a) preparation for college & & \\
\hline entrance & 90.9\% & 70.0\% \\
\hline (b) preparation for college & & \\
\hline study & 72.7 & 70.0 \\
\hline (c) improvement of human relations & & \\
\hline (d) in community & 63.6 & 70.0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{(d) improve human relations} \\
\hline around the world & 72.7 & 90.0 \\
\hline (e) improve world understanding & 63.6 & 70.0 \\
\hline (f) raise the cultural level & 100.0 & 70.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{APPENDIX F}

Foreign Lancuage Coordinator Questionnaire
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\section*{Foreign Language Coordinator}

What is your title? \(\qquad\)
Do you have other duties in addition to coordinating foreign language instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, please indicate:
\(\qquad\) A. Foreign language teacher? Percent of time?
B. Other instruction (class time) duties? Percent of time? \(\qquad\)
C. Other supervision duties? Percent of time? \(\qquad\)
D. Other? (Explain.)

What method of instruction is used in the foreign language program? Please indicate.

K-8
9-12
Audiolíngual
Traditional (Grammar-Translation)
Combination (Both A and B)

Is there an automatic placement to the second year in the high school program after two or more years of elementary school foreign language instruction?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If NO, do you coordinate for proper placement into secondary level by:
\(\qquad\) A. Standardized test?
B. District-made test?
C. Teacher recommendation?
D. Other? (Explain.)

If there is a different method of foreign language instruction used in elementary and secondary schools, are all ninth grade students assigned to the same year of foreign language instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Are incoming (out-of-district) transfers processed the same as students concerned in question number 5? Yes_ No \(\qquad\)
If students are not processed in a like manner, what method is used? Explain.

Is the foreign language program coordinated within the district so that an interdistrict transfer is automatically placed at the same level with little or no loss? Yes_ No

Do you have enough qualified foreign language teachers to meet the demand of enrollment in the elementary schools? Yes__ No___

If NO, what procedure is used to limit the enrollment at the various levels of secondary foreign language instruction? Please indicate.
A. Letter grades (A, B, C, etc.) ___ minimum.
B. Achievement test. Standardized \(\qquad\) District-made \(\qquad\)
C. Teacher recommendation.
D. Track (college preparatory).
E. Other. (Explain.)

What are the qualifications required by your office for a foreign language teacher in the elementary program ( \(\mathrm{K}-8\) )? Please indicate.
_ A. Major in foreign language.
B. Minor in foreign language.
C. Native speaker.
D. Fluency.
E. Other. (Explain.)

Qualifications required for foreign language teachers at the secondary level (9-12)?
A. Major in foreign language.
B. Minor in foreign language.
C. Native speaker.
D. Fluency.
E. Other. (Explain.)

Does your foreign language program move sequentially through elementary and into secondary with the same type of material for each foreign language offered (same book series, language lab, etc.)? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, are the teachers included in the selection?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If NO, please indicate method of selection:
A. By your office?
B. By the district administration?
C. By out-of-district personnel (county)?
D. By individual schools?
E. By teachers?
F. Other? (Explain.)

What is the maximum and minimum class size for foreign language instruction? K-8:

Maximum number. 9-12:

Minimum number.
\(\qquad\) Maximum number.
\(\qquad\) Minimum number.
Other? (Explain.)
\(\qquad\)

When, and if, a foreign language falls below a minimum does your office:
A. Arrange to transport students to another school to combine classes?
B. Continue below minimum to insure that the students acquire the necessary instruction?
\(\qquad\) C. Drop the class?
D. Other? (Explain.)

Do all elementary ( \(\mathrm{K}-8\) ) schools in the district allot the same amount of time to foreign language instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, what is the schedule? Please indicate.
\(\qquad\) A. Minutes each day.
B. Minutes per week.
C. Alternated with another subject(s):
1. Weekly.
2. Monthly.
3. Semester.

If NO, which office regulates the time schedule? Please indicate.
A. District office.
B. Your office (Foreign Language Coordinator).
C. School principal.
D. Teacher.
E. Other. (Explain.)

Does your office arrange for district-wide in-service education, coordination, and articulation for foreign language teachers? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, please indicate:
A. Regular schedule of foreign language teacher meetings (other than social)?
B. Workshops on a district-wide basis?
C. Expert consultants?
D. Special college-credit classes?
E. Other? (Explain.)

Does your office or the district make arrangements for foreign language teachers to observe other teachers and methods of instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No Permitted at district expense? Yes__ No____

If YES, please indicate:

A. Inter-school.
B. Inter-county.
C. Intra-county.
D. Inter-state.
E. Out-of-state.
F. Other. (Explain.)

When teachers attend workshops or classes for professional improvement are they assisted by financial aid from the district?

Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Are the foreign language teachers encouraged to attend professional improvement institutes (N. D. E. A. , etc.)? Yes_No \(\qquad\)

If YES, do they receive advancement on the salary schedule for professional improvement? Yes__No__

How many foreign language teachers do you have in the district?
Full-time: (Part-time: Percent)
\(\qquad\) Elementary
Secondary

\(\qquad\)
How many foreign language teachers in the district are native speakers of the language they teach (ethnic background, lived in foreign country, etc.)? Indicate. Elementary system ( \(\mathrm{K}-8\) ).
Secondary system (9-12).
Does the district employ para-professional (aides) to assist the foreign language teachers? Yes No \(\qquad\)
If YES, indicate those which apply:
A. Native speakers assisting with instruction.
B. Native speakers who do not assist with instruction.
C. Used only on a non-teaching basis (setting up equipment, etc.).
D. Other. (Explain.)

If you were able to employ para-professionals, would you do so?
Yes \(\qquad\)
If NO, indicate those which apply:
A. It is not desirable.
B. It would increase supervision time.
C. It would reduce money available for other needs.
D. Other. (Explain.)

Would you use para-professionals if by doing so it would not cause the district, or your department, to lose needed budget allowance?

Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)

Are the cultural aspects (customs, habitation, etc.) of the language part of the regular instruction? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)

If YES, please indicate method.
\(\qquad\) A. Special films.
B. Display of realia (articles of dress, etc.).
C. Supplementary reading material.
D. Visits to ethnic surroundings (trips to Mexico, ethnic restaurants).
E. Role playing.
F. Other. (Explain.)

Do the foreign language classes communicate by "Pen Pal" or "Tape Pal" with foreign countries? Yes_ No

If YES, at what level?
A. Elementary (K-8).
B. Secondary (9-12).
C. Both A and B.

Are there foreign language clubs in:
A. Each elementary ( \(\mathrm{K}-8\) ) school?
B. Each secondary ( \(9-12\) ) school?
C. Some elementary schools. Amount?
D. Some secondary schools. Amount? \(\qquad\)
Are the foreign language classes encouraged to participate in extra-curricular activities (school fairs, assemblies, parades, etc.)? Yes No

In general, in California why do most students fail to continue foreign language in the second year of instruction at the secondary level? Please indicate by rank order of preference. (1. for main reason, 2. next most important, etc.).
A. Too difficult.
B. Different method of instruction.
C. Different type of material or lack of material (audio-visual, books).
D. Lack of scheduled time.
E. Advice from counselors.
F. Preference for another elective.
G. Not needed for scheduled secondary program.
H. Other. (Explain.)
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Affirmative Responses to Questjonnaire by Foreign Ianguage Coordinators of High and Low Retention Districts

AFFTRMATIVE RPSPONSES TO QUESITONNAIRE BY FOREIGN LANGUAGE COORDINAIORS OF HTGH AND IOW REPENTION JISTRICIS
Item
1. Title
2. Additional duties
\(\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { a) foreign language teacher } \\ \text { b } \\ \text { c }\end{array}\right)\) other instruction duties
\begin{tabular}{cc}
\(60.0 \%\) & \(70.0 \%\) \\
30.0 & 30.0 \\
0.0 & 0.0 \\
40.0 & 40.0
\end{tabular}
3. Method of instruction
(a) audiolingual, K-8
(b) audiolingual, 9-1c
\(80.0 \quad 80.0\)
(c) traditional, \(K-8\)
\(70.0 \quad 80.0\)
(d) traditional, 9-12
(e) combination, \(\mathrm{K}-8\)
(f) combination, 9-12
\(0.0 \quad 0.0\)
\(0.0 \quad 0.0\)
\(20.0 \quad 10.0\)
\(20.0 \quad 10.0\)
4. Student placement procedures
(a) teacher recommendation
\(66.7 \quad 30.0\)
(b) standardized tests
\(\begin{array}{rr}33.5 & 70.0 \\ 0.0 & 30.0\end{array}\)
5. Dirferent instructional methods used in K-8
25.0 57.1
6. Incoming transfer process
(a) counselor
(b) teacher
\(70.0 \quad 77.8\)
\(10.0 \quad 10.0\)
7. Program coordination within district
\(100.0 \quad 90.0\)
8. Shortage of \(F \mathrm{~F}\) teachers
\(60.0 \quad 20.0\)
(a) meithod to limit
(2) letter grades
\(20.0 \quad 70.0\)
9. Qualifications of \(F\) teachers, \(K-8\)
(a) major in foreign languages
c) native speaker
(d) fluency
\(30.0 \quad 10.0\)
\(10.0 \quad 40.0\)
\(20.0 \quad 0.0\)


10. Program continuity \(80.0 \quad 40.0\)

11. Class size
\(\left(\begin{array}{lll}\text { a) maximum number, } & \mathrm{K}-8 & 31.8 \\ \text { b }) & 34.5 \\ \text { cinimum number, } & \mathrm{K}-8 & 16.5 \\ \text { c maximum number, } & 9-12 & 30.9 \\ \text { d) minimum number, } & 9-12 & 17.0 \\ \hline\end{array}\right.\)
12. Procedures, below minimum enrollment
(a) arrange transportation to other school
(b) continue the class
30.0
10.0
(c) drop the class
70.0
30.0
(d) combine classes
50.0
13. Instructional time allotment, \(K-8\)
(a) mirutes each day
(2) school principal
80.0
60.0
30.8
10.0
10.0
30.6
20.0
10.0
14. Teacher in-service provisions
\(100.0 \quad 90.0\)
(a) regular schedule of teacher
meetings
\(\begin{array}{rr}100.0 & 70.0 \\ 90.0 & 80.0 \\ 90.0 & 70.0 \\ 20.0 & 40.0\end{array}\)
15. District arrangement for in-service
90.0
80.0
(a) district expense
80.0
60.0
(b) inter-school
80.0
60.0
(c) inter-county
50.0
60.0
(d) intra-county
40.0
50.0
\(\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { e } \\ \text { f }\end{array}\right.\)
10.0
(f) out-of.-state
0.0
16. Financial aid for teacher improvement
60.0
17. Teacher professional improvement \(90.0 \quad 100.0\)
37.5
(a) advancement on salary schedule 100.090 .0
\(=-\infty \quad\) High
18. Full time FL teachers
(a) elementary, K--8

Part time FL teachers
(a) elementary, \(K-8\)
(b) secondary, 9-12
\begin{tabular}{rr}
44.6 & 83.0 \\
43.1 & 42.7 \\
4.0 & 4.0 \\
15.0 & 5.0
\end{tabular}
19. Number or native speakers
(a) elementary, \(K-8\)
\(17.4 \quad 23.7\)
(b) secondary, 9-12
23.230 .5
20. Employment of paraprofessionals
\(30.0 \quad 40.0\)
(a) native speakers assisting with instruction
0.0
0.0
(b) native speakers not assisting in instruction
0.0
20.0
(c) used only on non-teaching basis
30.0
30.0
21. Desire employment of
paraprofessionals
\(\begin{array}{rr}70.0 & 80.0 \\ 10.0 & 0.0\end{array}\)
(a) not desirable
(b) increase supervision
(c) reduce roney
(a) use of paraprofessionals
without losing budget allowance
\(0.0 \quad 20.0\)
\(20.0 \quad 20.0\)
90.0
90.0
22. Inclusion of cultural aspects 100.0100 .0
(a) special films
(3) display of realia
c) supplementary reading material
100.0
100.0
(d) visits to ethnic surroundings
90.9
100.0
(e) role playing
81.8
100.0
72.7
100.0
23. Student correspondence with

> foreign countries
(a) elementary
(b) secondary
(c) both
\begin{tabular}{rr}
70.0 & 40.0 \\
10.0 & 20.0 \\
30.0 & 30.0 \\
40.0 & 0.0
\end{tabular}
2.4. Foreign language clubs
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
a) each elementary school & 10.0 & 30.0 \\
b & each secondary school & 30.0 \\
c & some elementary schools & 20.0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Item & Righ \\
Retention Retention
\end{tabular}
25. Extra-curricular activity encouragement
\(88.9 \quad 87.5\)
26. Failure of students to continue language after second year
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline (a) & too difficult & 70.0 & 80.0 \\
\hline (b) & djeferent method of instruction & 10.0 & 40.0 \\
\hline (c) & different type of material & 0.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline (d) & Lack of scheduled time & 30.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline (e) & advice from counselors & 100.0 & 40.0 \\
\hline (f) & preference for another elective & 45.5 & 80.0 \\
\hline (g) & not needed for scheduled secondary program & 45.5 & 60.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

APPENDTX H
Head Counselor Guestionnaire
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\section*{Head Counselor}

Do the counselors assist eighth grade students in course selection prior to entrance into the ninth grade? Yes_No \(\qquad\)
Are all eighth grade students allowed to select a foreign language at the ninth grade level? Yes_No No_

If YES, are they encouraged to continue with the language studied at the elementary level? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If NO, what are the restrictions that your district places upon continuing foreign language instruction? Please indicate.
A. Achievement level(by letter grade) \(\qquad\)
B. Teacher recommendation
C. Ability level (standardized test)

Minimum I. Q.
D. Track selection (college preparation, etc.)
E. Parent objection
F. Other (explain)

Do the counselors administer foreign language proficiency tests in order to facilitate proper placement level at the secondary (9-12) school?
Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If NO, please indicate method.
\(\qquad\) A. Automatic placement at second year in high school foreign language class (after two or more years of foreign language instruction at the elementary level).
\(\qquad\) B. Teacher recommendation.
C. Level of foreign language attainment while in elementary school? How ascertained? Please indicate.
1. By years of study
2. Other (Explain)

Do the counselors inform the ninth grade entrants that only two years of foreign language at the secondary (9-12) level is required for college preparatory? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
In general, how many years of foreign language instruction does the high school counselor advise an entering student to take? Please indicate.
A. Minimum of two years
B. Three years
C. Four years
D. Other (Explain)

Is an explanation to butline benefits of continuing a four year course of foreign language given to the incoming student? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
When working with the ninth graders for a tenth year program, do the counselors request a reason for the student's dropping of a foreign language? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\) If YES, is the reason recorded? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If recorded, indicate reason(s) most frequently given
\(\qquad\) A. Too difficult
B. Different method of instruction
C. Different materials (audio-visual, books, etc.)
D. Did not like the teacher
E. Not interesting
F. Other (Explain)

Are the counselors notified of the number of students to be allowed in foreign language study? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
If YES, is it for each level of instruction? Yes
No \(\qquad\) If YES, who makes the determination? Please indicate.
\(\qquad\) A. Your office (Head Counselor)
B. District Administration
C. Curriculum Coordinator
D. Other (Explain)

Does the counseling staff assist in foreign language grouping of elementary students by ability? Yes__ No___

If YES, do the several classes of foreign language taught by different teachers generally keep together in the amount of work they cover? Yes \(\qquad\) No \(\qquad\)
Does the district use ability grouping for foreign language instruction in the secondary schools? Yes_ No \(\qquad\)
If YES, please indicate method.
A. By standardized foreign language proficiency tests
B. By district-made tests
C. By teacher recommendation
D. Other (Explain)

What are the indicated criteria used by teachers for referring students to the counselors to change a student from a foreign language course to another subject? Please indicate.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
A. Lack of foreign language ability \\
B. Low grade point (C, D, F, ) \\
C. Student decision \\
D. Other (Explain) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

From the counseling viewpoint, what is the reason for high attrition in the foreign language program at the secondary (9-12) level? Please indicate.
A. Different method of instruction.
B. College preparatory students know that only two years of foreign language are required.
C. The advanced classes are too difficult.
D. The non-college preparatory students are discouraged from continuing.
E. Other (Explain)
3. In your experience, what do you believe identifies the student who continues foreign language study for the entire secondary (9-12) school period (4 years)? Please indicate.
\(\qquad\) A. They have high foreign language ability
B. They are college preparatory
C. They have been encouraged to continue
D. They had competent command of the foreign language prior to entry into the secondary (9-12) program
E. Other (Explain)
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\section*{APPENDIX I}

Affirmative Responses to Questionnaire
by Head Counselors of Hich and Low
Retention Districts

AFPIRMATIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNATRE BY HEAD COUNSEIORS OF HIGH AND LOW

RETENTION DISTRICTIS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Item & High Retention & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Jow } \\
& \text { Retention }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1. Assistance in course selection & 100.0 & 100.0 \\
\hline 2. Policies for student selection of FL & 60.0 & 55.6 \\
\hline (a) encouragement to continue language & 40.0 & 30.0 \\
\hline (b) restrictions & & \\
\hline ( 1 ) achievement & 70.0 & 30.0 \\
\hline (2) teacher recommendation & 80.0 & 50.0 \\
\hline (3) parent objection & 60.0 & 20.0 \\
\hline (4) ability & 30.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline (5) teacher selection & 10.0 & 30.0 \\
\hline 3. Student placement procedures & 0.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline 4. Information provided students by counselor & 100.0 & 100.0 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
5. Counsejor advisement for FL study \\
(a) minimum of two years
\end{tabular} & 40.0 & 50.0 \\
\hline (b) three years & 30.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline (c) four years & 60.0 & 40.0 \\
\hline 6. Explanation of four-year benefits given & 60.0 & 81.8 \\
\hline 7. Procedures for dropping FI course & 80.0 & 80.0 \\
\hline (a) reason recorded & 37.5 & 42.9 \\
\hline (b) too difficult & 20.0 & 20.0 \\
\hline (c) different method of instruction & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline (d) different materials & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline (e) did not like teacher & 0.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline (f) not interesting & 10.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline 8. Number of students allowed & 10.0 & 20.0 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
(a) for each level of instruction \\
(b) head counselor makes
\end{tabular} & 100.0 & 100.0 \\
\hline determination & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline (c) district administration makes determination & 10.0 & 10.0 \\
\hline (d) curriculum coordinator makes determination & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Item & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { High } \\
\text { Retention }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Low } \\
& \text { Retention }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
9. Counselor grouping by ability \\
(a) several classes taught by different teachers cover same amount of work
\end{tabular} & 88.9
62.5 & 40.0
100.0 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
10. Grouping for instruction \\
(a) by standardized FJ proficiency tests \\
(b) by district-made tests \\
(c) by teacher recommendation
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
60.0 \\
20.0 \\
0.0 \\
40.0
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
60.0 \\
30.0 \\
0.0 \\
40.0
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
11. Teacher referral criteria for student drop \\
(a) lack of foreign language ability \\
(b) low grade point \\
(c) student decision
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 70.0 \\
& 90.0 \\
& 70.0
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 90.0 \\
& 80.0 \\
& 40.0
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
12. Reason for high attrition rate at secondary level \\
(a) different method of instruction \\
(3) know only two years needed \\
(c) advanced classes too difficult \\
(d) non-college students discouraged
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 50.0 \\
& 70.0 \\
& 50.0 \\
& 50.0
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 30.0 \\
& 50.0 \\
& 80.0 \\
& 30.0
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
13. Characteristics of students continuing four years \\
(a) have foreign language ability \\
(b) college preparatory \\
(c) have been encouraged to continue \\
(d.) had competent command of language prior to program
\end{tabular} & 90.0
80.0
100.0
50.0 & 60.0
50.0
70.0
20.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

    APPENDIX J
    Checklist of
    What the Audio-Jingual Teacher Should Not Jo

```

CHECKIIST OF
WHAT THE AUDIO-LINGUAI TEACHER SHOULD NOT DO
1. Class conducted almost entirely in English . . Y N
2. Class conducted in \(F\) except for "real communication" situations such as "Who has a question?" - "Turn to next page" - and assignment of home work . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
3. Interweaving--i.e., half: FL and half Engiish in same utterance, e.g., "Por favor, turn to next page." . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
4. Students allowed to use English and/or to interweave . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
5. Straight translation exercise FL to English . . Y N
6. More time spent in talking about language than talking language . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
7. Oral report by student in English . . . . . . . Y N
8. Most of class conducted with books open . . . . Y \(\mathbb{N}\)
9. Pattem practice conducted exclusively with books open . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
10. Departure from text resulting in incorrect language . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
11. Student mistakes allowed to go incorrected . . . Y N
12. Misuse of exercise, such as pattern practice used for translation, or conversation as monologue . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
13. Impossibility for student to hear what was said by another student . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y \(N\)
14. "Games" that waste time which could be spent more effectively in language practice . . . . . Y N
15. Class turned into "deaf and dumb" silent study period without student-teacher exchange . . . . Y N
1.6. Lab practice conducted with books open . . . . . Y N
17. Iab practice with materials not previously Y N presented to class . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
18. Room does not reflect culture of FL . . . . . . Y N
19. Student allowed to engage in non-pertinent activity . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y \(\mathbb{N}\)
20. Administration of test which does not reinforce specific skills taught . . . . . . . . Y N
21. Students not given enough time to perform in taped drill practice . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
22. Language modeled incorrectly by teacher . . . . Y \(\mathbb{N}\)
23. Language modeled correctly but with inaudible voice . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
24. Language modeled correctiy but with unclear enunciation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N
25. Teacher did not move about room now and then . . Y in
26. Speaking with students while they speak . . . . Y N
27. Teacher speaks with students who echo or respond . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Y N

\section*{APPENDIX K}

Chandler's Checklist of Foreign Lariguage Instruction Observation

\section*{CLASSROOM METCHODOLOGY}
1. Classroom ref'lects F'J culture (s)
2. Seating arrangement rigid (non-flexible for change to semi-circle or small group, etc.)
3. Entering students manner animated (contrasted to a subdued manner).
4. Teacher attitude relaxed (friendly in manner, not stilted, cheerful, etc.)
5. Teacher bilingual (native speaker).
6. Teacher native of culture of instruction (where language of instruction is mother tongue). + -
7. Teacher's use of English good (Is English usage difficulit to understand?)
8. Teacher enunciates clearly (Engiish or FL).
9. Teacher begins class in FI (greetings, questions, etc.)
10. Time allowed for rapport (contrasted to down to business attitude).

1i. Teacher well organized (not necessarily structured but plan of achievement).
12. Class conducted in FL (according to degree of expected sophistication).
13. Diversified presentation (Pattern practice, audio-visual, laboratory, culture, etc.) + -
14. Voluntary student participation.
15. FL usage by students corrected when appropriate. + -
16. Student FJ usage appropriate to year of instruction.+ -
17. Class time devoted to FL instruction and related cultural activities (plus marked if other activities discuised in FL of instruction). + -
18. Class time sufficient ( 30 minutes or more). \(+\ldots\)
19. Teacher-student dialogue.
20. Class conducted audio-lingual (compared to
"traditional" method of reading translation). \(+\quad+\)
21. Paraprofessionals used (native speakers used in K-8).

QUESTIONS ASKED OF TEACHER
I. FL teacher by choice. +-
2. Other duties in addition (subject matter other than FT).
3. Foreign language club(s) on campus (active). + -
4. Teacher allows time for in-service activity (self-improvement, new materials). \(+\quad=\)
5. Fielả trips authorized. + -
6. Entrance to FI classes restricted by grade or number.
7. Supervision and administrative assistance adequate.
8. Materials of instruction adequate or available. + -
9. Teacher wants to continue in FL. \(+\quad-\)
10. Teacher satisfied with present method of instruction.

QUESTIONS FOR OBSERVER
1. Is teacher competent?
2. Is class well handled?
3. Does teacher have class control?
4. Would you recommend teacher?


\section*{APPENDIX L}

Criteria Sheet for Evaluation of Administrative Policy Related to Foreign Language Instruction

CPITERIA SHEET FOR EVAIUATITON OF ADMINISTRATIVE POITCY RETATED TO FORETGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

County \(\qquad\) District \(\qquad\) School \(\qquad\)
Dete \(\qquad\) Evaluator \(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Number} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Question} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Rating - Indicate Degree} \\
\hline & & Never & Almost never & Sometimes & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Almost } \\
& \text { always }
\end{aligned}
\] & Always \\
\hline 1 & Is there a minimum class size for FI instruction within the district? & & & & & \\
\hline 2 & Is transportation provided to another school if FL class retention falls below minimum for efficient operation? & & & & & \\
\hline 3 & Are sufficient teachers available to insure qualified FL instruction? & & & & . & \\
\hline 4 & Are FL teachers required to teach other than foreign language? & & & & & \\
\hline 5 & Does the district provide paraprofessionals as aides to FI teachers at the elementary level? & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Number} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Question} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{hating - Indicate Degree} \\
\hline & & Never & Almost
never & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Some- } \\
& \text { timees }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Amost } \\
& \text { anways }
\end{aligned}
\] & Always \\
\hline 6 & Are FI classes eiective at the ninth grade level or restricted for coliege preparatory? & & & & & \\
\hline 7 & Are incoming students to high school ( \(9-12\) ) placed accordine to FI level of proficiency? & & & & & \\
\hline 8 & Do counselors advocate a fouryear FI study to ninth grade entrants? & & & & & \\
\hline 9 & Are methods of \(F\) in instruction uniform in elementary and secondary schools within the district? & & & & & \\
\hline 10 & Are FI bcoks and materials uniform at each level within the district? & & & & & \\
\hline II & Are FI class-time aliowances uniform in all elementary schools within the district ( \(\mathrm{K}-8\) )? & & & & & \(\cdots\) \\
\hline 32 & Are FI class-time ailowances uniform in all secondary schocls within the district (9-12)? & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{APPENDIX M}

Statistical Analysis Data of Classroom Observation Using Mathieu Audio-Tingual Checklist

STATISTICAL ANATYSIS DATA OF
CLASSROOM CBSERVATION USING MATHIEU AUDIO-INGUAL CHECKEIST
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Question Number & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { High } \\
& \text { Yes }
\end{aligned}
\] & Low & High & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Low } \\
& \text { No. }
\end{aligned}
\] & \(x^{2}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Signifi- } \\
& \text { cance }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 1 & 0 & 4 & 11 & 6 & 13.870 & . 001 \\
\hline 2 & 0 & 5 & 11 & 5 & 22.700 & .001 \\
\hline 3 & 0 & 3 & 11 & 7 & 7.235 & . 01 \\
\hline 4 & 3 & 8 & 8 & 2 & 28.001 & . 001 \\
\hline 5 & 0 & 3 & 11 & 7 & 7.235 & . 01 \\
\hline 6 & 0 & 7 & 11 & 3 & 46.944 & . 001 \\
\hline 7 & 0 & 7 & 10 & 3 & 42.500 & . 001 \\
\hline 8 & 1 & 7 & 10 & 3 & 34.836 & . 001 \\
\hline 9 & 0 & 4 & 11 & 6 & 13.870 & . 001 \\
\hline 10 & 0 & 1 & 10 & 9 & 0.555 & NS* \\
\hline 11 & 0 & 4 & 11 & 6 & 13.870 & . 001 \\
\hline 12 & 0 & 1 & 11 & 9 & . 0.550 & NS* \\
\hline 13 & 1 & 1 & 10 & 9 & 0.211 & NS * \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
*Not Significant

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Question Number & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { High } \\
& \text { Yes }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Low } \\
& \text { Yes }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { High } \\
& \text { ino }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Low } \\
& \text { No }
\end{aligned}
\] & \(x^{2}\) & Signifir
cance \\
\hline 14 & 0 & 7 & 10 & 3 & 42.500 & . 001 \\
\hline 15 & 0 & 5 & 11 & 3 & 28.229 & . 001 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{16**} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{17**} \\
\hline 18 & 1 & 4 & 10 & 6 & 7.747 & . 01 \\
\hline 19 & 0 & 6 & 11 & 4 & 33.724 & . 001 \\
\hline 20** & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{21**} \\
\hline 22 & 0 & 6 & 9 & 4 & 27.126 & . 001 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{23**} \\
\hline 24 & 0 & I & 11 & 9 & 0.550 & NS* \\
\hline 25 & 1 & 8 & 9 & 2 & 42.500 & . 001 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{26**} \\
\hline 27 & 0 & 8 & 10 & 2 & 56.500 & . 001 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
*Not Significant
**Not Observed


\section*{APPENDIX N}

Foreign Language Offerings and
Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Tall 1968

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

\section*{DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION}

721 CAPITOL MALL, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814 BUREAU OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION March 20, 1969

FOREIGN IANGUAGE OFFERINGS AND ENROLIMENTS IN PUBIIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS, FAL工 1968

Prepared by
John P. Dusel, Consultant Foreign Language Education
I. Number of public secondary schools offering foreign languages in 1968-69:
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|r|r|r|r|}
\hline \multicolumn{1}{c|}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Offerings
\end{tabular}} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Jr. HS \\
\(7-8\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Jr. HS \\
\(7-9\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Jr.- \\
Sr. HS \\
\(7-12\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c}
\(4-\mathrm{Yr}\) \\
HS \\
\(9-12\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sr. HS \\
\(10-12\)
\end{tabular} & Totals \\
\hline Jo foreign languages & 2 & 3 & - & 11 & 11 & 27 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
nly classical languages \\
Latin, classical Greek)
\end{tabular} & - & - & - & - & - & - \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
nly modern foreign \\
anguages
\end{tabular} & 160 & 254 & 28 & 292 & 97 & 831 \\
\hline lassical and modern & 3 & 96 & 10 & 215 & 131 & 455 \\
\hline oreign languages & 165 & 353 & 38 & 518 & 239 & 1,313 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
II. Number of districts which include secondary schools offering languages other than French, German, Latin, and Spanish:
\begin{tabular}{lrlrlr} 
Chinese & 13 & Hebrew & 3 & Portuguese & 4 \\
Greek & 1 & Italian & 14 & Russian & 43 \\
(Classical) & & Japanese & 2 & Swahili & 1
\end{tabular}
III. This report is based upon data obtained from all of the 354 Califormia unified and high school districts.
III. The table of enrollments by languages, included on page 2 , indicates that of all the languages taught in California secondary schools, Spanish is in first place with \(64 \%\) of the enrollment; French is in second place with 22\%; German is in third place with \(10 \%\); and Latin is in fourth place with 2.8\%.
II. The seventh and eighth enrollments in French and Spanish are down from last year, although both held up well in grades nine through twelve. Courses II, IV, and V in French show a rise as do all the high school courses in Spanish. Many students from grade eight are going directly into the II or III-year courses in high school.
IX. The numbers of students in the IV and V-year courses in almost all languages increased, demonstrating that more students are studying foreign languages for a longer period of time.
X. Consistent increases in German (grade seven through course V) and in Russian (grade seven through course IV) enrollments are noted.
XI. Enrollments increased in certain language areas over 1967 figures as follows:
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Chinese & Grade 8, Courses I and II. \\
French & Courses II, IV and V. \\
German & Grades 7 and 8, Courses I, II, III, \\
& IV and V. \\
Hebrew & Courses I, II, and III. \\
Italian & Grade 7, Courses II, III, and IV. \\
Japanese & Course II. \\
Latin & Grade 7, Course IV. \\
Russian & Grades 7 and 8, Courses I, II, III, and \\
& IV. \\
Spanish & Courses I, II, III, IV, and V.
\end{tabular}
IV. Foreign language enrollment compared with total school enrollment, 1968-69:
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|c|c|}
\hline Type of Inrollment & Fall 1967 & Fall 1968 & Increase & \% of Increase \\
\hline Total school enrollment (7-12) & \(1,539,606\) & \(1,588,801\) & 49,195 & \(3.2 \%\) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
Total foreign language \\
enroliment (7-12)
\end{tabular} & 575,845 & 584,652 & 8,807 & \(1.5 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
V. Percent of increase or decrease in foreign language enrollment by language (grades 7-12 in secondary schools only). The percentages for 1966-67 and 1967-68 are shown for purposes of comparison.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Language & 1966-67 & 1967-68 & 1968-69 \\
\hline Chinese & + \(35.1 \%\) & + 2.4\% & - 25.0\% \\
\hline French & + \(2.4 \%\) & - 1.7\% & - \(3.8 \%\) \\
\hline German & + 12.7\% & - \(4.3 \%\) & \(+11.0 \%\) \\
\hline Hebrew & + 6.7\% & + 1.7\% & +190.0\%* \\
\hline Italian & + 9.6\% & + 1.9\% & + \(4.2 \%\) \\
\hline Japanese & + 86.9\% & - \(9.5 \%\) & - \(5.7 \%\). \\
\hline Latin & - 16.0\% & - 14.6\% & - \(13.7 \%\) \\
\hline Russian & \(+10.4 \%\) & - \(4.1 \%\) & + 13.5\% \\
\hline Spanish & + 12.3\% & + . \(4 \%\) & + \(2.6 \%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
(*Ine 1967-68 district reporting of Hebrew enrollments may be inaccurate.)
VI. The increase in total foreign language enrollment ( \(1.5 \%\) ) did not keep pace with the increase in total student enroliment ( \(3.2 \%\) ) in California's secondary schools. The difference may be expressed by subtracting \(1.5 \%\) from \(3.2 \%\) with a resulting - \(1.7 \%\). This difference may then be computed with the gross percentages shown in number VI as follows:

Chinese French German Italian Japanese Latin Russian Spanish
\(-25.0 \%-1.7 \%=\) \(-5.7 \%-1.7 \%=\) \(-13.7 \%-1.7 \%=\) \(+13.5 \%-1.7 \%=\) \(+2.6 \%-1.7 \%=\)
\(-3.8 \%-1.7 \%=5.5 \%\) decrease when compared with \(3.2 \%\) increase in enrollmen \(+11.0 \%-1.7 \%=9.3 \%\) increase when compared with \(3.2 \%\) increase in enrollmen \(+4.2 \%-1.7 \%=2.5 \%\) increace when compared with \(3.2 \%\) increase in enrollmen
26.7\% decrease when compared with \(3.2 \%\) increase in enrolimen \(7.4 \%\) decrease when compared with \(3.2 \%\) increase in enrollmen \(15.4 \%\) decrease when compared with \(3.2 \%\) increase in enrolimen \(11.8 \%\) increase when compared with \(3.2 \%\) increase in enrollmen \(.9 \%\) increase when compared with \(3.2 \%\) increase in enrollmen

FORETGN LANGUAGE RNROLILIBNTS DN GRADES SEVEN THROUGH THELVE IN SECONDARY SCHOOL SYSTRMS, FALL 1968
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Language} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
7 \mathrm{th} \\
\text { Grade }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sth } \\
& \text { Grade }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Total } \\
7-8
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{Grades 9 through 12} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Totel } \\
& 7-12
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & \[
\text { 1st }{ }^{I} \mathrm{Yr}
\] & \[
\stackrel{I I}{\text { Znd } \mathrm{Yr} .}
\] & \[
\underset{3 \mathrm{rd} \mathrm{Yr}}{\text { III }}
\] & \[
\stackrel{I V}{4 t_{h}} \mathrm{Yr}
\] & \[
\stackrel{V}{5 \operatorname{th}}
\] & \[
\stackrel{\nabla I}{\text { 6th } Y r .}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Total } \\
& 9-12
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline Chinese (Mandarin) & 71 & 179 & 250 & 336 & 169 & 43 & 15. & & & 563 & 813 \\
\hline French & 15,560 & 13,932 \({ }^{\text {c }}\) & 29,492 & 43,196 \({ }^{\circ}\) & 34,947 & 14,885 & 5,793 & \(612^{\text {h }}\) & 52 & 99,485 & 128,977 \\
\hline German & 4,675 & 3,751 & 8,426 & 24,504 & 17,214 & 6,366 & 2,168 & 110 & & 50,362 & 58,788 \\
\hline Greek (Claszical) & & & & 9 & & & & & & 9 & 9 \\
\hline Hebrew & & & & 365 & 107 & 37 & 8 & & & 517 & 517 \\
\hline Italian & 30 & & 30 & 680 & 289 & 120 & 22 & & & 1,111 & 1,141 \\
\hline Japanese & & & & 253 & 153 & 34 & & & & 440 & 440 \\
\hline Letin & 259 & 246 & 505 & 7,972 & 5,460 & 1,698 & 782 & 7 & & 15,919 & 16,424 \\
\hline Portaguese & & & & 62 & & & & & & 62 & 62 \\
\hline Massian & 85 & 60 & 145 & 1,298 & 628 & 249 & 71 & & & 2,246 & 2,391 \\
\hline Spanish & 71,191 \({ }^{\text {b }}\) & 57,001 \({ }^{\text {d }}\) & 128,192 & 115,8231 & 88,1608 & 31,046 & 10,426 & 1,3011 & 112 & 246,868 & 375,060 \\
\hline Swahili & & & & 30 & & & & & & 30 & 30 \\
\hline Totals & 191,871 & 75,169 & 167,040 & 194,528 & 147,127 & 54,478 & 19,285 & 2,030 & 164 & 417,612 & 584,652 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
(a) Includes 28 students taking Conversational French, 108 taking one semester end 236 taking a one-quarter course in French.
(b) Includes 1,408 students taking Conversational Spanish, 549 taking one semester, and 596 taking a onemuarter course in Spanish.
(c) Inolvdes 26 students taking Conversetional French and 316 taking a onemsemester course.
(d) Includes 1,096 students taking Conversational Spanish and 609 taking a onemenester course.
(e) Includes 53 students taking Conversational French.
(f) Inoludes 298 students taking Conversational Spanish.
(g) Includes 76 students taking Spanish for native speakers.
(h) Inoludes 51 students taking Adranced Placement Prench.```
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