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Problem

In the United States, a uniquely American situation exists in that there appears to be no uniform or consistent comprehensive rationale underlying foreign-language study and proficiency requirements for doctoral degrees. As contrasted to students in other parts of the world, especially in Europe--where compulsory basic requirements are usually met by language studies in elementary through secondary school--most American graduate students are ill-prepared for foreign-language proficiency examinations on
the doctoral level.

Method

Historical literature was reviewed to gather information regarding the development of foreign-language requirements in the United States and in Europe. In addition, a request for information about current procedures in American institutions of higher learning was sent to the principal administrator of each school accredited by professional accrediting associations and offering doctoral degrees in education, business, music, and theology. A comprehensive rationale was synthesized on the basis of historical trends, current practices, and concepts expressed by administrators. The rationale was sent to a panel of forty randomly selected administrators for validation.

Results

The rationale addresses eleven issues: (1) the need for foreign-language requirements on the doctoral level; (2) the purposes for such requirements; (3) the number of languages to be required; (4) specific languages to be required; (5) function of language competence; (6) degree of competence needed; (7) needs for other tools; (8) relationship between general and specific requirements; (9) appropriate time for completing foreign-language study; (10) administration; and (11) institutional policies.
Conclusions and Recommendations

It was concluded that

1. A comprehensive rationale must be flexible as needs vary

2. There is a need to establish priorities as to which tool subjects are most useful in each discipline

3. Basic foreign-language studies should be completed before doctoral studies are begun whenever feasible

4. Foreign-language study should be strongly encouraged, but foreign languages should not automatically be part of doctoral requirements

5. When there is a need for specific foreign-language competences in a discipline, these should be specified in the publications of professional schools

6. When there is a demonstrable need within an individual program, any foreign language should be allowed to fulfill doctoral requirements

7. Lack of an adequate foreign-language background may limit study options in some professional disciplines
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The study of foreign languages and the funding and administration of foreign-language programs in the United States is at the present time a national issue. In 1979, the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies reported that "Americans' incompetence in foreign languages is nothing short of scandalous."¹ Rose Hayden, Director of the National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies which was created in 1980 to rectify the situation, is of the opinion that "We graduate people who are globally illiterate."²

Foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines are particularly enigmatic. A proficiency in one, two, or more languages is required for


some degrees while none is expected for others. Some universities require students to "know" the languages, including complex grammatical structure and idiomatic writing. Others require a foreign-language "working knowledge" within a specific discipline. There is great variety in the ways foreign-language proficiency tests are constructed and administered in different schools and universities.

Language study, especially the study of ancient languages, used to be central to American collegiate education. Latin, Greek, and Hebrew were essential tools for transmitting the literature, culture, and scholarship of the Ancient World. Rigid college-entrance examinations called for extensive linguistic preparation and proficiency and, in the traditional classical college curriculum, the study of languages and literature took precedence over all other

---

1 As contrasted to American practices—where foreign-language study is closely linked to collegiate fields of specialization—European general foreign-language study is completed on the secondary level, before a student takes specialized professional studies in a university. See chapter 4, pp. 106-109; 113-30. While most of the variety in the foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees is seen in variance between disciplines (e.g., music vs. education) and between areas within disciplines (e.g., musicology vs. music performance), a considerable amount of variety is also sometimes seen within areas of specialization in different American universities and professional schools (e.g., within musicology.). See appendix C.

2 Doris Dickson Graves, "Foreign Language Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree as Reported upon and Viewed by Graduate Deans" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1982), p. 4.
Over a period of approximately a century and a half, however—from the first quarter of the nineteenth century to the early 1980s—a new and unique situation has evolved in which foreign-language study in American colleges and universities is neglected or ignored by most students in professional-technical disciplines.

The nineteenth century was particularly important and unique in the development and restructuring of the American college curriculum. Built on English models, American college education had largely been limited to four traditional areas of study: (1) philosophy, that is, liberal arts studies, (2) theology, (3) medicine, and (4) law, all of which emphasized the study of classical languages and literature. As in Great Britain, classical higher education in Colonial America was intended for the gentleman.

---

1 Cf. the "course of instruction" in the Harvard catalogues, 1825-26, pp. 19-23, and 1830-31, pp. 22-30; and Yale catalogue, 1845-46, pp. 27-40.

2 See The President's Commission, Strength through Wisdom, p. 3. According to Marvin Cetron, 52 percent of all Ph.D.s in America are foreigners; 34 percent of all master's degree students are foreigners; and 75 percent of all Ph.D.s in the sciences are foreigners. He asks: "... then you wonder why we are losing our technological lead? Because our engineers don't take language. [Other nation's] engineers do take language; they are able to come to this country and take our technology back with them." ("Cetron Talks about Today and Tomorrow," Michigan School Board Journal, November 1983, p. 8.) Unquestionably, foreign scholars living and working in the United States have also contributed much to American technological superiority, partly because of their knowledge of foreign languages.

3 "In the catalogues of graduates of Harvard College down to 1772, and in those of Yale down to 1767, the names..."
time of rapid change, the nineteenth century saw a steadily increasing demand for immediate usefulness and practicality in education. College and university studies were to provide professional-technical and vocational competence beside "culture."¹ As a result, the interest in classical liberal studies decreased and the popularity of the ancient languages diminished. In the second half of the nineteenth century, and in the twentieth century, the American curriculum was greatly expanded with a tremendous proliferation of course offerings. The changes in the American college and university curriculum were partly influenced by developments in and changing demands from American society, by industrial and other economic needs, and through the impact of German scientific scholarship and German academic models in professional education.²

At the present time, in the 1980s, foreign-language study and proficiency examinations for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines have become of students in the successive classes are placed—not alphabetically, as now, and not as at Oxford or Cambridge in the order of application for admission, or according to scholastic merit, but—in order supposed to indicate the rank of their respective fathers or families." (Franklin Bowditch Dexter, "On Some Social Distinctions at Harvard and Yale, before the Revolution," American Antiquarian Society, October 1893, p. 34.)


²See chapter 2, pp. 41-52.
almost entirely utilitarian\(^1\) in that academic disciplines which have a large useful body of literature or technical material and terminology in various languages—such as theology, philology, and music—continue to stress languages. Some of the older academic disciplines and most new professional-technical fields pioneered in America, such as medicine, science in general, international business, education, advertising, radio, film, television, electronics, and aviation have tended to gradually relax foreign-language requirements or completely ignore foreign languages for academic purposes.\(^2\) Often, new "practical tools" or non-linguistic "languages" are substituted for the older ones. The present study and use of languages and the administration of doctoral proficiency exams in such fields as education, business, music, and theology show a diversity of practices in American institutions of higher learning. There is a need to clarify the function of foreign-language requirements in professional fields.

**Statement of the Problem**

In the United States, a uniquely American situation exists in that there appears to be no uniform or consistent


\(^2\)Treen et al., "English, English Everywhere," pp. 98-103. Professional fields such as medicine, pharmacy, and law use Greek or Latin terminology but not the actual languages.
comprehensive rationale underlying foreign-language study and proficiency requirements for doctoral degrees. As contrasted to the study of foreign languages in other parts of the world, where compulsory basic requirements are usually met by language studies in elementary through secondary school, American language studies at best start at the secondary level. Only 8 per cent of American colleges and universities now require a foreign language for general admission. Besides, most language programs in American schools are not conducted in such a manner that the mastery of a foreign language is the natural or guaranteed outcome. Most American graduate students are therefore ill-prepared for foreign-language proficiency examinations on the doctoral level.

As a result of strong and conflicting opinions among educators, foreign-language requirements have in recent decades undergone continual modifications to the point that it is difficult to ascertain what is standard for a particular

---

1 In Norway, for example, English-language instruction starts in the 4th grade. The Norwegian Basic School, (Oslo: Basic School Council, 1981), p. 27. Interestingly, all foreign students requesting admission to universities in the Federal Republic of Germany, Austria, Norway, and other European countries are admitted on the basis of university-preparatory secondary school diplomas from their home country. An exception to this is made for students with American high-school diplomas, who are not admitted until they have reached junior standing in an American college or university. See chapter 4, pp. 113-14.

2 The President's Commission, Strength through Wisdom, p. 7.

---
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lar professional degree.¹ Several studies have been made of the language requirements for the Ph.D. degree.² A review of the literature has indicated, however, that a comprehensive study has not yet been conducted regarding the need and rationale for guidelines within specific professional fields.³

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to develop a rationale for foreign-language proficiency requirements for doctoral degrees in four selected professional disciplines in American universities and professional schools; namely, education, business, music, and theology.

Related "sub-purposes," providing a background for the rationale to be developed, are:

1. To trace the factors that have been affecting the study of languages in American colleges and universities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, leading to the present situation of foreign-language de-emphasis.

2. To compare current American linguistic practices with

---

¹There are those who question whether there should be a "norm." See chapter 6.


practices in selected European countries.

3. To trace current practices and attitudes to foreign-language study in general in the United States, identifying unanswered questions to be addressed in this study.

Significance of the Study

There is a need to establish guidelines for reasonable and relevant foreign-language studies and proficiency requirements in professional disciplines, such as education, business, music, and theology, as contrasted to general competence requirements for doctoral students preparing to become foreign-language teachers, interpreters, foreign-service personnel, philologists, and missionaries. Since it has been demonstrated that the present foreign-language requirements in American colleges and universities have failed to provide adequate useful language preparation,¹ a comprehensive rationale or framework, with new procedures, is essential for improving the situation.

American "gross national inadequacy" in foreign-language skills has become a serious and growing liability.² It is going to be far more difficult for the United States to survive and compete in a world where nations are increasingly dependent upon one another if American professionals cannot communicate with their neighbors in their

¹The President's Commission, Strength through Wisdom, pp. 1-11.
²Ibid.
own languages and cultural contexts. The inability of most American professionals to speak or understand any language except English and to comprehend other cultures handicaps the United States seriously in the international arena.¹ A new comprehensive rationale for foreign-language study among American professionals and a framework for the administration of doctoral proficiency requirements are urgently needed for the reversal of the current highly undesirable linguistic trends in the United States.

The information derived from this study will make it possible for administrators in professional schools to relate their proficiency requirements to those of other schools in their own disciplines. Also, it will be useful to educators on the secondary and undergraduate levels by giving some indications of graduate foreign-language expectations in various professional disciplines, and it can assist in curriculum development in higher education.

Prospective graduate students in professional fields may also find useful the information obtained in this study as they plan for their own graduate programs.

Limitations and Delimitations

In order to make the study manageable, the research is limited to doctoral degrees in four professional disciplines: (1) education, (2) business, (3) music, and (4) theology.

These four professional areas were selected to represent two areas from among those which traditionally require considerable language proficiency (music and theology) and two from those which traditionally do not require a broad language background (education and business).

Definitions of Terms

Rationale. A rationale is a reasoned theory or the fundamental logical principles accounting for the why and how of an action or a practice or process. It gives guidelines with accompanying reasons. The guidelines suggest appropriate application and implementation as conditions or circumstances vary. It is contrasted to a model or a pattern, to which all applications are attempting to conform.

Foreign-language proficiency test. In the United States, "proficiency tests" are commonly administered to graduate students to insure that they have a "reading knowledge" or "working knowledge" of one or more foreign languages—most often French and German.¹

Secondary-school level. In America, secondary-school level refers to American high school, grades 9-12. In

¹The examinations call for the reading or the translation of passages of literature in the students' field of specialization. In most educational institutions, the language requirements must be satisfied before the graduate student begins writing the dissertation. The nature of the testing and the proficiency required have varied greatly from one university to another. Within the past twenty years, however, the standardized Graduate School Foreign Language Tests (GSFLT) of the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, have been commonly used.
American usage, lower elementary level refers to grades K-5, middle school (junior high school) refers to grades 6-8, and secondary school (high school) refers to grades 9-12. The European gymnasium, lycee, and videregaaende skole are secondary-level schools.¹

**Professional education.** Professional education is the term used for education undertaken primarily for the purpose of preparing a person for earning a livelihood and that requires specialized knowledge and academic (collegiate) training. It is contrasted to "vocational" and "technical" education, which usually prepares a person for a non-academic (non-collegiate) occupation or activity, undertaken in a vocational or technical school.²

**Professional degrees.** Professional degrees are those offered in disciplines other than the "liberal arts." They include such fields as law, medicine, education, business, theology, music, engineering, and the natural sciences. The areas of specialization are usually indicated in the degree designations: doctor of jurisprudence (D.J. or J.D.), doctor of medicine (M.D.), doctor of education (Ed.D.), doctor of business administration (D.B.A.), doctor of music (Mus.D.,

¹See chapter 4, pp. 106-109.

²In the early American colleges, "the professions" were medicine, law, theology, and "classics" (teaching the liberal arts). The proliferation of collegiate-level subject material over the past century has tended to make the difference between professional and vocational education less and less distinct.
D.M.A., or Mus.Ed.D.), doctor of theology (Th.D. or S.T.D.), and doctor of engineering (D.Eng.).

Graduate education. That area of study in American academic institutions beyond the "undergraduate" bachelor's degree; that is, advanced study in preparation for a profession, is commonly known as graduate education.

Classical languages. Classical languages are those used in the literature of Classical Antiquity. They are the written Greek and Latin languages of Ancient Greece and Rome.

---

1 The doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D.) is usually not considered a "professional" degree. In classical college education, philosophia (Gr = "love for wisdom") was divided into (1) moral philosophy; that is, the theory of knowledge and the processes of learning related to perceiving, thinking, and knowing; and (2) natural philosophy; that is, general science, especially physics. Emphasis was put on concepts and literature handed down from Classical Antiquity. With the recent proliferation of degrees, however, many professional disciplines are now also represented by Ph.D. degrees; for example, Ph.D. degree in education and Ph.D. degree in musicology or composition.

2 In continental European universities there is no distinct difference made between undergraduate and graduate education. Undergraduate "general education"—such as foreign languages—is usually completed in secondary school.

3 Koine Greek and modern Greek, as well as mediaeval Latin, are different from their classical counterparts. The classical languages are occasionally referred to as "dead" languages as contrasted to "modern" languages still in common use, such as French, German, and Spanish, and "oriental" languages, such as Japanese and Chinese. Hebrew was also included in the nineteenth-century American Classical college curriculum as an "ancient" language, but it is generally not considered "classical." Koine Greek was the international contact language of the pre-Roman Hellenic world. Its function was in many ways similar to that of Latin in the Middle Ages and English today.
Vernacular. A regional or provincial language as distinguished from the standard, literary language is a vernacular or the language commonly spoken by the people of a region or country.

Lingua franca. The term *lingua franca* (Lat & It = "language of the Franks") originally referred to a jargon or hybrid language developed from French, Italian, Spanish, Greek, and Arabic linguistic elements in the Middle Ages and used as a trading brogue in Mediterranean ports.¹

The Elective Principle. The "elective principle," sometimes called the "elective system" or "elective curriculum," was initially introduced in the United States by President Charles William Eliot at Harvard College. Modeled after German university practices, it promoted the substitution of a broadly elective course of study for the old prescribed classical curriculum. At Harvard, "all [old prescribed unchangeable] subject requirements for seniors

¹*Lingua franca* was first applied to this jargon, especially as based on southern French and Italian dialects, which crusaders and traders used in the eastern Mediterranean. As trade routes were extended in connection with overseas colonization, during and after the Renaissance, new mixed contact jargons or "linguae francae" were developed.

"Linguae francae" are compromise languages used between peoples speaking mutually incomprehensible languages. There are two kinds: (1) either a conventional language or dialect is used, such as Swahili in East Africa, or (2) a new jargon is created, such as the Chinook jargon, which is built on Chinook and other American Indian languages with English admixture. The use of English as a contact language generally belongs to the first group, even though English is built on elements from other languages, such as Latin, French, Old Norse, etc. English may more appropriately be called an "international language."
were abolished in 1872, for juniors in 1879, and for sophomores in 1884. They were greatly reduced for freshmen in 1885 and eliminated altogether, except for English composition, in 1897.

Review of Literature

A substantial amount of literature exists that is related to (1) the history of the use of languages in university education in America and in Europe; (2) current American attitudes to foreign-language study in general; (3) the nature of current study of languages in European educational institutions; (4) the present general foreign-language requirements in non-professional disciplines in American colleges and universities; (5) perceptions of the need for academic language requirements; (6) the nature of present academic general foreign-language requirements in the United States; and (7) current attitudes among administrators toward general foreign-language requirements for the Ph.D. degree, without distinction between professional disciplines.

The history of the use of languages in university education in Europe is well documented by Hastings Rashdall, Hans Ruckert, and others. In the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Latin was, of course, not really a foreign


\[2\] See Bibliography under authors' names.
language. Later, in Europe, the use of several languages among university students became natural, because students from different countries studied together and each used his native tongue.

The present-day study of languages in European educational institutions and the rationale for such study has been well described in a wealth of recent literature. The ministries of education of most European countries have issued publications describing the characteristics of their own educational systems and the subject material studied on each educational level. Most of this literature is available and has been obtained from different European embassies and legations in Washington, D.C.1 Also, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of International Education Programs, has issued two series of comparative educational monographs since World War II.2 The individual volumes of the first series are called "Education in [country];" and the volumes of the second are called "The Educational System of [country]." In addition, the Office of International Education Programs has various monographs on foreign-language study and requirements abroad and foreign students' guides to study in the United States. These monographs are available also in the ERIC Document Repro-

1See Bibliography under authors' names.

2The first series is called Comparative Education Series, while the other is called Education Around the World.
ducation Series. Much up-to-date information on current language study and academic requirements in other parts of the world is found in large comprehensive international reference works such as the UNESCO World Guide to Higher Education and the International Handbook of Universities.

The history of foreign-language study in the United States is documented in detail by Frederick Rudolph in his comprehensive books The American College and University and Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636 and similar surveys. A first hand view of the evolution of the use of foreign languages in American colleges and universities can be obtained from the annual catalogues of the major American educational institutions, most of which are found in the Newberry Library in Chicago. The Newberry Library also has most of the works by and about the American educators who shaped the history of American higher education, i.e., Charles William Eliot of Harvard University, Timothy Dwight of Yale, Frederick A. P. Barnard of Columbia, Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins, G.

1. The microfiche copies in the "ERIC Document Reproduction Series" are available in the Andrews University Teaching Materials Center.


The need for a general foreign-language requirement in American colleges and universities has within the past two decades been argued at great length. William W. Brickman, Royal L. Tinsley, Guy Stem, Victor Anthony Rudowski, Julian F. Smith, Albert Allen Bartlett, William R. Parker, Oliver C. Carmichael, and others have been in favor of a general foreign-language requirement, while Moody E. Prior, Robert G. Meyer, Herbert J. Walberg, Fred S. Keller, Robert Frausen Topp, Alvin H. Scaff, and many others have for various reasons expressed opposition to a general university-wide requirement.

The nature of present graduate foreign-language requirements has been described by Francis J. Noch, Julian F. Smith, Gustave O. Arlt, Albert Allen Bartlett, and Tomas Feininger. Little agreement exists as to how the requirements should be established and to what extent foreign-language requirements should be university-wide or

1See Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 447, and the Bibliography under the names of these university presidents; Johns Hopkins University, List of Dissertations, 1876-1926 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1926).

2See chapter 5, pp. 139-40.

3See chapter 5, pp. 141-42.
controlled by individual schools and departments.\(^1\)

The general foreign-language requirements for the Ph.D. degree—as opposed to those for professional degrees—in American universities have been studied by Doris Dickson Graves in a 1982 doctoral dissertation.\(^2\) Her dissertation was developed from a questionnaire which she sent to deans of graduate schools so that she could establish the current requirements and the perception of the nature and administration of these requirements in the various schools offering the Ph.D. degree. The statistics show a wide variety of practices and virtually no uniformity in rationale. The usefulness of the study and its findings is questionable because the study did not separate the practices in different disciplines. The primary message of the study was merely that different disciplines have different requirements and different administrative practices, and that some institutions have university-wide requirements, while others have requirements set by individual schools and departments.

**Procedures**

This study uses historical-descriptive and developmental methods. In order to gain a better understanding of the foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines and to establish a rationale for the

\(^1\)See chapter 5, pp. 142-45.

\(^2\)See Graves, "Foreign Language Requirements," passim.
administration of foreign-language requirements for professional degrees, it was essential to have a detailed insight into how the current linguistic situation in American colleges and universities evolved. Consequently, it was necessary to trace the development of the use of languages and the function of foreign-language requirements in college and university education both here and in other countries.

Special attention was given to the factors affecting language study in the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, leading to the present situation of national linguistic non-involvement and lack of competence. The historical development of the American curriculum was traced through the study of selected university catalogues and historical literature; and the evolution in educational philosophy underlying the curricular changes was sought in the writings of educators closely associated with the development.

To understand the uniqueness of the American situation, current language study and foreign-language requirements in other parts of the world—especially in continental Europe—were reviewed. Source materials used were published national and international tables showing the foreign-language requirements and study plans in European elementary and secondary schools and selected university catalogues and catalogues of professional schools, as well as academic
monographs on contemporary education in individual countries.¹

A review of the research done since 1960 on contemporary practices and attitudes in the United States was needed. It included (1) study of the literature showing the prevalence of general university-wide as well as departmentally established foreign-language requirements in the United States; (2) identification of the languages commonly required and studied for doctoral proficiency exams; (3) study of the use of the languages within the framework of specific academic degree requirements; and (4) a review of the rationale used in support of and in opposition to general foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees.²

The literature described was reviewed to gather concepts from which a comprehensive rationale for foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees could be built. Emphasis was placed on present American and foreign concepts that appeared to be practical and successful. Special attention was given to graduate foreign-language requirements as published in the bulletins and pertinent departmental literature of the institutional members of the national accreditation associations in education (National Council for

¹See chapter 4, pp. 106-130.

²See chapter 5, pp. 135-83. Personal letters of inquiry were sent to the principal administrator of all schools (colleges) offering doctorates in education, business, music, and theology (religion).
the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), business (American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business [AACSB]), music (National Association of Schools of Music [NASM]), and theology (Association of Theological Schools [ATS]).

A personal letter of inquiry was sent to the dean, chairman, or director of all accredited schools, colleges, and independent departments offering doctorates in education, business, music, and theology; i.e., the letter was sent to the principal administrator in these disciplines in each institution. Two hundred thirty-five replies were received. Many of the principal administrators answered the inquiry in considerable detail. Often, however, they turned over the inquiry to some other administrator specifically concerned with the foreign-language requirements within their institution for reply.

On the basis of the information and the ideas gathered, a comprehensive rationale was developed, including recommendations for foreign-language study and a set of guidelines that take into consideration and that can be modified

---

1See chapter 5, pp. 154-181. All the institutions involved are listed in the Bibliography under "Catalogues." A more detailed description of the procedure is found in chapters 5 and 6.

2See appendices A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, and in the Bibliography under "Personal Letters and Other Correspondance." A complete list of all the 235 deans, chairmen, and other administrators sending personal letters or notes referring to their foreign-language requirements is found in the Bibliography. See chapter 6 for a more detailed explanation of the evaluation procedure.
according to the diversified needs in different professional
disciplines. A preliminary draft of the rationale was first
given to seven local professionals for review and suggestions
for refinement. The modified, final draft of the rationale
was then sent to forty randomly selected deans, assistant
deans, chairmen, professors, and other administrators in
education, business, music, and theology for evaluation and
validation. Ten respondents from each discipline were
randomly selected from among the institutions offering
doctoral degrees. The purpose of the evaluation was to gain
additional insight as to the practical validity of the
proposed rationale developed by this researcher in the
professional disciplines of this study.

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 1
includes an introduction, the background, the problem, the
purposes, the significance, the definitions of terms, and the
limitations and delimitations of the study. It also gives a
brief review of the literature available, a description of
the procedures used, and an overview of the organization of
the study.

Chapter 2 describes the unique academic situation found
in the United States in the nineteenth century which has made
language study and foreign-language requirements in America
different from those of any other country, requiring pro-
ficiency exams on the doctoral level rather than on the
secondary level. Chapter 3 deals with trends in foreign-language study in the first half of the twentieth century. Foreign-language requirements in other parts of the world, especially in Europe, are reviewed in chapter 4.

Chapter 5 reviews and reports on research from 1960 to the 1980s that deals with general foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in the United States and reviews the current foreign-language requirements (1984) in the American universities and professional schools offering doctorates in education, business, music, and theology.

Chapter 6 presents the rationale for foreign-language requirements in professional disciplines, to which this study has led. The basis for the rationale is outlined, the evaluation procedure is described, and the reaction to the rationale by the evaluators is given. Chapter 7 concludes the study. It includes a summary and the conclusions drawn from the study and makes recommendations for future action.
CHAPTER II

FACTORS AFFECTING THE STUDY OF LANGUAGES IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Introduction

The nineteenth century was a time of great change—a time during which the study of languages in American educational institutions was gradually becoming substantially different from that found in Europe. In this chapter, the factors affecting the changing attitude toward foreign-language study in the United States are traced.

Foreign Language Requirements for Early American Doctorates

Language Background Required for Doctoral Degrees at Yale College, 1860-61

General foreign-language proficiency expectations for early doctoral degrees in American colleges and universities were essentially the same as those for undergraduate degrees in the same disciplines. Doctoral-level, general foreign-language requirements and exams, as such, did not exist. On the secondary and the undergraduate levels, Greek and Latin were emphasized in the liberal arts, as well as in medicine, law, and theology, while the emphasis was on French and
German in the sciences. Since doctoral studies consisted of advanced work in specialized fields, general competence or proficiency requirements were expected to be fulfilled in secondary school and on the undergraduate college level.

The "Prep School" Curriculum

(05) A representative "general statement" of "terms of admission" for the "Yale Academical Department"—reflecting the subject emphasis of the classical secondary-level college-preparatory school curriculum—is found in the Yale College catalogue for the 1860-61 academic year, the first year the Ph.D. degree was offered at Yale:

Candidates for admission to the Freshman Class are


2 Interestingly, of the nine degree-granting colleges established prior to the American Revolution, eight were founded by religious groups: Harvard (1636), Yale (1701) and Dartmouth (1769) were established by the Congregationalists; William and Mary (1693), now the University of Virginia, and King's College (1754), now Columbia, by the Anglicans; the College of New Jersey (1746), now Princeton, by the Presbyterians; Rhode Island College (1764), now Brown University, by the Baptists; and Queen's College (1766), now Rutgers, by the Dutch Reformed. Only the College of Philadelphia (1755), now the University of Pennsylvania, was nondenominational.

The classical curriculum of these nine colleges showed a remarkable similarity, as it was strongly influenced by precedents set by Harvard and Yale. The classical curriculum of Harvard, as well as that of Yale, was patterned after Cambridge University, and fundamental to studies in higher education was a strong secondary-school foreign-language background. The classical curriculum—as opposed to new curricula—continued to be conservative and somewhat uniform in newly established schools of higher learning.
examined in the following books and subjects,—

Cicero—seven Orations.
Virgil—the Bucolics, Georgics, and the first six books of the Aeneid.
Sallust—Catilinarian and Jugurthine Wars.
Latin Grammar—Andrews and Stoddard, or Zumpt.
Latin Prosody.
Arnold's Latin Prose Composition, to the Passive voice, (first XII Chapters).

Greek Reader—Jacobs, Colton, or Felton.
Xenophon—Anabasis, first three books.
Greek Grammar—Hadley, Sophocles, Crosby, or Kühner.

Thomson's Higher Arithmetic.
Day's Algebra (Revised Edition), to Quadratic Equations.
Playfair's Euclid, first two books.
English Grammar.
Geography.

The Undergraduate Liberal Arts Curriculum

The four-year undergraduate "course of instruction" for the B.A. degree in the Yale Academical Department for the same school year, incorporating the traditional American obligatory foreign-language requirements, was described as follows:

---

FRESHMAN CLASS.¹

First Term.

Greek.—Homer's Iliad, two books.
Latin.—Livy; Arnold's Latin Prose Composition.
Mathematics.—Day's Algebra; Playfair's Euclid.

Second Term.

Greek.—Homer's Iliad, continued through four books; Herodotus; Arnold's Greek Prose Composition.
Latin.—Livy; Latin Composition.
Mathematics.—Playfair's Euclid.
History.—Pütz and Arnold's Ancient History.

Third Term.

Greek.—Herodotus; Greek Testament; Greek Composition.
Latin.—The Odes of Horace; Latin Composition.
Mathematics.—Day's Algebra; Stanley's Spherics.
Rhetoric.—Lectures on the Structure of Language, with Recitations. Compositions.

SOPHOMORE CLASS.

First Term.

Greek.—Champlin's Select Orations of Demosthenes; Alcestis of Euripides.
Latin.—The Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica of Horace; Latin Composition.
Mathematics.—Day's Mathematics; Stanley's Mathematical Tables.

Second Term.

Greek.—Prometheus of AESchylus; Panegyricus of Isocrates.
Latin.—Cicero de Officiis; Latin Composition.
Mathematics.—Day's Mathematics; Stanley's Spherics.
Rhetoric.—Declamations. Compositions.

¹The original style of printing and spelling has been retained here.
Third Term.

Greek.—Antigone of Sophocles.
Latin.—Cicero de Officiis.
Mathematics.—Day's Mathematics; Loomis's Conic Sections, (see Elective Studies).
Rhetoric.—Whately's Rhetoric, (with the exception of Part IV, on Eloquence). Declamations. Compositions.

JUNIOR CLASS.

First Term.

Greek.—Gorgias of Plato.
Latin.—Tacitus; Latin Composition.
Mathematics.—(See Elective Studies).
Natural Philosophy.—Snell's Olmsted's Natural Philosophy:—Mechanics. Lectures.
Rhetoric.—Forensic Disputations.

Second Term.

Greek.—Thucydides.
Latin.—Cicero de Natura Deorum; Latin Composition.
Mathematics.—(See Elective Studies).
Logic.—
Natural Philosophy.—Hydorstatics, Hydraulics, Pneumatics, Acoustics, Electricity, Magnetism. Lectures.
Rhetoric.—Forensic Disputations.

Third Term.

Natural Philosophy.—Optics. Lectures.
Chemistry.—Lectures.

SENIOR CLASS.

First Term.

Disputations.

Chemistry.—Silliman's Chemistry. Lectures, with Recitations.

Second Term.

Moral Philosophy.—Stewart's Active and Moral Powers; Butler's Sermons; Whewell's Elements of Morality. Lectures.

Political Philosophy.—Political Economy, finished; Lieber's Civil Liberty and Self Government. Lectures.

Constitution of the United States.— Lectures.


Meteorology.—Lectures.

Astronomy.—Lectures.

Anatomy.—Lectures.

Third Term—until the Examination, May 23.

Political Philosophy.—Law of Nations.

Mineralogy and Geology.

Theology.—Paley's Evidence of Christianity. Lectures.

The Undergraduate Theology Curriculum

The foreign-language proficiency requirements in the Yale Theological Department were not equally clearly stated. Already in 1860 there was a certain freedom of choice built into the curriculum. In the Annual Catalogue for 1860-61, it was indicated that "The conditions for entrance are hopeful piety, and a liberal education at some College, or such other literary acquisition as may be considered an equivalent preparation for theological studies." This seems to suggest

1Yale College, Annual Catalogue, pp. 31-33.

2Ibid., p. 40.
that when they were accepted into the Theological Department, theology students would normally be expected to have the Greek and Latin proficiency attained as students in the Academical Department at the end of the sophomore year. Hebrew was begun in the junior year.

The regular "course of instruction" in the Theological Department took three years, and comprised the following subjects:

JUNIOR CLASS.¹

Hebrew Grammar, (Roediger's Gesenius, translated by Conant).
Conant's Hebrew Exercises and Chrestomathy.
Principles of Sacred Criticism and Hermeneutics.
Critical and Exegetical study of Hebrew and Greek Scriptures.
Critical and Exegetical Dissertations.
Lectures by the Professor of Sacred Literature on some topics introductory to Theology, and in Exegetical Theology.
Lectures by the Professor of Didactic Theology on Mental Philosophy, including the Will.

MIDDLE CLASS

Lectures by the Professor of Didactic Theology—
On Moral Philosophy.
Moral Government.
Natural Theology.
Necessity and Evidences of Revelation.
Exegetical study of the Scriptures and Dissertations continued.

SENIOR CLASS.

Lectures on the Structure and Composition of Sermons and on Public Prayer.
Criticism of Sermons and of Plans of Sermons.

¹The original style of printing and spelling has been retained here.
Exercises in Extemporaneous Speaking and Preaching before the Class.
Lectures on the Pastoral Charge. Revivals of Religion
History of Modern Missions.
Expository Preaching.
Elocution, attended by Practice in the Delivery of Sermons.¹

The Law Curriculum

In the Law Department, also, foreign language requirements were not clearly stated. According to the 1860-61 annual catalogue,

The Degree of Bachelor of Laws will be conferred by the President and Fellows, on liberally educated students who have been members of the Department eighteen months, and have complied with the regulations of the Institution, and passed a satisfactory examination. Those not liberally educated, will be graduated upon similar conditions, after two years' membership; and members of the Bar, after one year's membership subsequent to their admission to the Bar.²

The Medical Curriculum

The regulations of the Medical Department indicated that

By the Statutes of the State, the requirements for the Degree of Doctor in Medicine are three years' study for those who are not Bachelors of Arts, and two years' study for those who are; attendance upon two full courses of Lectures, either in this Institution, or some other of a similar character; the attainment of twenty-one years of age, and a good moral character; together with a satisfactory examination before the Board of Examiners for the State, at which the candidate must present a

¹Yale College, Annual Catalogue, pp. 31-33.
Secondary School Preparation for the Collegiate "General Course" in the Yale Scientific School

Collegiate foreign-language entrance examinations in the Yale Scientific School were less stringent than those in the Academical Department. However, modern foreign languages, such as French and German, were required as part of the regular undergraduate "course of instruction." In addition, prospective students were admonished that

The same preparation in Latin, which is required for admission to the Freshman Class of the Academical Department is recommended to the student, as facilitating the study of the sciences and of the English, French, and German languages pursued in the Scientific School.

The "terms of admission" stated that

Applicants for admission to the first year of either course in the Scientific School as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy, must be at least sixteen years of age, and must bring satisfactory testimonials of good character. They must also sustain an examination in the following books, or their equivalents:

Arithmetic—Thomson's Higher Arithmetic.
Algebra—Day or Davies.
Geometry—Davies Legendre.
Plane Trigonometry—Loomis or Davies.
Natural Philosophy—Loomis or Olmsted.
Chemistry—Silliman or Porter.
English Grammar.

\[1\] Ibid., p. 44.
\[2\] Ibid., p. 54.
The Undergraduate "General Course" in the Yale Scientific School

The "General Course" of the Yale Scientific School during the 1860-61 school year consisted of the following subjects, including compulsory French and German:

FIRST YEAR.

First Term.

Mathematics—Davies's Analytical Geometry.*
Mathematics—Spherical Trigonometry. Surveying.
English Language—Etymology. Exercises in composition.
Elocution—Lectures on Elocution, with practice.
Elocution—Declamations.
Chemistry—Lectures on General Chemistry.
French—Fasquelle's Method.

Second Term.

Mathematics—Descriptive Geometry, and Geometrical Drawing.
Elocution—Practical exercises in Elocution.
French—DeFiva's Reader.

Third Term.

Mathematics—Linear Perspective, and Isometrical Drawing.
Mineralogy—Lectures, with practical exercises in the determination of Minerals. Lectures on Building Materials.
Botany—Lectures and practical exercises in Botany and Vegetable Physiology.
French—Souvestre, Moliere, Racine.

1Ibid., p. 46.
SECOND YEAR.

First Term.

Physical and Political Geography--Lectures and Recitations.
Logic--Wilson's Elementary Treatise.
German--Woodbury's Method.

Second Term.

Astronomy--Norton's Astronomy, with practical Problems. Lectures.
Rhetoric--Whately's Rhetoric.
Chemistry--Agricultural Chemistry. Lectures and recitations.
Agriculture--Lectures on Agriculture (optional, see p. 51).
German--Andersen, Fouque, Schiller.

Third Term

Literature--Critical study of classical English authors.
History--History of the United States.
Industrial Mechanics--Lectures on the Steam Engine and other Motors.
German. Schiller, Goethe.

THIRD YEAR.

First Term.

History--Guizot's History of Civilization. Lectures.
Mental Philosophy--Hamilton's Metaphysics. Lectures.
Rhetoric--English Classics, continued.
Political Economy--Laws of Trade; Forms of Business; Statistics of Agriculture, Commerce and Manufactures.

Second Term.

Moral Philosophy--Stewart's Active and Moral Powers; Butler's Sermons; Whewell's Elements of Morality.
Lectures.
Political Philosophy—Political Economy; Lieber's Civil Liberty and Self Government. Lectures.
Constitution of the United States--Lectures.
Meteorology--Lectures.
Anatomy and Physiology--Lectures.

Third Term.

Political Philosophy--Law of Nations.
Logic--Mill's Logic, Books III and IV. Induction.
Theology--Paley's Evidences of Christianity. Lectures
Commercial Law--Lectures and Recitations in connection with classes in the Law School.¹

The Specialized Engineering Courses

The 1860-61 foreign-language requirements in French and German for the "Course in Chemistry and Natural Science," the "Course in Engineering," the "Higher Course in Engineering," and the "Course in Agriculture" in the Yale Scientific School were the same as those for the "General Course."² In addition to the undergraduate French and German requirements in the Scientific School, it was

... required of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, that they shall faithfully devote at least two years to a course of study selected from branches pursued in the Department of Philosophy and the Arts. The selection may be made from the studies of either or both sections but must belong to at least two distinct departments of learning.

All persons who have not previously received a degree furnishing evidence of acquaintance with the Latin and Greek languages, will be required before presenting themselves for the final examination for the Doctor's degree, to pass a satisfactory examination in

¹Ibid., pp. 47-49.
²Ibid., pp. 149-51.
these languages, or in other studies (not included in their advanced course) which shall be accepted as an equivalent by the Faculty.¹

The Doctor of Philosophy and the Doctor of Science Degrees

In 1861, Yale awarded three Doctor of Philosophy degrees in the fields of philosophy and psychology, physics, and classics, respectively—the first earned doctorates in the United States.² In 1863 Harvard followed, and in the next decade and a half, Ph.D. degrees were awarded to a small number of students at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Cornell, Rutgers, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Syracuse.³ With the founding of Johns Hopkins in 1876—the first American "graduate level" university built on German models—the number of Ph.D. degrees granted increased greatly. By 1900, however, Johns Hopkins had probably lost its eminence as the premier Ph.D. degree-granting institution to Harvard.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 54. Emphasis supplied. This was the first evidence of doctoral foreign-language requirements. It was imposed on students who appeared to have an inadequate secondary or undergraduate foreign-language background. This was also the first evidence that other tools could fulfill requirements. But these requirements had to be fulfilled outside the regular doctoral program.

²Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 115.

³Walters, Graduate Education, 1862-1962, pp. 124-5. These doctoral degrees were "post-graduate" degrees, rather than part of a standardized "graduate" doctoral curriculum.

⁴Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 336.
Graduate Foreign-Language Requirements in the Last Quarter of the Nineteenth Century

With the Ph.D. degree went a kind of competence, authority, and power that the earlier academic community did not have.¹ By the end of the century, the inter-relationship of resident time requirements, acquired in previous studies, and scholarly achievements was emphasized and the rationale behind the American Ph.D. degree was well expressed in the Harvard University catalogue of 1900. As in German and other European universities, no mention was made of foreign-language study or requirements on the graduate level:

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, not less than two years,—at least one of which must be spent in residence at this University,—devoted to advanced studies, approved as affording suitable preparation for the degree by the Committee on Honors and Higher Degrees in that Division of the Faculty in which the student is to be a candidate, are required of students already qualified for candidacy for the degree. The Faculty will, in estimating the amount of a candidate's study for the degree, give weight to advanced work done in the graduate department of another university.

For the degree of Doctor of Science, three years of scientific study, approved as affording suitable preparation for the degree by the proper Divisional Committee on Honors and Higher Degrees,—at least one of these years being spent in residence at this University,—are required of students already qualified for candidacy for the degree. A student who holds the two degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science from Harvard University is excused from one of the three years of study required for the degree of Doctor of Science.

The periods of residence and study named above for the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Science must be regarded merely as minimum requirements. The requirements of time for the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Science are wholly secondary. These degrees do

¹Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 18.
not rest on any computation of time, nor on any enumeration of courses; although no student can become a candidate for one of them until he has, in the judgment of the Administrative Board of the Graduate School, fulfilled the requirements of residence and study for the prescribed periods.

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy or of Science is given, not for the mere reason of faithful study for a prescribed time or in fulfillment of a determinate programme, and never for miscellaneous studies, but on the ground of long study and high attainment in a special branch of learning, manifested not only by examinations, but by a thesis, which must be presented and accepted before the candidate is admitted to final examination, and must show an original treatment of a fitting subject, or give evidence of independent research.

Any person on whom the University confers the degree of Doctor of Philosophy or of Science is thereby recognized as qualified to give instruction to candidates for this degree in the Department in which he has taken the degree, and to advance knowledge in that Department by his own investigation.¹

By 1900, the Ph.D. degree at Harvard could be earned in the fields of philology, philosophy, history, political science, music, mathematics, physics and chemistry, "natural history," American archeology, and ethnology. The degree Doctor of Science could be earned in the mathematical, physical, and natural sciences.² Gradually, advanced work leading to the Ph.D. degree became the earmark of the American university as contrasted to a college. The degree itself became the necessary credential in the emerging

¹The Harvard University Catalogue, 1899-1900 (Cambridge, MA: The University, 1900), p. 459-60.

²Ibid. Similar doctoral degree programs were developed in most other representative universities, including Columbia, Michigan, Illinois, Chicago, etc.
profession of college and university teaching.¹

**New Undergraduate Admissions Requirements**

**American Universities**

By 1900, college entrance examination requirements had been liberalized considerably and could be met in two different ways: (1) by taking the classical entrance examinations as prepared for in a college preparatory school,² or (2) by taking entrance examinations built on high-school graduation requirements.³ The subjects which could be presented in fulfillment of the requirements for admission to the freshman class at Harvard College⁴ were as follows (the figures attached to each subject indicated the relative weight which was given to that subject in determining the question of the candidate's fitness for admission):⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English (4)</td>
<td>Greek (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (4)</td>
<td>Latin (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin (4)</td>
<td>German (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (2)</td>
<td>French (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Rudolph, *Curriculum*, p. 131.
²The *Harvard University Catalogue, 1899-1900*, pp. 287-310. Columbia, Chicago, Michigan, and most other universities showed similar procedures. See the catalogue of the University of Michigan, 1900-1901, pp. 47-53.
³Ibid., p. 310. (Referred to as "New Method")
⁴Requirements at Chicago and other universities were similar; cf. catalogue of the University of Chicago, 1900-1901, pp. 53-61.
⁵*Harvard University Catalogue, 1899-1900*, pp. 287-310.
One of the following four:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient History (2)</th>
<th>Ancient History (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>English and American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English and American History (2)</th>
<th>English and American History (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of Europe (2)</td>
<td>History of a period (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algebra (2)</th>
<th>Algebra (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geometry (3)</td>
<td>Logarithms and Trigonometry (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>or</th>
<th>Astronomy (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plane Geometry (2)</th>
<th>Physics (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logs and Trigonometry (1)</td>
<td>Physics (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>or</th>
<th>Meteorology (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physics (2)</th>
<th>Chemistry (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics (2)</td>
<td>Chemistry (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physiology (1)</th>
<th>Anatomy, etc. (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy (1)</td>
<td>Meteorology (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anatomical, etc. (1)</th>
<th>Anatomical, etc. (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A candidate for admission to the freshman class was required to offer from the above list study amounting to 26 points, of which at least four must be in advanced studies. The studies offered must include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One ancient language (Elem. Latin or Elem. Greek)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One modern foreign language (Elem. German or Elem. French)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary History</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry or Plane Geometry</td>
<td>3 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies amounting to two points from the following sciences (Elem. Physics, Chemistry, Physiography, Anatomy, etc., Astronomy)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 or 18</td>
<td>19 or 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foreign-language entrance requirements for the Lawrence Scientific School were similar to those of Harvard College. In 1900, a candidate could satisfy the language requirement by:

---

1. Ibid., p. 311.
2. Ibid., p. 311-13.
requirements for admission by passing entrance examinations
in the following subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary German</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary French</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In principle, at the end of the nineteenth century, the twentieth-century American custom of requiring a proficiency in French and German for doctorate degrees had been established in several disciplines.\(^1\) Foreign-language requirements and the rationale behind such requirements, however, were in constant flux.

A Time of Rapid Change

The general professional curriculum in the newly established American institutions of higher learning and the foreign-language proficiency requirements had changed dramatically in the second half of the nineteenth century.\(^2\) Influenced by new and modified concepts of the function of higher education, the curricular changes were reflected in the introduction of a vast number of new university-level subject areas and a shifting emphasis in the use of foreign languages. As new universities were created and

\(^1\)See foreign-language requirements in the 1900-1901 catalogues of the University of Chicago, University of Illinois, University of Michigan, and others.

\(^2\)By 1900, subject area emphasis had changed so that at Columbia University students were expected to have
the older colleges and universities were adjusting their educational priorities, American education gradually moved away from traditional classical university studies. Their emphasis, which had been on the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew languages and literature, moved toward new and more utilitarian professional-technical subjects.¹ This remarkable educational revolution which had started before 1850 continued into the twentieth century.

either (1) a Greek and French background; (2) a Greek and German background; or (3) a background in three of the following areas: French, German, History, Mathematics (catalogue of Columbia University 1898-99, pp. 203-4). However, at the New York College for the Training of Teachers (later Teachers College of Columbia University) foreign language requirements were not stipulated. At Illinois Industrial University (later University of Illinois), on the other hand, admission could in 1900 be obtained in one of three ways: (1) by certificate from "a fully accredited high school;" (2) by examination; or (3) by "transfer of credit from some college or university." Subjects approved for admission were: French, German, Greek, Latin, Plane geometry, History, Physical and Biological Sciences, Astronomy, Botany, Chemistry, Civics, Drawing, Geology, Geometry, Manual Training, Physics, Physiography, Physiology, and Zoology (catalogue of the University of Illinois 1901-1901, pp. 42; 49-55). Cf. curricula for chemical and physical studies, household science studies, pedagogical studies, and agricultural studies (Ibid., pp. 105-127; 135-9; 144-152). Since the foreign language background for prospective doctoral students had become very diversified, the University of Michigan made the specific announcement that "the doctoral degrees are open to all persons who have received a bachelor's degree; but no student will be accepted as a candidate for a doctor's degree who has not a knowledge of French and German sufficient for purposes of research (catalogue of the University of Michigan, 1900-01, p. 137.)

¹See Rudolph, Curriculum, pp. 25-244; idem., The American College, pp. 264-307.
Pragmatism in the American Curriculum
"Classical" vs. "Professional-technical" University Education

A major factor that affected the study of languages in American colleges and universities in the nineteenth century was the growing demand for everyday practical usefulness in the curriculum. It was reflected in the new curricula of the Lawrence and Yale scientific schools, the School of Mines at Columbia, the College of Agriculture of Illinois, and in similar programs. It was closely linked to the dramatic increase in scientific knowledge and the proliferation of course offerings influenced by German scholarship and German university models.

Higher education in established American colleges during the first half of the nineteenth century was still essentially a nonprofessional liberal arts education. Evolved from concepts and practices of ancient Greece, nineteenth-century higher education was designed for the gentleman; that is, it was intended for the financially independent man "of gentle birth and good social position." Education in ancient Greece was a service of the city-state, and was an instrument for the training of citizens for leadership in peace and defense in times of crisis. Citizenship was a unique privilege, because Greek civilization rested on slavery. Trade and manual work was regarded as degrading and was left for the slaves. As a result, Hellenic education did not include technical and commercial studies. This concept
was still reflected in early nineteenth-century American higher education.¹

The basic curriculum of the established institutions of higher learning was virtually untouched until the middle of the century despite the fact that the nineteenth century witnessed a sharp expansion of scientific knowledge. Higher education followed a single dimension. While this was the century of Michael Faraday (1791-1867; electromagnetic induction, electrolysis, electromagnetic fields), Hermann von Helmholtz (1821-1894; nature and conservation of energy, optics, acoustics), James Joule (1818-1898; thermodynamics), Joseph Lister (1827-1912; antiseptic surgery), Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920; psychology), Louis Pasteur (1822-1895; microbiology, vaccination), and Robert Koch (1843-1910; bacteriology, infectious diseases), up to the end of the century, most significant research was done outside the walls of institutions of higher education.²

In 1828 Yale College declared that a single prescribed course of study—non-technical and non-professional—was the only proper course for an institution of higher learning.³ When Abbot Lawrence in 1847 notified the president and fel-


³Encyclopaedia Britannica s.v. "Higher Education" by Allan Orel Pfnnister; cf. Rudolph, Curriculum pp. 72-75.
laws of Harvard College that he would give $50,000 for the support of scientific education, the college organized a separate school, the Lawrence Scientific School, in order that the basic liberal arts curriculum of Harvard College could remain intact. The Classical concept was that the task of a university was to prepare young men "to fill any position with credit and to master any subject with facility." In 1852, before taking the office as Rector of the new University of Dublin, Cardinal Newman expressed this same view. A university, he wrote,

... is a place of teaching universal knowledge. This implies that its object is, on the one hand, intellectual, not moral; and, on the other, that it is the diffusion and extension of knowledge rather than the advancement. If its object were scientific and philosophical discovery, I do not see why a University should have students; if religious training, I do not see how it can be the seat of [secular] literature and science.


1Ibid.

2Ibid.

Despite the rhetoric, however, the sciences steadily gained ground at the expense of classical education throughout the century.

The German Influence

Another influence on language study in higher education was the German universities with their emphasis on everyday practicality and strength in research. Without the German influence, there would probably have been no Ph.D. degree programs in American universities in the nineteenth century. In colonial days, North American higher learning had been strongly influenced by English educational models. In the nineteenth century, German universities were to have an increasingly strong impact on American educational institutions. Beginning shortly after 1800, thousands of American students went to Germany to pursue university studies in various fields.¹ Many of them returned home with the conviction that American higher education must be transformed to conform to German standards. As a result, the seminar method of teaching, the laboratory system of scientific method, the German university lecture method, the doctor philosophiae degree, and German as the principal

foreign language of scientific university study were introduced in American education. By 1880, the German scholarly spirit in search of knowledge, emphasizing original and productive research, was transplanted to American soil, and the German and French languages were needed and used in the transformation of the American curriculum.¹

It soon became apparent, however, that there was no easy way to turn American liberal arts colleges into German-type graduate-level doctoral degree-granting universities. The two types of educational institutions had two different functions. While American colleges had been emphasizing and providing "general education" or "general culture" in a single prescribed course, German universities were educational institutions where young men prepared to "earn their bread and butter." In Germany, general education was assigned to the gymnasium as a prerequisite for university study. The purpose of German higher education was to produce professionals; that is, it was to provide for the nation and society lawyers, physicians, clergymen, and teacher-scholars in the professions which were part of the studies included in the Philosophisches Fakultät, such as chemistry, physics, philosophy, philology, and languages.²


The Elective Principle

A major influence in eroding the American liberal arts curriculum, with its stress on ancient languages, was the "elective principle." A principal feature in German university studies was the freedom of choice in selecting university courses. Traditionally, however, each course was to directly prepare the student for the final state exam, the Staats-examen, on which depended his right to be "licensed" and employed as a teacher or other state employee. The first question a German university student would ask before selecting specific courses of study would therefore be: "Of what practical benefit will these courses be to me?" As time went on, this was a question which American college and university students adopted and more and more frequently asked themselves. The question is still often asked in connection with foreign-language requirements in American universities and professional schools today.

The elective principle and the proliferation of subject material in American higher education were also promoted by the concept that educational institutions should actively seek to serve the manifold interests of an evolving democratic community. American colleges and universities should furnish the specialized and professional training required in

1 West, "What is Academic Freedom?" p. 67.
2 Ely, "American Colleges and German Universities," p. 78.
an increasingly complex society. There was, therefore, a need to greatly increase the subject areas included in the college and university curriculum.¹

In tracing the development of the college curriculum in the annual catalogues of American colleges from 1820 to 1920, one not only finds a vast increase in course offerings and degree options but also a tremendous increase in the number of faculty members and students.² With larger numbers came opportunity for diversification. The development of new academic and social disciplines in the sciences and the social sciences led, on one hand, to the proliferation of specialized subject-matter courses, and, on the other hand, to a greater degree of departmental specialization within college faculties.³ The practical effect was that foreign languages were becoming less utilitarian.

State Universities and Land-grant Colleges

During the colonial period, and for some time to follow, the founding and maintenance of institutions of higher learning had been left to private initiative, mainly to churches. The private church-dominated colleges had favored a


²See the catalogues of Harvard University, 1819-1919; and University of Chicago catalogues, 1894-1910.

curriculum serving the intellectual interests of the professions of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy. In general, they failed to respond to the need for developing new professional and vocational areas. The state universities were created, in part, to fill this gap. The first state university to take the initiative in making provisions for enhancing the professional-vocational freedom of the individual was the University of Virginia, established in 1825.¹ Other universities followed, prominent among which was the University of Michigan.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, it appeared that the old traditional colleges and their classical curriculum were out of step with practical life. The country was seeking civil and mechanical engineers, agricultural experts, and managerial talent in all fields of enterprise. Harvard had established the Lawrence Scientific School in 1847. Yale followed with a scientific school in 1854.² This trend added academic professional-technical education to the technical training already provided by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, the United States Military Academy, and other "non-collegiate" institutions. The great change in the


²Yale College catalogue, 1861, p. 45. See Rudolph, Curriculum, pp. 103-4.
The first Morrill Act was followed by the Hatch Experimental Station Act of 1887 and the second Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1880. These acts provided funding for and established

---


2In such curricula [agriculture and mechanical arts], the need for foreign languages was greatly decreased.

agricultural experiment stations at land-grant colleges and appropriated funds derived from the sale of public lands "for the more complete endowment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanical arts."¹

Greatly expanding needs for food, timber, and minerals; the building of factories; and the expansion of transportation and communications had created demands for technical training that existing educational facilities were unable to supply adequately. Also, with the commercialization and consequent mechanization of farms and plantations, there was a recognized need for improved and standardized cultivation and husbandry. Land-grant colleges, with their expanded curricular offerings, provided the answer.

Graduate-level Universities

Graduate work was offered at a few American colleges and universities during the first half of the nineteenth century, but it was not offered in regular programs leading to advanced degrees. Harvard, Yale, and other colleges had accepted post-graduate students, in an informal way,² but it was not until 1860 and 1872 that Yale and Harvard, respectively, established graduate departments. The first Ph.D. degrees were conferred at Yale in 1861 and at Harvard in


1863. In the next decade and a half a small number of earned "post-graduate" Ph.D. degrees were awarded at Columbia, the University of Michigan, Cornell, and other universities.¹

"Graduate study" built on German models began in 1876 with the founding of Johns Hopkins University. Its concept and model was almost entirely German. From the beginning, the chief emphasis at Johns Hopkins was on advanced graduate study and research. It did not call for the use of classical languages. President Daniel C. Gilman and his colleagues stressed subjects that were new to American higher education, such as the biological sciences, geology, political science, taxation, crime, etc. They were promoted as a result of the pressures of the sciences on the traditional classical curriculum and the dissatisfaction with contemporary collegiate instruction and in order to direct the application of university teaching and research to the needs of society.² Essentially the same ideals for graduate education were established at the opening of Clark University in 1889 by G. Stanley Hall and at the University of Chicago in 1892 by William R. Harper. The interest created by and the success achieved in these graduate programs were such that new advanced programs were started at an increasing

¹Ibid., pp. 124-25. In the practical, new vocationally oriented curricula, foreign-language study was losing its relevance.

number of other universities, including Princeton, Cornell, Columbia, Michigan, and Pennsylvania. Since 1890, enrollment in American graduate schools approximately doubled each decade, and in 1920 a total of 615 doctorates and 4,279 masters' degrees were awarded. Most degrees were earned in the new professional-technical fields. The expansion of graduate study and the proliferation of course offerings continued throughout the twentieth century.

Changes in the Function and the Use of Languages in American Higher Education

The Use of Languages in the Classical Curriculum

Another factor that affected the study of languages was seen in the steadily declining attractiveness of the classical curriculum. It was largely caused by a lack of usefulness of the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew languages in everyday life.

The typical liberal arts classical curriculum in the first quarter of the nineteenth century was rigid and unchangeable. All students attended the same classes, more or less as early elementary students do today. It is well

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Walters, "Graduate Education, 1862-1962," p. 126.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 128.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}See Harvard University, Doctors of Philosophy and Doctors of Science Who Have Received Their Degree in Courses from Harvard University, 1871-1916, With the Title of Their Thesis (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916); Johns Hopkins University, List of Dissertations, 1876-1926 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1926).
\end{itemize}
illustrated in the 1825-26 Harvard "Course of Instruction,"
published in the October, 1825, Harvard catalogue (Figure 1):

**COURSE OF INSTRUCTION.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Livy, 7 books.</td>
<td>9. 9. finished.</td>
<td>18. Moral Philosophy (Payley's)</td>
<td>27. Opticks (Camb. course of Nat. Phil.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Adam's Roman Antiquities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Harvard Course of Instruction for 1825-26.

The October 1825 Harvard catalogue also listed the requirements for admission as freshmen at Harvard College:

To be received into the Freshman Class, the candidate must be thoroughly acquainted with the Grammar of the Latin and Greek languages, including Prosody; be able properly to construe and parse any portion of the following books, namely, Jacobs' Greek Reader, the Gospels in the Greek Testament, Virgil, Sallust, and Cicero's Select Orations, and to translate English into Latin correctly. He must be well versed in Ancient and Modern Geography; the fundamental rules of Arithmetick; vulgar and decimal fractions; proportion, simple and compound; single and double fellowship; alligation, medial and alternate; and Algebra to the end of simple equations, comprehending also the doctrine of roots and powers, and arithmetical and geometrical progression.

The other books used in the examination are the following, namely, Adam's Latin Grammar (Gould's edition is preferred); the Gloucester Greek Grammar (Buttmann's Greek Grammar, and the Abridgment of it, are allowed); Lacroix's Arithmetick, Cambridge edition; Euler's Algebra, printed also at Cambridge; "Elements of Geography, Ancient and Modern, by J. E. Worcester."

The historical evolution of university studies, leading up to the classical curriculum of the early nineteenth century, was explained by Charles W. Eliot in 1884. The growing lack of attractiveness of the Classical languages had come about through "their separation from everyday practical life." He contended that the spirit and method in which languages for the most part were studied in the nineteenth century were very different from the spirit and methods through which they had been studied in preceding centuries. In the nineteenth century, the classical languages were taught as "dead languages," while they had previously been

\[1\text{Ibid., p. 19.}\]
taught as living tongues, the common tongues of all scholars, both lay and clerical. Latin used to be particularly utilitarian because it was not a "foreign" language in previous centuries.

Greek took root in Italian liberal education as early as 1400, and it was rapidly diffused after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. It became established at the University of Paris some time before 1458 and at Oxford by the end of the century. It is probable, however, that Greek had no real hold of English grammar schools until the end of the sixteenth century. The statutes which were adopted by the University of Paris in 1600 list the studies to comprise Latin, Greek, Aristotelian philosophy, and Euclid. Greek was also required for the admission to the study of law. It had taken approximately two hundred years for the Greek language and literature to replace to a greater extent scholastic metaphysics which, with scholastic theology, had previously been regarded as the principle part of a liberal education. According to Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard from 1869 to 1909, a quick survey of the past shows that some of the studies commonly referred to as "liberal studies" had not long held their preeminence in higher education; and new learning and subject areas had repeatedly forced their way, in times past, to full academic standing in spite of the op-

---

2Ibid., pp. 26-27.
position of the conservatives and the resistance of established teachers and learned organizations, "whose standing is always supposed to be threatened by the rise of new sciences."¹

In 1884 Eliot proposed that English language and literature deserved equal standing with traditional academic subjects, because "It cannot be doubted that English literature is beyond all comparison the amplest, most various, and most splendid literature which the world has seen."² In his opinion, Greek literature may be compared with English as Homer compares with Shakespeare, that is, it is like "comparing infantile [primitive civilization] with adult civilization." Eliot continued to propose that French and German be given an equal academic position with Greek, Latin, and mathematics and that history, "political economy," and "natural science" be added.³

The "Disciplinary" Function of Greek and Latin in the Classical Curriculum

The attacks on classical training and liberal education and on the use of the classical languages as intellectual tools were countered by strong supporters of the Greek and Latin languages, grammar and literature. For example, Andrew

¹Ibid., p. 29.
²Ibid.
³Ibid., pp. 31, 34, 35, 37.
F. West gave a strong rationale, in 1884, for the retention of the ancient languages and mathematics. According to West, "man is born into the world ignorant both of himself and his surroundings." In order to act his part so as to reach success and happiness he needs to understand both. He must learn, therefore, and in order to learn he must be educated. This involves the development of man's power to master himself and circumstances. That is, it includes intellectual discipline and the communication of the most valuable knowledge, which is information. Intellectual discipline must precede information, because power precedes acquisition. But information completes discipline by yielding actual results in the everyday practical world. Discipline gives man "the power to acquire information and the total result is culture." According to West, the two principal instruments of intellectual discipline and educational information up to that time had been mathematics and [the Greek and Latin] languages.

West continued to say that the study of Greek and Latin must be considered immeasurably superior to the study of modern languages as a means of discipline for four reasons: First, their structure is regular and highly complex. Modern languages do not contain material from which to construct a logical grammar such as is found in Greek and Latin. "What does English, French, or German amount to? Simply debris of

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{Ibid., p. 47.}\]
the classical languages, mixed with barbaric elements.\footnote{Ibid., p. 49.}

Second, even if the modern languages had equaled the ancient languages in structure, they would be less useful for discipline. Too much time is necessary to master pronunciation and acquiring facility of use, but this requires only inferior intellectual effort and is mistaken for mastery of the language. Furthermore, "modern languages are too near our own modes of thinking to help us enlarge our knowledge in kind by entering widely different fields of thought, as we need to do."\footnote{Ibid., pp. 49-50.} Third, "No modern languages have yet stood the great test of performance which the classics have now endured for more than twenty centuries." Fourth, "Modern languages, just because they are modern, are growing and, therefore, changing. This makes them unfit for being the permanent basis for culture." According to West,

Human invention has never produced anything so valuable, in the way both of stimulation and of discipline, to the inquiring intellect, as the dialectics of the ancients, of which many of the works of Aristotle illustrate the theory and those of Plato exhibit the practice. No modern writings come near to these in teaching, both by precept and example, the way to investigate truth on those subjects, so vastly important to us, which remain matters of controversy from the difficulty or impossibility of bringing them to a directly experimental test. To question all things; never to turn away from any difficulty; to accept no doctrine, either from ourselves or from other people, without a rigid scrutiny by negative criticism, letting no fallacy or incoherence or confusion of thought slip by unperceived; above all, to insist upon having the meaning of a word clearly understood before using
it, and the meaning of a proposition before assenting to it; these are the lessons we learn from the ancient dialecticians. With all this vigorous management of the negative element, they inspire no skepticism about the reality of truth or indifference to its pursuit. The noblest enthusiasm, both for the search after truth and for applying it to its highest uses, pervades these writers, Aristotle no less than Plato.

The defense of the classical languages was of no avail, however. The many pressures for progressive change overpowered tradition of the past.

New Language Patterns
The Introduction of Modern Languages

A strong factor affecting the study of languages was seen in the usefulness of German, French, and Spanish in connection with international business and travel and for accessing significant bodies of scholarly literature. Besides, English was becoming more and more utilitarian as it was gradually developing into a prominent international language.

Instruction in modern languages had been introduced sporadically at a few colleges during the second half of the eighteenth century. However, it was not until the first half of the nineteenth century that modern languages appeared regularly in the college curriculum. French entered the formal course of study at an American college at Columbia in 1779 and at the College of William and Mary shortly thereafter.

1Ibid., p. 56.
At about the same time, for a few years, Hampden-Sidney College in Virginia accepted French as a substitute for Greek for the B.A. degree; and in 1787 Harvard permitted the substitution of French for Hebrew. Williams College allowed French to be substituted for Greek for admission during the years from 1793 to 1799, and William and Mary required it for admission in 1793. In 1795 Williams College established the first professorship in French and Union College in New York permitted students to substitute four years of French for four years of Greek. The interest in French cooled, however, with the growing American reaction against the French Revolution.¹

French, German, Spanish, and Italian did not have the same popular and practical appeal as did the new sciences. More than anything else, what promoted the modern languages was the widespread dislike for the ancient languages. Where parallel courses of instruction were developed, the substitution of modern languages for Greek and Latin made parallel courses both attractive enough to draw students and sufficiently respectable to justify awarding a degree, although it was usually not the B.A. degree. A professorship in modern languages was founded at Harvard in 1816. George Ticknor was appointed to the chair in 1817 and began to teach in 1819, but Harvard did not make modern languages compulsory. Since modern languages were alive—they were the native languages

¹Rudolph, *Curriculum*, pp. 51-52.
of many Americans and they were useful in foreign travel and in business—they were accepted by students. However, French, German, and Spanish lacked academic prestige and they were not taken seriously by many of the students who enrolled in them.¹

In 1841 the arrangement for studying modern languages at Yale was stated in the college catalogue as follows: "Gentlemen well qualified to teach modern languages are engaged by the Faculty to give instruction in these branches to those students who desire it, at their own expense."² The Princeton Alumni Association had pledged itself already in 1827 to raise funds for a professorship in modern languages, but as at Wesleyan and Dartmouth, modern languages courses were added to the regular programs of students and this made foreign-language study burdensome.³

As science was promoted as essential to living and working in a modern society, there was no similar argument in favor of the indispensibility of modern languages. Until 1860, their professional usefulness was recognized primarily by civil engineers and military personnel. Interest in foreign languages was contrary to a national sentiment that was increasingly favorable to what seemed practical and that preferred what was American.

¹Ibid., p. 62.
²Ibid., p. 64.
³Ibid., p. 64.
Trade schools and some professional schools had previously not had specific language requirements, and when Harvard opened the Lawrence Scientific School in 1847 and Yale opened the Yale Scientific School in 1854, the problem of the academic requirement of languages and institutional integrity arose. It was solved by giving the graduates at Harvard the bachelor of science degree (B.Sc.) and those at Yale the bachelor of philosophy degree (B.Ph.). At Yale, the science students were not really treated as barbarians but, on the other hand, they were not permitted to sit in chapel with the students of Yale College.¹

In the older colleges, entrance requirements were changed so that acceptance was possible without Greek and Latin, and by 1910 a dual system of entrance exams, referred to as the "old plan" and the "new plan," and a proliferated college curriculum with vast course options developed.² College entrance was possible on the basis of "evidence of having satisfactorily completed an approved school course."³ In some colleges and universities, especially in professional schools, language requirements were not very

²See chapter 2, pp. 39-41.
specific as early as before the 1880s. A new set of degrees in professional fields had developed, with the emphasis on technical courses, and languages were made available as options.¹

A New Kind of Scholar-Teacher in American Universities

Doctoral education in the new American "graduate universities" founded during the last quarter of the nineteenth century--such as Johns Hopkins, Clark, and the University of Chicago--quickly established new practices and new norms for foreign-language study. "Scientific" German, French, and Spanish were introduced along with new concepts as to the function of foreign-language study for graduate students.

The international character of the faculty of the University of Chicago, for example, was accentuated from the very beginning. Opening in 1892 with an enrollment of 742, the University of Chicago developed in a short time an educational program that spanned from kindergarten through the Ph.D. degree. In many ways, it set norms that were to have a lasting impact on American graduate education and foreign-language requirements for the doctorate.

In addition to hiring a significant number of German

¹Cf. the catalogues of New York College for the Training of Teachers, 1889-90, pp. 11-36; Illinois Industrial University, 1878-9, pp. 24-91; and University of Michigan, 1868-9, pp. 51-57.
and other foreign scientists and scholars with European and American doctorates, President William Rainey Harper succeeded in putting together a faculty that included eight former college and seminary presidents, five Yale professors, and over one half of the academic staff of troubled Clark University.¹ The 1893-1894 catalogue of the University of Chicago showed a large and illustrious roster of more than 150 scholars with impressive vitae. Included were foreign scholars with European doctorates, Americans with European doctorates, as well as Americans with doctorates from American universities newly offering graduate degrees. Characteristically, many of the American faculty members took pride in listing their European studies even when they held no European degrees. In contemporary American academic society, European studies and the implied foreign-language competence and germanic scholarly involvement were used as "academic status symbols," suggesting academic superiority.² In education, however, American educational institutions led the way. As can be seen from samples of the faculty roster, the vitae appeared as prominently displayed and were as important as the actual degrees earned—a new trend in American graduate education. Implied in the vitae was the concept

¹Rudolph, The American College and University, pp. 349-50.

²Smaller colleges followed the trend. Emanuel Missionary College (Andrews University) for example, published special vitae in its catalogues until 1965-66.
that European scholarship was superior in the sciences as well as in traditional collegiate disciplines:

Paul Shorey, Ph.D., Professor of Greek

A.B., Harvard College, 1878; University of Leipzig, 1881-2; University of Bonn, 1882; American School of Classical Studies, Athens, 1882-3; Ph.D., University of Munich, 1884; Professor of Greek, Bryn Mawr College, 1885-92.

John Dewey, Ph.D., Head Professor of Philosophy.

A.B., University of Vermont, 1879; Fellow, Johns Hopkins University, 1883-4; Ph.D., ibid., 1884; Instructor in Philosophy, University of Michigan, 1884-6; Assistant Professor, ibid., 1886-8; Professor of Philosophy, University of Minnesota, 1888-9; Professor of Philosophy, University of Michigan, 1889-94.

George Baur, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Comparative Osteology and Palaeontology.

Academy of Hohenheim, 1878-9; University of Munich, 1879-81; University of Leipzig, 1881-2; Ph.D., University of Munich, 1882; Assistant to Professor C. Kupffer, Munich, 1882-4; Assistant to Professor O. C. Marsh, Yale University, 1884-90; Assistant in Osteology, Yale University, 1886-90; Docent in Comparative Osteology and Palaeontology, Clark University, 1890-2.

Heinrich Maschke, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Physics.

Universities of Heidelberg, Breslau, Berlin, and Göttingen, 1872-80; Ph.D., University of Göttingen, 1880; Professor of Mathematics in the Luisenstädtische Gymnasium at Berlin, 1880-90; Electrical Engineer at the Weston Electrical Instrument Co., Newark, N.J., 1891-2.


Graduate of Tromsø Academy, Norway, 1872, and Bethel Theological Seminary, Stockholm, Sweden, 1884; A.M., Christiania [Oslo] University, Norway,
1886; Pastor, Trondhjem, Norway, 1886-7; Graduate Christiania University with degree Candidatus Philosophiae, 1888; Professor of Greek and New Testament Interpretation in the Dano-Norwegian Department of the Baptist Union Theological Seminary, 1888; D.B. (Honorary), Baptist Union Theological Seminary, 1889.


A.M., pass degree, 1884; A.M. Honors of the First Class, 1886, University of Edinburgh; First place on the Honors List, with Bruce of Grangehill Fellowship, 1886; Student at Jena, Paris, Cambridge, Berlin, Freiburg; Ferguson Scholarship (open to honorolds of all Scottish Universities), 1887; Assistant Professor of Logic, Edinburgh University, 1888-90; Locumtenens Professor of the Moral Sciences, Cardiff, for winter term of 1888; Sir William Hamilton Fellow, Edinburgh, 1888, for three years; Shaw Fellow, 1890, for five years; Lecturer of University Association for Education of Women, Edinburgh, 1889; Government Examiner for Degrees in the Moral Sciences, St. Andrews University, 1890, for three years; Lecturer on Logic and Methodology, Sage School of Philosophy, Cornell University, 1891-2; Tutor in Political Economy, the University of Chicago, 1892-3; Shaw Lecturer, University of Edinburgh, 1893; Doctor in Mental Science, ibidem, 1893.

Massuo Ikuta, Ph.D., Assistant in Chemistry.

University of Tokio, 1880-4; University of Berlin, 1885; University of Erlangen (Germany), 1886-8; Ph.D., University of Erlangen, 1887; Chemist, Hoechst Color Works, Germany, 1888; Consulting Chemist, Tokio, 1889-90; Assistant in Chemistry, Clark University, 1891-2.

"Scientific" German, French, and Spanish

Because European, especially German, scholarship

dominated so many of the new scientific fields of study on
the doctoral level, competence in reading scientific
professional literature in the original languages and knowl-
edge of specialized professional vocabulary were considered
imperative. "Literary" German, French, and Spanish were no
longer adequate. As a result, required courses in scientific
German, French, and Spanish were introduced in the
curriculum, and a large number of new textbooks designed to
help meet the new academic foreign-language requirements
appeared.¹

Occasional published surveys of the teaching of scien-
tific modern languages show that German was somewhat more
popular than French and that scientific Spanish was
considered less utilitarian than German and French.² In
1925, approximately 60 per cent of engineering schools in the
United States offered scientific German; approximately 40 per
cent offered scientific French, and approximately 20 per cent
offered scientific Spanish. Of these schools, 25 per cent
required scientific German and 20 per cent required

¹See Paul Holroyd Curts, Readings in Scientific and
Technical German (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1935);
John Theodore Fotos and R. Norris Shreve, ed., Advanced
Readings in Chemical and Technical German (New York:
John Wiley and Sons, 1940); Oscar Burkhard, Readings in
Medical German (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1930);
Edwin B. Williams, ed., Technical and Scientific French
(Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1926).

²See Edwin B. Williams, "The Teaching of Scientific
French, German and Spanish in American Colleges" Modern
Language Journal 13 (March 1929): 471.
scientific French. There seemed to be no general requirement for scientific Spanish.¹

Answering a questionnaire sent in 1929 to the German, French, and Spanish departments of 207 colleges and universities in the United States, respondents indicated that 45 per cent taught scientific German, 14 per cent scientific French, and 4 per cent scientific Spanish.² Respondents were asked to indicate which of the following activities in foreign-language study were considered "essential," "desirable," and "unessential" [for "academicians," in scientific fields]:

(1) Practice in reading aloud in foreign language
(2) Oral translation into English
(3) Written translation into English
(4) Vocabulary drill
(5) Study of formal grammar
(6) Oral work (questions and answers in foreign language)
(7) Written translation into foreign language
(8) Free composition in the foreign language

The answers indicated that only item (2) (oral translation into English) [except for Spanish] was considered essential and that items (6), (7), and (8) were considered unessential.³ A new and lasting trend in the emphasis on foreign-language proficiency and testing had been set. The general recommendations for the future were: (1) emphasis on

²Williams, "The Teaching of Scientific French, German and Spanish in American Colleges," p. 471.
³Ibid., p. 472.
reading; (2) more translation; (3) more accuracy in translation; (4) emphasis on technical vocabulary; (5) no emphasis on literary appreciation but "trustworthy knowledge;" (6) less "direct method;" (7) less grammar and syntax; and (8) less or no composition.\(^1\)

During and following World War I, the study of German was almost eliminated in American secondary schools; and a tremendous growth was seen in the study of Spanish.\(^2\) The percentage of students in public and private schools, combined, studying German between 1889 and 1922 were as follows: 11 per cent (1889-90); 15 per cent (1899-1900); 24 per cent (1909-10); 24 per cent (1914-15); and 0.84 per cent (1921-22).\(^3\) The interest in German bounced back, however, and in 1928 Walter French asserted that "A Doctor of Philosophy is hardly accepted as being genuine unless he has in some way fulfilled his language requirement in German."\(^4\) Students planning to take medicine or advanced work in chemistry were urged to get their reading knowledge of the language before their major subjects begin to demand all their attention. It

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 473.


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 88.

was suggested that a modern foreign language be taught in such a way that it would be of more than a theoretic value to the students— that it be demonstrably useful as a tool in the student's profession. In order to facilitate this, the students in foreign-language classes were to state the field of study in which they were particularly interested— such as organic or physical chemistry, electro-chemistry, and the like— and the language professor involved would prepare a list of references and useful periodical reading materials.¹ Through this concept, another new trend in American foreign-language study in preparation for the doctorate was initiated.

Summary

A number of factors influenced foreign-language study in the United States during the nineteenth century. The changes took place as a result of demands for immediate usefulness and practicality in education. There was a proliferation of new non-linguistic subject fields through the creation of land-grant colleges and technical universities. In the process, many non-linguistic professional and vocational disciplines were elevated to collegiate status.

The changing specialized needs and expectations from industry and American society in general made the underlying purposes of the classical curriculum gradually obsolete.

¹Ibid., p. 209.
Demands arose that education provide professional-technical and vocational skills—not only "culture." There was a considerable influence from German academic models in professional education.

German, French, and Spanish were added to the curriculum because they were alive and practical. They were useful (1) for students in science and other scholarly fields for the reading of professional literature; (2) for foreign travel; (3) for conducting international business; and (4) for the appreciation of much of the world's great literature.

Pioneering work in almost all the new late nineteenth-century academic fields of collegiate study was done in English, however. Many of the new fields of study had little or no professional literature available in foreign languages. As a result, English was developing as the dominant international language of the world. The need for the use of foreign languages in graduate university education, especially the ancient languages, had been greatly diminished by the end of the century.
CHAPTER III

TRENDS IN FOREIGN-LANGUAGE STUDY IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Introduction

Trends in foreign-language study that had begun in the nineteenth century in American higher education continued to develop in the first half of the twentieth century. As education, business, music, and other disciplines gradually were accepted as regular fields of study in the American university curriculum, new and uniquely American foreign language requirements for doctorates in these fields were gradually established.


A comparative study of the foreign-language requirements in education, business, music, and theology for doctorates in diverse universities and professional schools, such as Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, the University of Chicago, Columbia (including Teachers College and its predecessor, the New York College for the Training of Teachers), the University of Illinois (including its predecessor, Illinois Industrial University), and others show the emerging patterns
In studying in detail the development of foreign-language requirements in a few representative schools, it is possible to discern the trends leading to present doctoral foreign-language requirements in American educational institutions. The study of foreign languages has traditionally played an insignificant role in American teacher training. Until the end of the nineteenth century, there were no teachers' colleges and the universities had not yet established schools or departments of education. After the Civil War, a few colleges and universities, mostly in the Mid-west, established chairs in pedagogy or didactics. These professorships were usually found within departments of philosophy. Throughout most of the nineteenth century, the responsibility for teacher training rested with the "normal schools" and "teachers' institutes." Their primary function consisted in preparing teachers for elementary, rather than secondary schools, and neither was considered part of "higher education."

1 Not all of these institutions had curricula in all of these disciplines in 1900.


3 Ibid., p. 155.
Before the Civil War, a small number of "normal schools" was established in possibly as many as a dozen states, but enrollments were small. During the last quarter of the century, however, the number of normal schools increased rapidly and the enrollment rose dramatically. In 1876, the National Education Association Proceedings reported that there were 67 state normal schools and 54 private ones in 1874.¹ In 1898 it was reported that the respective figures were 166 and 165.² Foreign language study was still not an integral part of teacher education, however.

At the end of the nineteenth century, teacher training was still considered incidental to the historical role of American colleges and universities of educating personnel for the classical professions. At the turn of the century, colleges and universities were invaded and transformed by young faculty members with the Ph.D. degree, and they had their sights set on "higher goals and higher studies."³ But, gradually, normal schools became "teachers' colleges." Nineteen normal schools made the transition between 1911 and 1920, 69 between 1921 and 1930, and most of the others did so between 1931 and 1951.⁴

²Ibid.
³Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 179.
⁴Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years, pp. 88-9.
The life-span of the teachers college was short, however. In California, the state normal schools became teachers colleges in 1921 and general state colleges in 1935. In Michigan, the transition sometimes took place in stages. The normal school at Kalamazoo became Western Michigan State Teachers College in 1927, Western Michigan College of Education in 1941, and Western Michigan University in 1957.¹

Whatever the foreign-language requirements were and are for doctorates in education, they did not emerge from the traditional American teacher-training programs; they emerged from the liberal arts foundation for the Ph.D. degree. At the University of Chicago, for example, the 1893-94 Annual Register shows no department of education and no foreign languages requirement in education. In the Annual Register for the 1900-01 school year, a faculty of twenty-nine was listed, only three of whom—including President William Rainey Harper and Francis Wayland Parker, Director of the School of Education, holding an honorary doctorate—held doctoral degrees. Twenty-one of the twenty-nine faculty members in the school held no degrees.² This situation was soon to change, however. By 1910, over half of the faculty

in the School of Education held one or more academic degrees and 15 per cent held doctorates.¹

The University of Chicago School of Education was formed through consolidation with the University of Chicago Institute (The Emmons Blaine School) and the University Laboratory School, directed by Professor John Dewey, Head of the Department of Education. The courses in the School of Education were "designed for the training of teachers and supervisors in elementary and normal schools, for the preparation of kindergartners, and other specialists in educational work."²

The question of foreign-language study was settled from the beginning. The candidate

... must conform to the requirements for admission to the Junior Colleges of the University of Chicago. The following classes of students may be admitted upon their credentials: (1) graduates of accredited secondary or high schools; (2) graduates of accredited normal schools; (3) graduates of colleges and universities; (4) teachers with an experience of at least three years who can offer satisfactory evidence of efficiency.³

Admission to the Junior Colleges of the University of Chicago included a proficiency in Latin, German, and French.

²University of Chicago, Annual Register: July, 1900 --July, 1901, pp. 107-8.
³Ibid.
Preparation for foreign-language competence was begun already in the elementary school:

... in the University Elementary School an attempt is made to provide ideal conditions for the education of children and youth between the ages of four and fourteen.¹

The subjects of study include science and nature study in all its branches; geography and mathematics; civics, history, and literature; English, German, French, Latin; home economics, manual training, the arts, and physical culture. Reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, grammar, and English are correlated with all other subjects, and taught continuously from the Kindergarten through the grades. French and German are begun in the lower grades and continued throughout the course. Latin is begun in the sixth grade, thus giving, with the four years in the High School, eight years of training in this language.

As at Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, and other universities, German and French were prerequisites for doctoral degrees.³ Foreign-language proficiency of candidates for graduate degrees was carefully monitored, as seen in the University assertion that "if an applicant desires to come into candidacy for the Master's or Doctor's degree at the University of Chicago, it must be ascertained whether the Bachelor's degree received from another institution, and

¹Ibid., p. 109.

²Ibid., p. 110. Emphasis supplied.

represented by the diploma, is equal to the Bachelor's degree of the University of Chicago."¹

By 1921, admission requirements in the University of Chicago—as in most other American universities—had been liberalized so that in order to verify the foreign-language requirements for degrees they were spelled out in detail.² In the section, "Description of Subjects Accepted for Admission," in the Annual Register for 1921-22, it was suggested that in Latin the "aim of the students should be to understand the sentences as a Roman reader would have understood them."³ In a similar way, the admissions requirements for German and French gave specifics to indicate a demand for a thorough background in those languages.⁴

The language requirements for the Ph.D. degree, offered through the Graduate Schools of Arts and Sciences, specifically demanded a reading knowledge of "two foreign languages other than English." Beginning with the Summer Quarter of 1940, a "new plan" was instituted for the Ph.D. degree in the School of Education of the University of Chicago including, among other changes, a relaxation of the foreign-language requirements: "The candidate is required to

¹University of Chicago, Annual Register: July, 1910--July, 1911, p. 175.
²Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 115.
³University of Chicago, Annual Register: July, 1921--July, 1922, p. 95.
⁴Ibid., pp. 96-97.
show ability to read in French and German, or in either of them and one other modern foreign language recommended by the Department and approved by the Dean.¹ The "demonstration of reading power in French and German sufficient for advanced study in the Division, or in either French or German and a second language" remained the standard requirement for Ph.D. degrees in education up through the 1960s.²

During the first sixty years of the twentieth century, Harvard University consistently held on to the requirement of a reading knowledge of German and French for its doctorates in education, which were granted through the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.³ Specific foreign-language requirements were not spelled out for the doctoral degrees in education, however, because a foreign-language proficiency was a prerequisite for the undergraduate degrees. The admonition was given that language requirements "must be met by the end of the student's Sophomore year. . . . It is of great benefit to all students to plan their work in school with these requirements in mind and to begin before entering

¹University of Chicago, The School of Education: The University High School, 1940-41, p. 348.
²University of Chicago, Announcements: Graduate Programs in the Divisions, Sessions of 1960-1961, p. 95.
³In 1919-20, foreign-language proficiency was assumed through admissions requirements and not mentioned in the Ph.D. requirements. See Harvard catalogue, pp. 609-12. At the present time (1984) foreign-language requirements are specified when needed, because there is no assurance that they have been met on the secondary or undergraduate college level.
College, if possible, a study of at least two of the following languages: Latin, French, German."¹

Gradually, however, the foreign-language requirements for graduate degrees were relaxed. In 1940, in the Harvard University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, "applicants for admission must present satisfactory evidence that they possess a reading knowledge of French or German, unless on the recommendation of a Department or Committee this requirement is waived. . . ."² In 1960, the language requirement in the Graduate School had become further relaxed:

Although the Graduate School has no general language requirement, most Divisions, Departments, and Committees require a knowledge of one foreign language for the Master's degree and of two foreign languages for the Doctor's degree. In addition, some Divisions, Departments, and Committees expect students to be well prepared in certain foreign languages at the time of admission to the School.³

In the School of Education, the foreign language requirements for the Ph.D. degree were set by the Graduate School, but in the requirements for the Ed.D. degree, no foreign-language requirements were indicated.⁴ Also, for-

¹Harvard University, Harvard University Catalogue: November, 1930, p.327.
²Harvard University, Harvard University Catalogue: November, 1940, p. 356.
³Harvard University, Harvard University Catalogue: December, 1960, p. 548.
eign-language requirements were not specifically stated as part of the admissions requirements.

At Harvard, the first Ph.D. degree in education was granted in 1905. Few doctorates in education were conferred until the 1920s, however.¹

Business

Foreign-language requirements in business also evolved over a number of decades. Business, like education and music, was not a part of the traditional American college and university curriculum of the nineteenth century. As business and commerce were elevated to collegiate status, foreign languages had no tradition in the discipline except as useful tools in international trade and other business interaction; and in the new curriculum it continued to serve purely utilitarian purposes.

Collegiate business education originated in response to definite needs, not unlike those which gave rise to other types of professional education. Prior to the twentieth century, preparation for the business profession had in the United States been informal and to some degree haphazard. Admission to private business schools or "business colleges" presented no great problem to the student who was able to pay

¹Harvard University, Doctors of Philosophy and Doctors of Science Who Have Received Their Degree in Courses from Harvard University, 1873-1916, With the Title of Their Thesis (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916), pp. 49-50.
the fees. Entrance requirements were often low, and most students applying were admitted because the capacity of the schools exceeded the number of applicants.¹

In 1936 Robert Maynard Hutchins, Chancellor of the University of Chicago, made the remark that "if the public becomes interested in the metropolitan newspaper, schools of journalism instantly arise. If it is moved by the development of big business, business schools full of the same reverence appear."² It reflected the fact that demands from the public created and shaped the new professional curricula. By 1875, more than twenty colleges and universities, mostly in the Mid-west, had been supplementing training offered in non-collegiate so-called business colleges by offering scattered commercial courses of their own. But it was the establishment in 1881 of the Wharton School of Finance and Economy, the name later changed to the Wharton School of Commerce and Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, that became the model for colleges and universities elsewhere. It combined liberal studies with practical business training.³ It was the quality of the program at Wharton—as presented in an address before a Convention of


²Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 216.

³Ibid.
the American Bankers' Association, 3 September 1890, by Wharton Professor Edmund J. James—that gave the initial strong impetus to the establishing of university-connected business schools.¹

The Wharton School was made possible through the generosity of Joseph Wharton, a Philadelphia merchant and manufacturer, who gave the University of Pennsylvania the sum of $100,000 to establish a collegiate school for "higher commercial training."² The object of the school was to provide for young men special means of training and of correct instruction in the knowledge and in the arts of modern Finance and Economy, both public and private, in order that, being well informed and free from delusions upon these important subjects, they may either serve the community skillfully as well as faithfully in offices of trust, or, remaining in private life, may prudently manage their own affairs and aid in maintaining sound financial morality: in short, to establish means for imparting a liberal education in all matters concerning Finance and Economy.³

From the beginning, specific admissions requirements were spelled out. The collegiate business school was to be


³Education of Business Men.—I., p. 30.
built on a liberal secondary school and college foundation:

Assuming that the special instruction of the School . . . will occupy three years, which may be called the sub-junior, junior, and senior years, the general qualifications for admission to the sub-junior class should be equal to those for the corresponding class in the Towne Scientific School, but different in detail to the extent required by the difference in studies to be thenceforward pursued.

As preparatory to admission to that class, candidates may at the discretion of the Trustees of the University, be received into either of the lower classes of the Department of Arts, or of the Towne Scientific School, upon the same general conditions as shall, from time to time, be established for admission to those classes. To guard against the too frequent unsoundness of preliminary instruction, which is a vice of our time, and which affords no proper foundation for a collegiate course, honest fulfillment must be exacted of those reasonable detailed conditions for admission which shall, from time to time, be determined upon and set forth in the official catalogue.¹

The specific foreign-language requirements for admission were spelled out as follows:

Candidates for admission as full students of the Sub-Junior year must pass examinations in all the subjects specified in the following list under the head A, and either those which are specified under the head B or those under the head C:—


¹Ibid., pp. 30-31.
The School of Business of the University of Chicago, established in 1898 as the College of Commerce and Politics and later re-named the School of Commerce and Administration, was the second collegiate school in America. It was followed the same year by the College of Commerce of the University of California. In 1900, four similar business schools were established: The Amos Tuck School of Administration and Finance at Dartmouth College; a Department of Economics and Commerce at the University of Vermont; a School of Commerce at the University of Wisconsin; and a School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance at New York University. Thus, by the beginning of the century seven universities offered collegiate business education.

Within the next ten years, twelve additional colleges and universities added business curricula. Between 1910 and 1915, business programs were inaugurated in twenty-one additional institutions, and in 1925 at least 183 universities offered collegiate business education.

---


2Ibid., pp. 3-8.
and colleges had business schools or departments.¹

By that time, institutions offering collegiate business training could be classified in four groups: (1) There were the so-called "graduate type" business school, represented by Harvard and Stanford. These offered two-year curricula, usually leading to a doctorate. Admission was open to students with a bachelor's degree—whether from a liberal arts college, engineering school, business school, scientific school, or some other branch or recognized American university education. (2) There were "undergraduate-graduate" schools, represented by the University of Michigan and Dartmouth College. They were graduate schools in that they admitted students with baccalaureate degrees; but they also admitted properly qualified seniors. These had also two-year curricula. (3) A large number of colleges offered a two-year undergraduate curriculum—junior and senior years—admitting students who first had obtained a two-year liberal arts college education. Some prerequisite subjects were "recommended," while others were "required." Finally, (4) another large group maintained a four-year curriculum, admitting students directly from high school to the professional school of business. Ordinarily, these four-year schools required a certain amount of liberal arts work, so the difference between these schools and the two-year schools was

¹Ibid.
not always significant.¹

In the earlier collegiate (university-related) business schools, the foreign-language requirements were strictly maintained. The University of Chicago continued to specify foreign language admissions requirements in Latin, French, and German. The University of Pennsylvania required German and French, with Latin as an elective. The University of California admission requirements specifically included German, French, and Latin. And, "Semitic; Greek, Latin, French, Spanish, Italian, German, English; Chinese and Japanese, languages and literature, or any other languages and literatures that may at any time be announced among the courses of instruction" were offered as electives within the regular business curriculum.²

Thus, the foreign-language proficiency requirements for doctorates in business and finance were firmly established in most universities during the first quarter of the twentieth century, even though they were not always spelled out in the specific requirements for the specific doctorate degrees. As in European universities, foreign-language requirements were assumed to be met before entering specialized doctoral studies. In 1920, candidates for the Ph.B. in "commerce and administration" at the University of Chicago were required to have "4 majors in Greek, Latin, German, French, or

¹Ibid., pp. 11-12.
²Ibid., pp. 66-70.
Spanish.\textsuperscript{1} In 1930, each candidate for a doctorate was expected to have a serviceable command of French and German (on recommendation by the School, approved by the Dean, any other Germanic language may be substituted for German and any other Romance language for French).\textsuperscript{2} But by 1940, for the first time no minimum foreign-language requirements were stipulated for the Ph.D. degree in business at the University of Chicago and the admissions requirements for the School of Business merely stated that "students must have completed as a minimum two years of general education of collegiate grade, such as is prescribed by accredited junior colleges offering work substantially the equivalent of that offered by the College of the University."\textsuperscript{3} Likewise, by 1930 the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration made no mention of foreign-language requirements for admission and for the Doctor of Commercial Science degree.\textsuperscript{4} The Ph.D. degree, however--offered through the Graduate School--retained the traditional foreign-language requirements.

In the 1920s, new trends were set regarding language

\textsuperscript{1}University of Chicago, Annual Register, 1921-1922, p. 419.

\textsuperscript{2}University of Chicago, Annual Register, 1931-1932, pp. 336-7.


\textsuperscript{4}Harvard University Catalogue, November 1930, p. 550.
requirements for doctorates in business. A commission report of 1926 showed that during the 1925-26 school year such universities as New York University, the University of Cincinnati, the University of Denver, the University of Washington, Northwestern University, the University of Kansas, the University of Minnesota, the University of Missouri, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Texas, and Washington University had no specific minimum foreign-language proficiency for graduation in business education. As time progressed, other universities followed the trend.

Music

Foreign language requirements for doctorates in music have in the twentieth century varied greatly according to fields of study and specialization, and they are largely utilitarian. Music, like education and business, did not become an academic subject until the end of the nineteenth century. Applied music, especially, had traditionally been taught in an apprentice-type situation, as performers and composers learned their trade under the personal instruction of established masters in the field.

Music was first made a part of the American school

---

1 Marshall, The Collegiate School of Business, plate facing p. 84.

2 In England, however, Oxford and Cambridge have granted doctorates in music since the fifteenth century. See chapter 4.
curriculum in 1838 when Lowell Mason was engaged to teach singing in the Boston schools. During the next two decades, other cities followed; but the development was slow. Music education was promoted primarily through privately operated singing schools and conservatories, and music did not become part of the regular university curriculum until pioneering work began at Harvard University in 1870.¹

A variety of earned doctorates such as the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.), the Doctor of Music (Mus.D.), the Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A), the Doctor of Arts (D.A), and the Doctor of Music Education (Mus.Ed.D.) degrees are presently offered by American Universities. Over the years, there has been little uniformity in the foreign-language proficiency required for these degrees, but there has been a general trend to maintain rigorous foreign language requirements for degrees in the scholarly fields of music, such as musicology, music theory, and ethnomusicology, and less rigid requirements for applied fields such as music performance, composition, and pedagogy.

Musicology, a term adopted from the French musicologie to denote the scholarly study of music, is used to indicate study and research in the areas of history of composition and performance, instruments and instrumentation, melody, harmony, rhythm, music theory, musical paleography, aesthetics,

and teaching. It corresponds to the German term Musikwissenschaft (science of music; music scholarship), which was introduced by Friedrich Chrysander in 1863 in the preface to his *Jarhrbücher für musikalische Wissenschaft*, emphasizing the idea that musical studies should be raised to the same standards of seriousness and accuracy that had long been seen in the natural sciences and the humanities.¹ Musicology and music theory, then, became closely linked with the liberal arts curriculum and have been consistently represented by the Ph.D. degree. Early doctorates in music at Harvard and other universities reflect the emphasis placed on foreign-language competence in French, German, Italian, and Latin—enabling the student of music history and literature to work with the principal art forms of the musical repertory of Europe in the original languages. At Harvard, for example, foreign-language requirements for the Ph.D. degree in music were similar to those for the Ph.D. degree in the other fields offered in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

The Mus.D. degree, originally a purely honorary degree in the United States, was in the second quarter of the nineteenth century introduced as an earned degree in performance and composition in a small number of American

¹Ibid., s.v. "Musicology."
universities, such as Indiana University. Since such doctorates did not emphasize research and often did not require a regular dissertation—and since they were usually built on undergraduate performance degrees growing out of the music conservatory tradition having few or no foreign-language requirements—foreign-language study for these degrees was not emphasized on the graduate level. The D.M.A. degree has been similar in purpose and requirements to the earned Mus.D. degree and it, also, does not emphasize foreign languages in the curriculum.

The Mus.Ed.D. degree, like the D.M.A. and the earned Mus.D. degree, is a relatively recent music degree—and all three of these degrees are uniquely American, incorporating American pedagogical concepts and practices. The Mus.Ed.D. in music education is usually granted by universities and schools of music to students preparing to supervise or teach music in elementary or secondary school. In many ways, the Mus.Ed.D. degree has become similar to the Ph.D. degree in music education, except that it does not require foreign languages. In some universities it is designed as a preparation for college and university teaching in music, while in others it prepares for teaching or supervising music

1Indiana University, Indiana University Bulletin 1983-85: School of Music, pp. 42-77.

in the public schools.¹

Theology

Foreign-language proficiency requirements in theology and other religious studies also vary greatly according to degree and area of concentration and specialization.² Foreign-language requirements in theology, however, have changed little over the past century as theology is one of the established professions of the classical college and university tradition. Koine Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, as well as other ancient languages, such as Syrian, Coptic, Ugaritic, Aramaic, and others, have consistently been part of the theological curriculum, represented by the Th.D. degree. Within this century, French and especially German have been added. This is the case particularly for the Ph.D. degree in theology. The more recent professional doctorates in theology and religious studies, such as the Doctor of Theological Science (S.T.D.) and Doctor of Ministry (D.Min.) degrees—not unlike applied professional degrees in music—have tended to de-emphasize the use of foreign languages.³ For doctoral degrees in theology and religion as well as in other

¹Ibid.; A detailed discussion of recent practices is found in chapter 5, pp. 166-73.

²The foreign-language requirement in the classical theology curriculum is represented in chapter 2, pp. 29-30. Current foreign-language requirements are indicated in chapter 5, pp. 167-78.

³A more detailed study of the requirements for these degrees is found in chapter 5.
professional fields, foreign-language proficiency requirements have tended to become more and more utilitarian. Areas emphasizing a scholarly approach and research have retained the traditional classical requirements; applied professional areas require foreign languages only as they are directly needed for the study and the activities involved.

**English: A New "Lingua franca" of the World**

The rapid increase in the international use of English as a contact language has had a decisive impact on the study and use of foreign languages in the United States. Just as German was essential to the reading of professional-technical literature in the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, English has become indispensable for reading most international professional literature in the second half of this century.

English as a world language has been referred to as "the closest thing" to a *lingua franca* of the globe.¹ It is spoken by around 700 million people—an increase of 40 percent in the last twenty years—and it is the dominant language within the fields of medicine, electronics, space technology, aviation, international business, advertising, radio, television, and film. It is also predominant in higher education and music, especially pop music. It is used by Japanese business men negotiating a business deal in

Kuwait, by Swedes when furnishing foreign aid and cultural assistance to Mexico, and by Hong Kong bankers when working in Singapore. It has replaced French in the world of diplomacy and German in the field of science.\(^1\) While English is spoken by about one-tenth of the world's population, it is not necessarily the most universally used language everywhere. More people—perhaps as many as one billion—speak Mandarin Chinese; and Russian is studied by more individuals than any other language in Eastern Europe. Still, English has become such a powerful vehicle for international communication that any literate, educated person is deprived if he does not know it. This explains to a large extent the diminishing role of foreign languages in doctoral curricula in professional disciplines in American universities.\(^2\)

The dominant role of English as an international language is similar to the role of Koine Greek at the end of the Hellenic world, Latin in the Middle Ages, and French in seventeenth-century Europe. With the widespread international use of English, the need to know other languages has diminished drastically, and for this reason American intellectuals have in this century experienced the sharply deteriorating familiarity with foreign languages as a direct

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Ibid.
result of the decreasing emphasis on foreign-language study in American universities.

With the United States emerging as a dominant world power, however, the decreasing emphasis on foreign-language study seems anachronistic and, according to the report of the 1979 Presidential Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, the present lack of foreign-language proficiency among professionals diminishes American capabilities in foreign trade, diplomacy, and in citizen comprehension of the world in which they live and compete. The Presidential Commission concluded that the deterioration of this country's language and research capacity is alarming at a time when an increasingly hazardous international military, political, and economic environment is making unprecedented demands on America's resources, intellectual capacity, and public sensitivity. Since national security cannot safely be defined and protected within the narrow framework of defense, diplomacy, and economics, the nation's welfare depends in large measure on the intellectual and psychological strengths among professionals that are derived from perceptive visions of the world beyond one's own borders. On a planet shrunken by the technology of instant communication, "there is little safety behind a 'Maginot Line' of professional scientific and scholarly isola-
The Impact of Accrediting Associations

Accreditation, as applied to higher education, is supposedly the recognition accorded to an educational institution that meets the standards or criteria established by a competent agency or association. Its general purpose is to promote and insure high quality in educational programs. Voluntary accreditation is an American practice.\(^1\) It has had a considerable impact on foreign-language requirements in the American university curriculum in professional disciplines.

A basic purpose in accreditation is to encourage institutions to improve their programs by providing for them standards or criteria established by competent bodies. Another purpose of accrediting is to facilitate the transfer of students from one educational institution to another. The amount of such transfer has been rather extensive in the United States in this century. Some of it is horizontal, with students transferring from one level in one institution to the same level in another. But most of it is vertical, with students completing courses of study in one institution and then moving on to other institutions for more advanced or

\(^1\) The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, \textit{Strength through Wisdom}, p. 2.

\(^2\) In Europe, standards of achievement, including foreign-language requirements, are set by national departments or ministries of education and are enforced nation-wide.
professional study. In both instances, levels of foreign-language proficiency have had to be verified.\textsuperscript{1}

A third purpose of accrediting is to inform those who employ graduates of an institution, or who examine its graduates for admission into professional practice, about the quality of training which the graduates have received. A fourth objective of accreditation is to "raise the standards of education" within the practice of a profession. A significant effect of accrediting, although not generally stated as a purpose, is that it often serves as a support to administrative officers or a faculty or professional group who want to maintain "high standards" but face considerable local difficulty in effecting improvement. The pronouncements of accrediting agencies and associations are often helpful in such instances by calling attention to standards or proficiency levels that should be met. Finally, accreditation serves the general public, for it supplies to students and others guidance on institutions they may wish to patronize.\textsuperscript{2}

In the early days of accreditation associations in the United States, through the first quarter of the twentieth century, primary concerns were to establish better working relationships between secondary schools and institutions of


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.
higher learning. It was done by standardizing entrance examinations, defining what constituted a college and what constituted a secondary school, and establishing and evaluating systems and criteria for admission to college and university curricula. Among the many topics discussed were the following: (1) college entrance requirements, including foreign-language requirements; (2) systems of admission to universities and professional schools; (3) the identification of subjects which should be "constants" for all students in secondary school and college; (4) the problem of foreign-language study in high school and university requirements; (5) uniform requirements in English; and (6) the desirability of separate technical and professional schools in public school systems and universities.¹

In addition to the impact of general regional accrediting associations, such as the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and similar associations, professional accrediting associations, including the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), and the Association of Theological Schools (ATS), have helped to

standardize admissions requirements as well as curriculum content and foreign-language graduation requirements.

From the beginning of accrediting in the New England states around 1885 until 1910, the work associated with evaluating institutions of higher learning took predominantly the form of conferences—often including spirited discussions—from which occasionally emerged certain formal pronouncements and recommendations. These, however, were chiefly expressions of personal hopes and convictions and they had little immediate impact, except as individuals or institutions chose to adopt or apply them.¹ By 1910, the North Central Association—the first agency to attempt to accredit colleges and universities—established definite procedures and regulations for such accreditation. In 1912, as published in the Proceedings of the North Central Association, the standards for accrediting colleges and universities and their professional curricula were enlarged and specified in greater detail.²

Post World War II: "Non-linguistic Languages"

In the twentieth century, as doctoral foreign-language requirements have been modified, and in many instances, eliminated, the substitution of utilitarian "non-language

¹See Rudolph, The American College and University, pp. 437-8.

languages" or research tools such as statistics or computer science for foreign languages has become more and more common. Already in 1930, graduate students in the Chicago University School of Business were required "either as undergraduate or as graduate students" to give evidence of "adequate preparation" in statistics.¹ And in 1957, Viens and Wadsworth reported the results of a survey showing that nearly one-fourth of the graduate schools surveyed allowed the substitution of other research tools in all or at least some of their departments—most often statistics or "a strong minor."²

In 1966, a survey conducted by Admussen showed that computer science, statistics, or other research tools were accepted in lieu of one or two foreign languages in one-third of the institutions surveyed.³ Department chairmen polled by Wimberley in 1972 indicated that they considered other skills such as mathematics and writing more important than foreign languages in many professional disciplines.⁴

¹University of Chicago, Annual Register 1930-1931, p. 334.


eign-language requirements in many professional fields were in the process of disintegrating.

Summary

The early twentieth century continued to develop the nineteenth century trend of decreased foreign-language requirements in higher education. This became more obvious as many new American university disciplines such as education and business were developed in which foreign-language study was de-emphasized because of diminishing practical needs. As a result, foreign-language requirements for doctorates in these fields were gradually relaxed. A dual practice developed, however, in that "professional" or "applied" professional doctorates, such as the Ed.D. and the B.M.A. degrees, were cautiously but steadily moving toward the elimination of foreign-language requirements while the "academic" professional Ph.D. degree in the same disciplines retained the foreign-language requirements as a matter of "academic propriety" and tradition.

In other fields which had a large body of traditional literature in foreign languages—such as music and theology—foreign-language requirements for doctorates were commonly supported and continued. But even in these disciplines a differentiation between "applied" fields and "academic" fields within a discipline developed. Thus, the Mus.D., the Mus.Ed.D., and the D.Min. degrees would have decreasing foreign-language requirements, while the Ph.D. and the Th.D.
degrees still retained proficiency requirements in German, French, and other foreign languages.

As a result of demands for practical usefulness in many professional fields, new "non-linguistic" languages or skills, such as statistics, mathematics, analytic techniques, and computer science were substituted in lieu of the former foreign-language requirements, or they were introduced as viable options.
CHAPTER IV
FOREIGN-LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND INSTRUCTION IN
EUROPEAN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Introduction
In European universities, general post-secondary foreign-language study and foreign-language proficiency exams are not a concern or an issue except to students in the fields of languages, linguistics, and philology. It is assumed that all general language proficiency needs have been met in elementary and secondary school. Doctoral degrees are conferred for specialized research, and the acquisition of necessary cognant skills and the use of foreign languages as tools is the responsibility of each doctoral candidate.

Professional Education versus General Education

In Europe, as in America, there used to be a very definite distinction between academic professions and non-academic professions or vocations.¹ Education, business, and music were traditionally not part of the standard university curriculum, while the study of theology goes back

¹See Chapter 2, pp. 41-46.
to the earliest times in the European university move-
ment.¹ Elementary education and teacher training were, and
still are, obtained at teachers' schools or "teachers'
colleges," business education at business schools or
"business colleges," and applied music and music education at
music schools or conservatories.² None was part of the
continental European academic degree-granting university
system. One principal difference between the university and
the non-academic professional school was seen in the
requirements for admission. While admission to any
university has been, and still is, contingent upon graduation
from a university-preparatory gymnasium or lycee, non-
academic professional and vocational schools have
traditionally accepted students with a less rigid educational
background.³ The difference was usually seen in that
technical-vocational schools were originally a part of the
secondary-level school system and in that they put less
stress on competence in foreign languages. Only within the
past seventy years or so have the training in elementary
education, business education, and music become fully
accepted disciplines within the continental European academic

¹See Encyclopaedia Britannica, s.v. "History of
Education."

²See Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, s.v. "Kon-
servatorium," by Richard Schaal [7:1459-1482].

³See Blauch, A Century of the Professional School,
p. 144.
Preparation for secondary-school teaching has traditionally been obtained in the various faculties of European universities, however; but in the 1980s, professional studies in education, business, and music are still done to a large extent in institutions separated from the principal universities of Europe. Preparation for secondary and especially elementary-school teaching is done in a pädagogische Hochschule, an école normale supérieure, a pedagogiceskij institut, or a laererhøyskole; business education is obtained in a handelshøgskola; and applied music and composition are more often studied in a conservatoire or a Hochschule für Musik—a university-level professional school—than in the Institut für Musikwissenschaft (Institute or Department of Musicology) of a regular university. Exceptions to this general rule are seen in the British Isles, where music study and the granting of degrees in music

A number of terms are used to designate European institutions of higher education. Several lose their European academic significance when they are translated literally into English. The German term Hochschule (in Norwegian, høyskole; in Swedish, Högskola), for example, means "high school" but is used for a university-level "graduate type" institution specializing in educational programs in disciplines ordinarily not included in the regular national university, such as music, dentistry, engineering, etc.; e.g., Hochschule für Musik [university-level school specializing in applied music, as contrasted to the scholarly study of music], Handelshögskola [university-level business school], and the like. Other terms used for university-level professional schools are institut, école supérieure [also "high school"], akademie, etc.
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at Cambridge and Oxford go back to the fifteenth century.¹

Doctorates in Education, Business, and Music
In European Institutions of Higher Learning

Education

Teacher education is obtained in a variety of European educational institutions. In most countries these institutions are now part of the national system of higher education although they are not "universities." Doctorates in secondary-school teaching fields have a very long European tradition. They grew out of the classical curriculum in education. But doctorates in education as a discipline are relatively new in European universities and have been strongly influenced by American models and practices. Foreign-language expectations are stringent, but these requirements are met on the secondary-school level unless one or more foreign languages are part of the subject areas studied for the degree.²

Business

In continental Europe, the study of foreign languages in connection with business and "commercial education" has a long tradition. At the end of the nineteenth century, well known "business academies" with well-defined curricula were

¹Ibid.

²See under individual countries in International Handbook of Universities and Other Institutions of Higher Learning.
found in Vienna, Prague, Paris, Venice, and other cities.¹

According to a contemporary account by W. G. Blackie, however, commercial education in Britain was not equally well organized:

Until quite recently no one would have thought of preferring such a request [to lecture on commercial education] to anyone; and that for the simple reason that no one took any special interest in the education of those who were destined to be engaged in commercial pursuits. Public provision had been made for the education of clergymen, doctors, lawyers, teachers, of those to be employed in the applications of ornament in manufactures, and also of those proposing to devote themselves to scientific pursuits; but it was not thought necessary to provide any special educational course for training one of the most numerous as well as most important classes of the community—that to which is intrusted [sic] the carrying on the commerce of this great empire. In short, in a country which is commercial above all the countries of the world, whose relations in trade with foreign countries are more extensive than those of any other country in existence, and whose very life and prosperity depend in a very large measure on the success of its foreign trade, the public mind had never awakened to the necessity of providing public means for the educational training of those through whose exertions and mental capacity alone this success could be ensured.²

Blackie continued by comparing the language competence of business men in continental Europe to that of their colleagues in Britain, quoting M. Richard, from a previous


²W. G. Blackie, Commercial Education: An Address Delivered By Request, to the Members of the Glasgow Local Association of the Educational Institute of Scotland (Glasgow: Blackie and Son, 1888), p. 7.
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Every intelligent man must admit that the invasion of our commerce by foreigners is due entirely to this [Scottish] educational inferiority. The Germans are taking our places everywhere. They even supplant the English. Why is this? Because the teaching of modern languages in Germany is so thorough that "intelligent emigration" becomes easy and profitable, and commerce is advanced by the young adventurers who go to the end of the world in order to organize agencies for the large markets of Vienna, Prague, Berlin, Frankfort, &c. All these young men speak French and English as well as their own tongue; if they are going to the Spanish colonies they speak Spanish, and if to China they learn Chinese.

. . . . Let the merchants of France take warning in time. German commerce has better instruction, better discipline, and greater enterprise than French commerce; it is at home everywhere—no languages are foreign to it; it keeps a look-out over the whole world; it is not ashamed to go to school; and if you do not awake from your lethargy it will annihilate you.¹

Over the past one hundred years, however, business and commerce have become established disciplines in British as well as in continental European universities.²

Music

In the early European university movement, with the establishment of the medieval studium generale, the traditions of higher learning provided in cathedral and monastic schools were carried over into the university curriculum. University documents attest to music instruction


in many of these institutions, where all the students in the arts faculty often attended lectures on music. The first recorded professorship was established at Salamanca University in 1254. In Prague, lectures on music were given already in 1367, and in Vienna music was part of the requirements as early as 1389.¹

Degrees in music, which included the license to teach, may have been granted at the University of Salamanca and perhaps at some Italian universities in medieval times. But little definite information is available until in the statuta antiqua of 1456 Cambridge University stipulated that candidates for the bachelor of music degree deposit "caution money." By 1500 music had emerged as a separate faculty both at Oxford and Cambridge.² Until the second half of the nineteenth century, however, the study of music was not considered an independent discipline in continental European universities, but rather a part of general knowledge that gave theoretical treatment to specific musical questions.³

Theology

The study of theology is part of the regular university


²Ibid., [6:5-6].
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curriculum in virtually all non-communist European countries. In most countries, there is a state church which is financed through government support. The curricula in theology are the only ones among the four disciplines under study which regularly include foreign-language instruction and study (Latin, Greek, and Hebrew) on the university level.

The Nature of Secondary School
Foreign-Language Preparation

In general, the foundation for foreign-language competence in continental Europe is established through language study in elementary and secondary school. Except for students planning to become linguists and theologians, the basic working knowledge of needed foreign languages is completed before entering university studies. In most European countries, national students are admitted to all university studies on the basis of graduation from a university-preparatory secondary school. Interestingly, all foreign students requesting admission to universities in the Federal Republic of Germany and in Austria and the Scandinavian countries will be admitted on the basis of a university-preparatory secondary-school diploma from their home country. An exception to this is made for students with American high-school diplomas. These are not admitted until they have reached junior standing in an American college. Prerequisite for admission to German institutions of higher learning for American students are "at least five independent
liberal arts courses on the college transcripts, among them a second language," in addition to "English and mathematics and/or courses in the natural sciences."¹ American high-school diplomas are considered inferior.

Germany and Austria

In Austria and Germany, general education preparing for university studies is provided in the standard "academic secondary school" (gymnasium). It offers a nine-year foreign-language program (grades 5-13). It also has a "short form" (grades 8-13), into which students may transfer from the main school (Hauptschule) or middle school after completing the seventh grade. Both lead to university matriculation. The upper three grades represent general education on the higher secondary level. Upon completion of the academic secondary school, the students take the comprehensive state examination (Abiturprüfung or Reifeprüfung) to obtain the diploma (Abitur or Reifezeugnis) required for university entrance.²

Three types of academic secondary schools are generally found in Austria and the Federal Republic of Germany: (1)


the classical type, which includes the study of Latin and Greek, (2) the modern language type, which emphasizes two modern languages— one of which is usually English— or one modern language plus Latin, and (3) the mathematics-science type, which reduces the time spent in the study of modern languages in order to increase the emphasis on mathematics and science.¹

The number of hours of instruction per week in the modern languages program and in the mathematics-science program of a representative *gymnasium* (Hesse, Germany) are displayed in figures 2 and 3:

¹Ibid., p. 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st foreign language</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd foreign language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social problems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art education and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manual arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required elective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Half-yearly subjects that alternate with other half-yearly subjects. Consequently, they appear in the totals at half value.

Fig. 2. Modern-Language Secondary School (Gymnasium) in Germany. Hours of Class Instruction per Week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grades</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st foreign language</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31 or 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd foreign language</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21 or 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social problems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art education and manual arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required elective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Mathematics-Science Academic Secondary School (Gymnasium) in Germany. Hours of Class Instruction per Week.


It is seen that the first foreign language, usually English, is studied in grades 5 through 13 (9 years) and the second foreign language is studied in grades 7 through 13 (7 years) in the modern-languages-type academic secondary schools. In the mathematics-science program, the foreign-language requirements are reduced in the two upper grades, but the language proficiency obtained is still substan-
In the non-academic middle school (Realschule) program, English is studied for six years and French for five years. In the vocational-technical schools (Berufsfachschulen), foreign languages are emphasized in a similar manner, so that a trilingual education is the national educational norm. The emphasis on foreign languages and general education in the elementary and secondary schools is so strong that university studies can be devoted entirely to professional studies. An adequate foreign-language background for most professional disciplines has already been obtained.

The strong foreign-language preparation, not only in university-preparatory secondary schools but also in vocational-technical schools, has a long tradition in continental Europe. For example, a late nineteenth-century survey of the curricula of business schools in Germany, Austria, France, and Italy shows a similar emphasis on tri-lingual or quadri-lingual education.  

France

In France, professional university studies build on graduation and the diploma from secondary school (baccalaureat). A similar situation is found in Belgium.

---

1Ibid.

2James, *Education of Business Men in Europe*, pp. 16-191.
The French baccalaureat is offered with a large number of options in terms of subject emphasis. See table 4.

Baccalaureat de l'Enseignement
du Second Degre

Series A (Philosophy and Liberal Arts)

A 1 Latin and Greek
A 2 Latin or Greek and a second modern language
A 3 Second modern language
A 4 Second modern language and advanced French or advanced study in first modern language
A 5 Second and third modern languages
A 6 Music and Latin or Greek or second modern language
A 7 Plastic arts and Latin or Greek or second modern language

Series B (Economics and Social Sciences)

B 1 Latin or Greek
B 2 Second modern language

Series C (Mathematics and Physical Sciences)

Series D (Mathematics and Natural Sciences)

D' Agricultural Sciences

Baccalaureat de Technicien (Technical Secondary School)

Series F (Industrial Techniques)

F 1 Mechanical construction
F 2 Electronics
F 3 Electrotechnology
F 4 Civil engineering (building and public works)
F 5 Physics
F 6 Chemistry
F 7 Biochemistry
F 7' Biology
F 8 Medical-social sciences
F 9 Technical building equipment
F 10 Microtechnology
F 11 Music or dance

Series G (Tertiary Sector)
At least one modern language is required in all the different curricula. There are numerous language options, however, and each "series" provides the general education and foreign-language background for specific professional disciplines.

Northern Europe

The university-preparatory secondary schools (gymnas) in the Scandinavian countries are similar, and the transfer of studies from one country to another--both on the secondary level and on the university level--usually presents few problems. Until less than fifteen years ago, there was a distinct separation between secondary education leading to university matriculation and secondary vocational-technical education. More recently, most secondary schools (videregaaende skoler) are comprehensive high schools with many study options leading to a wide variety of vocations and professions.

While graduation from the gymnas (examen artium or
student eksamen), at the end of the twelfth grade, used to be limited to approximately 9-12 percent of the population fifty years ago, approximately 65 percent now complete the 12-year basic and secondary-school (videregaaende skole) curriculum. The first foreign language (English) is commonly begun in fourth grade and is continued all through secondary school (nine years).

The Danish gymnasium is representative of Scandinavian university-preparatory secondary education. There are seven options for subject material concentrations:

a. modern languages
b. music and languages
c. social studies and languages
d. classical languages
e. mathematics and physics
f. social studies and mathematics
g. natural sciences and mathematics

There is a common core of foreign-language study for all students, including English, German, French (or Russian), and Latin, so that all students entering university studies have studied at least four languages. However, since some instruction in Swedish, Norwegian, and Old Norse (Icelandic) literature is regularly included with the study of Danish, Scandinavian students matriculating in Danish universities—as well as those studying in Norwegian and Swedish universities—normally have various levels of working knowledge in eight languages.

Secondary students electing the foreign-language option and the mathematics-physics option in the upper secondary school have the weekly study programs noted in table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>curriculum</th>
<th>Modern Languages</th>
<th>Mathematics-Physics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grades</td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>- 1 2</td>
<td>- 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
<td>3 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4 4 6</td>
<td>5 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3 3 5</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (Russian)</td>
<td>5 5 3</td>
<td>5 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Civilization</td>
<td>4 4 -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Civics</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
<td>2 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2 - -</td>
<td>- - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>- - 3</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>2 3 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>3 3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2 3 -</td>
<td>5 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (max.)</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (min.)</td>
<td>2 - -</td>
<td>2 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>- 2 1</td>
<td>- 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 30 30</td>
<td>30 30 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5. Modern-Language and Mathematics-Physics gymnasium in Denmark. Hours of Class Instruction per week.


Southern Europe and Eastern Europe

The number of hours of class instruction per week--including foreign-language instruction--in other
representative European countries, such as Greece, Spain, Romania, and Poland, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grades 7</th>
<th>Grades 8</th>
<th>Grades 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Greek</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to democratic government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography with components from geology</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology and hygiene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and career guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Curriculum of the Three-Year Gymnasium in Greece. Hours of Class Instruction per Week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>curriculum</th>
<th>Classical</th>
<th></th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grades</td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Greek</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3 2 2</td>
<td>3 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1 - -</td>
<td>1 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic geography</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical geography</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4 - -</td>
<td>4 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and chemistry</td>
<td>- 3 3</td>
<td>- 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>1 - -</td>
<td>1 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1 - -</td>
<td>1 - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene and anthropology</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td>- 1 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>- - 2</td>
<td>- - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General biology</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Greek</td>
<td>- 2 3</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>- 2 2</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>- 2 2</td>
<td>- 2 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and chemistry</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- 3 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 36 35</td>
<td>33 36 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7. Curriculum of the Three-Year General Lyceum in Greece. Hours of Class Instruction per Week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>curriculum</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grades</td>
<td>6 7 8</td>
<td>9 10 11 12</td>
<td>10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>6 6 -</td>
<td>2 - 6 2</td>
<td>- 6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern language</td>
<td>- 4 4 1</td>
<td>3 1 6 3</td>
<td>1 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>- - 4 3</td>
<td>3 10 - 7</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>6 - 3 3</td>
<td>- 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>6 - 3 3</td>
<td>- 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious instruction &amp; civics</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3 3</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>4 4 -</td>
<td>- - - 3</td>
<td>- - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>3 3 7</td>
<td>- 7 - -</td>
<td>7 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6 3 3</td>
<td>3 - 6 -</td>
<td>3 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; chemistry</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>7 - - -</td>
<td>4 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>- 3 - -</td>
<td>3 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>6 6 6</td>
<td>6 6 6 -</td>
<td>6 6 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 33 33</td>
<td>33 33 33</td>
<td>33 33 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. Secondary School Curriculum in Spain. Hours of Class Instruction per Week.

Fig. 9. General Elementary School Curriculum in Romania.
Hours of Class Instruction per Week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romanian language and literature</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern foreign language (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from school of general education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second modern foreign language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-political studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World history</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary history of Romania, of the workers'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic and revolutionary movement, and of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Romanian Communist Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and logic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical instruction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for national defense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free elective activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 10. Curriculum of the Four-Year Liceo in Romania. Hours of Class Instruction per Week.

Source: Braham, *The Educational System of Romania*, p. 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>grades</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical and technical studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11. General Elementary School Curriculum in Poland. Hours of Class Instruction per Week.

Unifying Elements

Characteristically, European university-preparatory secondary schools provide a general education intended to serve as a foundation for study toward a variety of academic professions. In order to serve different academic disciplines well, this preparation is broad; but there is also opportunity for a considerable amount of specialization within the secondary-school curriculum. In most countries, there is a distinct differentiation between the curricula...
leading to liberal arts university studies and those leading to studies in scientific-technical fields.

The foreign-language preparation in secondary school—not only in the university-preparatory programs but also in the vocational-technical programs—is thorough. Individual foreign languages are studied sufficiently long and in sufficient depth that they become useful tools in future professional activities. In the process, most European academicians become at least tri-lingual. Academic transfer from one university to another usually presents few major problems. Through the study of foreign languages, European students early become oriented—both intellectually and culturally—to professional concepts and practices in other countries, and they can easily participate in international academic and professional interaction.

Summary

As contrasted to practices in American secondary education, European university-preparatory secondary education is designed to provide an adequate liberal arts, foreign language, and scientific-technical foundation to enable university students to concentrate on advanced specialized professional studies as soon as they enter the university. As in American high schools, European secondary schools in many countries also provide a comprehensive secondary education. But in European schools there is a
tendency to have fewer "short courses" for "enrichment" and to carry principal secondary-school subjects—including foreign languages—for longer periods of time in order to encourage practical usefulness, comprehension and mastery. Specialization and preparation for an academic profession is begun on the secondary level. Foreign-language proficiency is obtained in elementary and secondary school. There is no need to allow foreign-language requirements to distract from graduate professional studies. Therefore, there are no general foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines in Europe.
CHAPTER V

CHANGES IN AMERICAN PRACTICES AND ATTITUDES TOWARD
FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS SINCE 1960

Introduction

The national trend to relax foreign-language requirements in education in general and in doctoral studies in particular continued in the 1960s and 1970s. Although the launching of the Russian Sputnik temporarily created added interest in foreign-language study, this national trend has caused concern and alarm among educators in the United States. Several studies have been undertaken since 1960 to measure the decline in interest and to propose possible remedies.

The 1979 Report of the President’s Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies

National Concerns

The executive order to establish a "President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Affairs" was signed by President Jimmy Carter on 21 April 1978. The Commission was founded as a result of the final act of the Helsinki Accords, which committed the signatory states "to encourage the study of foreign languages and civilization as
an important means of expanding communication among peoples.\(^1\) The report of the Commission, published in November of 1979, explained why competence in foreign languages is important to all Americans; it identified the points of greatest weakness; and it presented "carefully considered recommendations" for remedial action.\(^2\)

According to the cover letter from Commission Chairman James A. Perkins to President Carter,

> Effective leadership in international affairs, both in government and in the private sector, requires well-trained and experienced experts. And in a democratic society like ours, leadership is paralyzed without a well-informed public that embraces all our citizens. But the hard and brutal fact is that our programs and institutions for education and training for foreign language and international understanding are both currently inadequate and actually falling further behind.\(^3\)

The basic concerns expressed by the Commission were as follows:

(1) There is "a serious deterioration" in this country's language and research capacity, at a time when an increasingly hazardous international military, political, and economic environment is making unprecedented demands on America's resources, intellectual capacity and public sensitivity.\(^4\)

(2) Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security.

\(^1\)The President's Commission, *Strength through Wisdom*, p. 1.

\(^2\)See the Commission Chairman's letter to President Jimmy Carter in the report.

\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 1.
At a time when the resurgent forces of nationalism and of ethnic and linguistic consciousness so directly affect global realities, the United States requires far more reliable capacities to communicate with its allies, analyze the behavior of potential adversaries, and earn the trust and the sympathies of the uncommitted. Yet, there is a widening gap between these needs and the American competence to understand and deal successfully with other peoples in a world in flux.

(3) The problem extends from the elementary schools, instruction in foreign languages and cultures [unlike that done in Europe and in other parts of the world] has virtually disappeared, to the imminent loss of some of the world's leading centers for advanced training and research on foreign areas.

(4) On a planet shrunken by the technology of instant communications, there is little safety behind a Maginot Line of scientific and scholarly isolationism. In our schools and colleges as well as in our public media of communications, and in the everyday dialogue within our communities, the situation cries out for a better comprehension of our place and our potential in a world that, though it still expects much from America, no longer takes American supremacy for granted.

(5) The United States is no longer the only major center of scientific and technological progress. We confront a potent combination of social ideologies and national aspirations that have extensive consequences for America's domestic well-being.

(6) While the use of English as a major international language of business, diplomacy and science should be welcomed as a tool for understanding across national boundaries, this cannot be safely considered a substitute for direct communications in the many areas and on innumerable occasions when knowledge of English cannot be expected. The fact remains that the overwhelming majority of the world's population neither understands nor speaks English, and for most of those who learn

---

1 Ibid., pp. 1-2.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p. 2.
4 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
English as a foreign language, it remains precisely that.¹

(7) Our lack of foreign language competence diminishes our capabilities in diplomacy, in foreign trade, and in citizen comprehension of the world in which we live and compete.²

Statistical Observations

The Commission's concern about the state of foreign language study in the United States was illustrated by the following statistics:

(1) Only 15 percent of American high school students now [1979] study a foreign language—down from 24 percent in 1965. The decline continues.

(2) Only one out of 20 public high school students studies French, German, or Russian beyond the second year. (Four years is considered a minimum prerequisite for useable language competence).

(3) Only 8 percent of American colleges and universities now [1979] require a foreign language for admission, compared with 34 per cent in 1966.

(4) It is estimated that there are 10,000 English-speaking Japanese business representatives on assignment in the United States. There are fewer than 900 American counterparts in Japan—and only a handful of those have a working knowledge of Japanese.

(5) The foreign affairs agencies of the U.S. government are deeply concerned that declining foreign language enrollments in our schools and colleges will lower the quality of new recruits for their services and increase language training costs, already at a level of $100 million in 1978.

(6) Our schools graduate a large majority of students whose knowledge and vision stops at the American shoreline, whose approach to international affairs is provincial,

¹Ibid., pp. 5-6.
²Ibid., p. 6.
and whose heads have been filled with astonishing misinformation. In a recent published study of school children's knowledge and perceptions of other nations and peoples, over 40 percent of the 12th graders could not locate Egypt correctly, while over 20 percent were equally ignorant about the whereabouts of France or China.

(7) At the college level, an American Council on Education study reported that at most only 5 percent of prospective teachers take any course relating to international affairs or foreign peoples and cultures as part of their professional preparation.

(8) A 1977 Gallup Poll furthermore showed that those who graduate from an educational system so glaringly deficient in this vital area carry their ignorance with them into their adult lives: over half of the general public was unaware that the United States must import part of its petroleum supplies.¹

In the view of the members of the Commission, there was an urgent need for better-trained teachers and for extensive retraining of those already serving in the nation's classrooms, particularly in view of widespread expert agreement that the decline in foreign-language enrollments is in large measure a response to poor instruction.²

Proposed Remedies

In order to remedy the weaknesses perceived in American foreign-language instruction and study, the Commission made a number of general recommendations.

(1) 20 regional centers, funded by the U.S. Department of Education, should reinvestigate and upgrade the foreign language and teaching competences of foreign language

¹Ibid., pp. 7-8
²Ibid., p. 8.
teachers at all levels. The regional centers should be organized as part of the international studies centers recommended for higher education.

(2) 20-30 Department of Education funded summer institutes should be offered abroad annually with objectives similar to those of the regional centers but to include advanced students and teachers of subjects other than foreign language, and to give special attention to the less commonly taught languages.

(3) Schools, colleges and universities should reinstate foreign-language requirements.

(4) The Department of Education should provide incentive funding to schools and postsecondary institutions for foreign language teaching: $20 per pre-high school student in the first two years of language courses, $30 and $40 respectively per high school and college student enrolled in third and fourth year language courses, with an additional $15 per student enrolled in the less commonly taught languages.

(5) The Department of Education should support Language and International Studies High Schools, 20 initially in major population centers and eventually up to 60, to serve as national models and offer intensive and advanced language and international studies in addition to regular courses, with special support to ensure minority enrollment.

(6) The National Institute of Education (NIE), National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FUND) (as well as NDEA Title VI research programs) should support pedagogical experimentation in foreign language teaching, particularly in effective methodology.

(7) A National Criteria and Assessment Program, funded by NIE, should develop foreign language proficiency tests, and report on, monitor, and assess foreign language teaching in the U.S.

(8) All State Departments of Education should have Foreign Language Specialists. Every state should establish an Advisory Council on Foreign Language and International Studies to advise and recommend on ways to strengthen these fields in their education systems.

(9) The U.S. government should achieve 100 percent compliance in filling positions designated as requiring foreign language proficiency, review criteria for such
designation in order to strengthen the government's foreign language capability, and evaluate the career systems of foreign affairs agencies to ensure adequate career incentives for obtaining and retaining foreign language and area expertise.\(^1\)

In the report, specific suggestions were made for foreign-language study in kindergarten through twelfth grade; for foreign-language training and research in college and university programs; for international education exchange programs; for meeting business and labor needs abroad; and for needed improvement in organization both within and outside central and local governments.\(^2\)

The Commission proposed that an international dimension be added to education in professional disciplines by the inclusion of "international studies curricular programs," combining international and professional studies on the graduate level.\(^3\) To provide educational institutions with incentives, federal subsidies based on enrollment in foreign-language courses should be used to help public and private educational institutions on all levels to encourage foreign-language programs. Such incentive funding would be intended to encourage the introduction of foreign-language courses where there is no current provision for such instruction, to encourage courses of study going beyond two years, and for

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 12-14.
\(^2\)Ibid., pp. 14-27.
\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 18-19.
the teaching of less commonly taught languages. Federal funds—administered by the U.S Department of Education—should be allocated for first and second year language instruction before high school and the third and fourth years of study in secondary schools and in colleges. It was implied that—as it is done in Europe and other parts of the world—general foreign-language study should be completed before students enter graduate professional degree programs.¹

American business and labor, and institutions of higher learning, were singled out by being admonished to give higher priority to foreign-language training in recruiting new personnel. Schools of business administration, as well as other professional schools, were encouraged to include foreign languages and international studies as part of their [undergraduate] degree programs.²

Finally, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies recommended that a permanent "National Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies" be established and funded for the purpose of increasing public interest in and support for the improvement of American capability in foreign languages and international understanding.³

¹Ibid., p. 36.
²Ibid., pp. 131-3
³Ibid., pp. 139-41.
The Nature of Foreign-Language Requirements

The trend to relax foreign-language requirements—already prominent in most colleges and universities before 1960—continued into the 1960s and 1970s. As pointed out by the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies in 1979, there was an "epidemic elimination" of foreign-language requirements.¹ A number of studies had been conducted in order to analyse the various aspects of the trend in greater detail.

Questions were addressed as to whether there should be a general foreign-language requirement for all students in American colleges and universities and, if so, whether one or two foreign languages should be required; which languages should be required; whether language requirements should be university-wide or set by individual departments; whether it should be possible to substitute other useful research tools or "non-linguistic languages;" and what proficiency should be expected when foreign languages were required. The studies showed that a variety of requirements and practices existed and that opinion differed greatly among professionals as to the need for and the perceived usefulness of foreign languages in professional disciplines.

In most colleges and universities, general university-

¹Ibid., p. 29.
Arguments Supporting a General Foreign-Language Requirement

Little consensus of opinion existed in the 1960s and 1970s as to the need for general university-wide foreign-language requirements. A number of arguments were offered in favor as well as in opposition to traditional practices.

The most frequently cited purpose for having foreign-language requirements was that languages are needed in and necessary for research. According to William Brickman, "It

---


is becoming rapidly perilous" to do research in a discipline without taking into consideration the source materials written in other languages.\(^1\) He considered the idea a "myth" that most foreign professional literature needed for research has been or will soon be translated into English. Besides, since there is usually a considerable time-lag between the original publication of a work and its translation into English, the mono-lingual researcher is always at a disadvantage.

Arguments were also presented that doctoral candidates must know foreign languages in order to acquire "cultural breadth," so that they would be able to understand and appreciate the life-styles of non-English-speaking citizens of the world.\(^2\) Other reasons for retaining strong foreign-language requirements included that they were part of an international academic tradition, that they promote international understanding, and that they enable American doctors to compete favorably with doctors holding foreign degrees.\(^3\)


\(^3\)Cf. Wiltsey, Doctoral Use of Foreign Languages,
Arguments Opposing a General Foreign-Language Requirement

The principal objection raised against general foreign-language requirements was that the use of foreign languages is no longer functional for most American students and scholars and that such requirements in reality become punitive. It was felt that since there is so much material to be mastered in any academic discipline, the time spent in mastering foreign-language requirements might better be used for acquiring learning tools and research methods more closely related to a person's speciality.\footnote{1}

Robert Wiltsey listed the following arguments in opposition to general foreign-language requirements:

1. In certain fields or professions, the lack of foreign literature or the need to use languages in other ways makes foreign language skills unnecessary.
2. In graduate study, students are not required to use foreign languages.
3. Students are not adequately prepared in foreign languages before they enter graduate school; therefore, they lack the time or motivation to acquire proficiency.
4. The proficiency standards and methods of evaluation are...

so variable across departments and institutions that they are unfair to students.

(5) The requirement unduly delays graduate training and subsequently increases costs to students.

(6) The rigidity and necessity of the requirements violate the right to freedom of choice.¹

Additional reasons for opposing general foreign-language requirements were given by Charles Grigg, Norma Siegel, Robert Bernreuter, Sherman Ross, Charles Shilling, and others that (1) in the life sciences, English is the primary language of the world; (2) about 88 percent of all professional materials published in psychology is written in English; and (3) in many disciplines the need for a knowledge of foreign languages as a research tool is minimal since much or most research even done overseas is now published in English.²

Decreasing Foreign-Language Requirements for Doctorate Degrees

Several independent studies over the past twenty-five years have shown how foreign-language requirements in specific disciplines have gradually been relaxed or

¹Wiltsey, Doctoral Use of Foreign Languages, p. 35.

eliminated. In 1957, Claude Viens and Philip Wadsworth investigated the foreign-language requirements in 121 universities granting the Ph.D. degree. They found that 97.5 percent had requirements in all departments; 76 percent had institution-wide requirements; and 80 percent required two languages.¹ Five years later, Saul Rosenzweig, Marion Bunch and John Stern reported that all of 681 recipients of Ph.D. degrees in psychology who responded to their inquiry had been required to show a foreign-language proficiency—76 percent in two languages and 24 percent in one language.²

A survey conducted in 1965-66 by Gladys Lund and Nina Herslow for the Modern Language Association reported that 95.6 percent of the schools had foreign-language requirements for doctoral students in all departments and that 66 percent had uniform requirements.³ In 1967 a poll of the graduate deans of the forty-six institutions belonging to the Association of Graduate Schools revealed that 81 percent of the institutions responding had changed their language requirements during the previous ten years. In 47 percent of

¹Viens and Wadsworth, Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements, p. 11.


the universities responding, language requirements had decreased; and in 54 per cent, policies had changed to allow departmental autonomy in establishing foreign-language requirements. In 1969, Philip Harvey reported on foreign-language requirements from 197 of the 287 institutions belonging to the Council of Graduate Schools. Forty-nine percent had uniform requirements for the masters and the doctorate, and 49 percent had departmental autonomy regarding the foreign-language requirements. The same year, a study conducted by Emile Gurstelle and Harold Yuker reported that in nineteen New York colleges and universities, 54 percent had institution-wide foreign-language requirements; 40 percent had autonomous departmental requirements; while 6 percent had no foreign-language requirements at all. In 1971 Neville Robertson and Jack Sistler found that in 136 institutions offering doctoral degrees in education, more than 20 percent of the institutions responding had no foreign-language requirement. About 25 percent required a reading skill in two foreign languages, but one could be


waved. Eight institutions required a reading competency in one language, but a waiver was possible. Twenty percent required reading competency in one language with no waiver possible. In eight institutions, foreign-language requirements were left to individual departments.¹

A 1972 report by Mark DeSantis, Eric Hauber, and Thomas Pearce reported on the foreign-language requirements in 25 percent of the anatomy departments of medical schools in the United States. Of the twenty-eight departments, one required no foreign languages; thirteen required one; five required two; eight required two, with waiver of one possible; while one required one, with waiver possible.² In 1973, a survey conducted by Ronald Wimberly showed that of ninety-seven institutions polled, 51 percent required foreign languages for all doctoral students, 25 percent required foreign languages for only some students, and 24 percent required no foreign languages. Usually, competence in only one language was expected.³


²Mark DeSantis, Eric Hauber, and Thomas L. Pearce, "Foreign Language Requirements for Graduate Students in Anatomy" Journal of Medical Education 47 (April 1972):298.

The first comprehensive study of the foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in the second half of the twentieth century was conducted by Doris Dickson Graves in 1981-82.¹ The Graves study centered around the requirements for the Ph.D. degree, regardless of subject field, and was not concerned about professional degrees or Ph.D. degrees in specific professional disciplines. This no doubt accounts—at least in part—for the great variety of opinions and practices and the apparent lack of consistency reported.

The study noted the diversified practices that had evolved from the traditional late nineteenth century French and German language requirements for the "academic" doctor of philosophy degree, and Graves set out to analyze the attitudes of the deans of graduate schools in American universities toward current attitudes and changes in the doctoral foreign-language requirements. The purpose was "to gather data concerning the persuasions of graduate deans in American colleges and universities which offer the Ph.D. [degree]" on the matter of foreign-language requirements.

¹A previous study of the differences between the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees was written in 1935 by McNulty (John Lawrence McNulty, "A Critical and Interpretive Study of the Requirements of Students of Modern Languages for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree at Graduate Schools and Schools of Education in the United States" [Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1935]).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Data were gathered regarding the deans' judgments about (1) the need for a foreign-language requirement; (2) the number of languages that should be required; (3) the languages that are acceptable for fulfilling the requirement; (4) the alternatives to foreign languages that may be permitted; (5) the agency most appropriate to set and administer the requirement; and other opinions about present and projected future language requirements.¹

In Graves' detailed questionnaire, which included fifty comprehensive questions, each dean was asked to state what he or she considered to be "the ideal policy of a college or university regarding the foreign-language requirements for the Ph.D. [degree]" and to compare it with "the current status of the foreign-language requirement for the Ph.D. [degree]" in his or her own graduate school.² The Ph.D. degree was treated as an entity, and no differentiation in questioning and inquiry was included regarding different subject areas and professional fields.³

The study—which included the responses from 227 graduate school deans and other academic personnel answering the inquiry—showed that more than 88 percent of the respondents had fulfilled foreign-language requirements in

¹Graves, "Foreign Language Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree," pp. 5-6.
²Ibid., pp. 173-180.
³Ibid.
obtaining their own doctorates.\textsuperscript{1} Two thirds (66.4 per cent) had been required to show proficiency in two languages. A little more than half (55 per cent) reported that both French and German had been required, and 24 percent of the remainder stated that they were required to show proficiency in either French or German.\textsuperscript{2} Of 224 respondents who answered this question, 26 (11.6 per cent) reported that they did not have to pass a foreign-language proficiency exam for their doctorate.\textsuperscript{3}

The majority of the respondents (53.6 per cent) were of the opinion that a knowledge of foreign languages should be a requirement in all departments of graduate schools. But they felt that autonomy should be granted to individual departments in determining the specifics of the requirement. According to 45.5 percent of the respondents, departments should determine the number of foreign languages to be required. Most deans felt that one foreign language or one language plus another research skill would be adequate or preferable.\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1}The study does not show what percentage of the doctorates were Ph.D. degrees and what percentage of professional doctorates—such as the Ed.D., D.B.A., Th.D., D.M.E., or others—were involved.

\textsuperscript{2}Graves, "Foreign Language Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree," p. 147.

\textsuperscript{3}No information is available as to the type of doctorate and the professional disciplines of these administrators.

\textsuperscript{4}Graves, "Foreign Language Requirements for the Doctor
The largest percentage of the respondents (42.9 percent) considered the appropriate time for fulfilling the foreign-language requirement to be some point prior to the comprehensive "mastery-of-field" examinations. Interestingly, however, the majority did not find acceptable the method of presenting undergraduate study and undergraduate "credit hours" in fulfilling the requirement. This is directly opposite to established European traditions.

In the opinion of the deans, knowledge of foreign languages have the following advantages:

(1) it is necessary for the well-educated person;
(2) it aids in a student's study program and in the preparation of his or her dissertation; and
(3) it aids in post-doctoral studies and in research.

Doris Grave's study showed that in 1981-82 only 5.2 percent of American graduate schools still required the traditional combination of French and German proficiency for all Ph.D. degrees. A comparison of Graves' findings with those in other studies since 1960 illustrates well the recent development in foreign-language study and requirements in

---

1Ibid., p. 149.
2Ibid., p. 150.
3Ibid., p. 151.
American colleges and universities.

A Comparison

General, university-wide foreign-language requirements showed a sharp decline over the quarter-century immediately preceding the Graves' study. While the 1957 survey of Viens and Wadsworth showed that 76 percent of all institutions granting the Ph.D. degree had uniform university-wide requirements;¹ the 1969 Gurstelle and Yuker report showed 54 percent had such requirements;² and Graves' study showed that only 11.6 percent of the graduate schools still had university-wide foreign-language requirements in 1981-82.³

In 1966, Lund and Herslow found that 95.8 percent of the graduate schools represented in their survey had foreign-language requirements in all departments.⁴ In 1973, Wimberley reported that 51 percent of the sociology departments in his survey required foreign languages for all doctoral students,⁵ and Graves reported that in 1981 only 32

¹Viens and Wadsworth, Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements, pp. 3-12.
²Gurstelle and Yuker, The Prevalence and Value of Language Requirements, p. 5.
⁴Lund and Herslow, Foreign Language and Degree Requirements, pp. 3-12.
percent of the graduate schools surveyed had foreign-language requirements in all departments.\(^1\)

While Viens and Wadsworth in 1957 found that over 80 percent of the institutions surveyed required all students in their Ph.D. degree programs to demonstrate a reading proficiency in two foreign languages,\(^2\) the 1962 survey conducted by Rosenzweig, Bunch, and Stern showed two languages to be required in 76 percent of the institutions.\(^3\) In 1971, Robertson and Sistler reported that this requirement was held in 25.8 percent of American graduate schools in the field of education.\(^4\) According to Graves, by 1982 this requirement was retained in only 5.1 percent of American graduate schools offering the Ph.D. degree.\(^5\)

Over 60 percent of the graduate schools surveyed in 1981-82 by Graves permitted the substitution of other research skills for foreign languages.\(^6\) One third of those

---

\(^1\)Graves, "Foreign Language Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree," p. 156.

\(^2\)Viens and Wadsworth, Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements, p. 8.

\(^3\)Rosenzweig, Bunch, and Stern, "Operation Babel," p. 239.

\(^4\)Robertson and Sistler, The Doctorate in Education, p. 47.

\(^5\)Graves, "Foreign Language Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree," p. 156.

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 157.
institutions surveyed by Admussen in 1967 and by DeSantis, Hauber, and Pearce in 1972 allowed such substitutions, while only about one fourth of the institutions surveyed by Viens and Wadsworth in 1957 allowed substitutions.\(^1\)

Conclusions

As a result of her study, Doris Graves arrived at the following conclusions:

(1) Graduate deans in American colleges and universities offering the Ph.D. favor the retention of a foreign language requirement.

(2) Language requirements advocated by the deans are far more flexible than the requirements of previous decades, allowing more freely for fulfillment with diverse languages and non-language research skills.

(3) The deans do not foresee a return to the rigid traditional requirements but predict instead little change in the current status or a further weakening of the requirement during the next decade.

(4) The chief value of the foreign-language requirement, in the judgments of the deans, is the utility of a knowledge of other languages for research and postdoctoral study. They consider such knowledge also a necessity for the well-educated person.

(5) The deans prefer that departments have considerable autonomy with respect to the requirement--its nature, fulfillment, control and administration. They foresee for the future even greater departmental autonomy than now exists.

(6) The current status of the foreign language requirement


\(^2\)Viens and Wadsworth, Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements, p. 8.
does not differ to a great extent from what the deans would have it be. The requirement is currently a part of the graduate program in most institutions; it is generally quite flexible, and it allows for considerable departmental autonomy and adaptation to the needs of individual students.

Unanswered Questions

The continuous liberalizing trend in American higher education over the past one hundred years to relax foreign-language requirements has been well documented in professional literature. Serious concerns have periodically been expressed within the academic community, but most studies have been more closely engaged in measuring the general evolution of and opinions held about language study and foreign-language requirements than with the reasons why language study and foreign-language competence has drastically deteriorated. Also, recent studies have usually made no attempts at establishing a rationale for and establishing what the requirements ought to be in various professional disciplines.

In order to develop a rationale for foreign-language requirements in professional disciplines, it was felt that it would be useful to investigate more carefully what the current practices actually are in these disciplines and areas of concentration, as contrasted to practices for merely a specific degree such as the Ph.D. degree. Then, it was

\[\text{Graves, "Foreign Language Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree," pp. 159-60.}\]
considered necessary to determine how the needs in different 
disciplines vary. This might furnish a foundation upon which 
useful guidelines for foreign-language study can be 
established.

1984 Foreign Language Requirements for Doctorates 
In Education, Business, Music, and Theology

To determine the current foreign-language requirements 
for doctoral degrees in the fields of education, business, 
music, and theology, an individual personal letter of inquiry 
was sent in January of 1984 to each of the principal admi­
nistrative officers (dean or chairman) of all professional 
schools (colleges; departments) offering doctoral degrees and 
belonging to the national accrediting associations in 
education (NCATE), business (AACSB), music (NASM), and 
theology (ATS).¹

Procedure

The letter requested information about the foreign­
language proficiency requirement for different types of 
doctoral degrees in each school. Inasmuch as the bulletins 
of all these graduate and professional schools were available 
on microfiche in the office of the Andrews University

¹No questionnaire, as such, was used; and no indication 
was given that the information to be obtained would be used 
for a doctoral dissertation. The letters were "word-proces­
sed" on the Andrews University Sigma 6 computer, and no xerox 
or other duplicating process was involved. The letters were 
run with a Courier 72 print wheel on a Diabolo printer in the 
Academic Computing Center, and all looked as if they were in­
dividually typed.
Director of Admissions, the letter merely asked the deans and chairmen to refer to their language requirements in their own bulletins. However, since language requirements and other departmental requirements often are outlined in greater detail in departmental handbooks or on information sheets, the deans and chairmen were also asked to refer to such informational materials. The letter indicated a special interest in getting to know how foreign-language proficiency requirements differ with each type of doctoral degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., D.B.A., D.M.E., D.M.A., Mus.D., Th.D., etc.) and how they differ in different areas of study or concentration within any one professional discipline. A copy of the letter sent to the deans and chairmen of schools (colleges) and departments of music appears in appendix G.

In music, the accredited institutions offering doctorates in music, their addresses, the specific degrees and subject areas in which doctorate degrees were offered, and the name of the principal administrative officer of each administrative unit offering doctoral degrees (school, college, or department) was obtained from the "List and Classification of Institutional Members of the National Association of Schools of Music" in the NASM Directory 1983.¹ In education, business, and theology, the

information needed was obtained in a similar manner.¹

The Responses

The responses from the administrative officers in schools and departments of education, business, music, and theology were excellent. No "follow-up" letters were sent to those administrators who did not respond, but the number of those who did not reply was relatively small. In music, administrators in 48 of 52 institutions offering doctoral degrees sent a personal letter or a personal note explaining their foreign-language requirements for the doctorate. In education, 106 administrators out of 148 sent catalogues and/or personal letters or notes; in business, 51 administrators out of 78 sent letters or notes; and in theology, 30 administrators out of 39 sent letters or notes with explanations.² In addition, a large number of administrators sent copies of their bulletins, student handbooks, departmental guidelines, or xerox copies of

¹When some of the information was not available through the accrediting association, supplemental information was obtained from Peterson's Guide.

²See Bibliography under "Personal Letters and Correspondence from Administrators Explaining Doctoral Foreign Language Requirements in their Schools." A number of the deans and chairmen referred the letter of inquiry to assistant administrators who were responsible for administering the foreign-language requirements. A total of 235 personal letters or notes of explanation were received. Information on the foreign-language requirements in additional schools was obtained directly from institutional bulletins.
relevant pages from their curriculum policy statements and other pertinent materials.

Current Requirements

As could be expected, the foreign-language requirements in the four professional disciplines of education, business, music, and theology varied greatly. In music and theology, foreign-language requirements were still prominent—especially in some areas of specialization. In education, a strong trend to emphasize other research tools or "research languages" was discerned, while in business, foreign-language requirements were almost non-existent.¹

Education. As seen in the tabulation in appendix A, there is no longer a distinct difference between the Ph.D. degree and the Ed.D. degree as far as doctoral foreign-language requirements are concerned. In 1965, John W. Ashton explained that the principal difference between the Ph.D. degree and the Ed.D. degree in education was seen primarily in the difference between foreign-language requirements for the two degrees. While the Ed.D. degree had largely discontinued foreign-language requirements, the Ph.D. degree in education was then still retaining these requirements.² This situation no longer exists. Only in four schools—in the Claremont Graduate School Department of

¹See appendices A-D.

Education; the Catholic University Departments of Education, and Religion and Religious Education; the Mississippi State University College of Education; and the Saint Louis University Department of Education—are two foreign languages still required for the Ph.D. degree. In six other institutions one foreign language is required. In most others, one or two foreign languages may be used as optional research tools, while in twenty-eight other institutions, administrators stated specifically that they had "no foreign language requirements" for the Ph.D. degree in education.¹

As regarding the Ed.D. degree, no institution listed a foreign language as a requirement, but most institutions included a foreign language among their research tool options. Almost without exception, the approval of research tools, including foreign languages, was left up to the department through the student's doctoral committee. Approved optional research tools included computer science (computer language(s), computer knowledge, computer research, computer proficiency), statistics, educational research methodology, historical methods (documentary methods), "research techniques," and quantitative and qualitative methodology.

A representative statement of policy is found in the requirements of Fordham University Graduate School of Education at Lincoln Center:

¹See appendix A.
Language and Statistics Requirement

Before taking the comprehensive examinations, Ph.D. candidates must show competence in any two of the following:

1. A reading knowledge of a modern foreign language (usually French, German or Spanish).

2. Successful completion of one of the following three courses offered in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at the Rose Hill campus:
   - FR 50900 French for Reading (0 credits)
   - GE 50900 German for Reading (0 credits)
   - SP 50900 Spanish for Reading (0 credits)


5. Computer applications to research.

Language examinations are given each semester. This includes the Summer session. Competency in statistics is usually evidenced by a passing grade in an advanced statistics course. Competency in computer language or computer applications to research is usually evidenced by a passing grade in one of several available computer courses. A student who desires to take the language examination in the modern languages mentioned above rather than taking an advanced course in statistics or computer language should apply to the Director of Graduate Studies in writing by the date announced for application for language examinations, indicated in the calendar in the school Bulletin. A student who has failed in a language examination may apply to the Director of Graduate Studies for permission to take another examination. The fee for the language examination must be paid to the Bursar prior to the examination, and the receipt must be presented to the proctor on the day of the examination.

A candidate for the Ed.D. should consult the specific program description for statistics requirements.¹

Johnathan P. Sher, associate dean of the North Carolina State University School of Education, explained in a personal letter what appears to be a typical practice in education:

In practice, none of the seven departments with the School of Education (i.e., Adult and Community College Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership and Program Evaluation, Counselor Education, Occupational Education, Math and Science Education and Psychology) require doctoral candidates to meet any foreign language requirements. Some faculty might argue that the sequence of courses in statistics—or the forthcoming requirement of "computer literacy"—constitute an equivalent to the foreign language competency some other universities demand of their doctoral students. As you might expect, other faculty would disagree. However, the whole issue is not one often raised by either faculty or students.

Business. In business, the two principal doctoral degrees offered are the Ph.D. and the D.B.A. degrees. There appears to be no discernible difference between the two degrees, and foreign languages as research tools—apparently rather uncommon—are approved on the departmental level.

Most administrators wrote and explained simply that "we do not have a foreign-language requirement."

Music. A completely different situation regarding foreign-language requirements was found in music. Extensive and clearly defined requirements were the rule, rather than the exception. These requirements were closely linked to specific areas of professional specialization, but they were

1Jonathan P. Sher to A. R. Holman, February 8, 1984.
usually listed as institutional requirements and they were to be uniformly enforced except under exceptional circumstances.

The following doctoral degrees were offered: the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree, the Doctor of Musical Arts (D.M.A.) degree, the Doctor of Arts (D.A.) degree, the Doctor of Music (D.Mus. or Mus.D.) degree, the Doctor of Music Education (D.M.E. or D.Mus.Ed.) degree, and the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree. They were awarded in many fields of specialization, such as:

Musicology/Music History and Literature (Ph.D.)

Music Theory (Ph.D., D.M.A.)

Music Theory/Composition (Ph.D., D.M.A.)

Ethnomusicology/Folk Music Research (Ph.D.)


  piano
  organ
  "keyboard"
  "winds"
  "woodwinds"
  clarinet
  trumpet
  "strings"
  violin
  viola
  cello
  vocal performance

Music Literature and Performance (Mus.D., D.M.A.)
  piano
  organ
  strings
  woodwinds
  voice
  "instrumental music"
  "choral music"
  etc.
Music Literature and Pedagogy (Mus.D., D.M.A.)
- piano
- brass
- voice

Applied Music, Theory, and Literature (Ph.D.)
Vocal Pedagogy and Performance (D.M.A.)
Piano Pedagogy (D.M.A.)
Fine Arts (Ph.D.)

In the review of the foreign-language requirements in music one finds a few general trends emerging: (a) in the larger schools of music, offering a large number of specializations, the foreign-language requirements vary greatly from one field of specialization to another; (2) the requirements are usually quite specific for each field of specialization; (3) foreign-language requirements are designed to facilitate the development of professional competence within each field of specialization; (4) when there is little practical need and demand for the use of foreign languages within a field, there are no requirements, and (5) foreign-language requirements can be added to or subtracted from general requirements in any field whenever there is a demonstrable need or justification to do so. In general, one finds that fields of concentration emphasizing research and scholarly involvement in the music of different national or ethnic origins require the most broad linguistic competence.

In musicology and in music history and literature, for
example, there is almost without exception a standard requirement of two foreign languages. The languages usually are German and French. German is needed for the reading of the large body of German scholarly literature written in musicology, music history and literature, and music theory; and it is essential for the understanding of German opera and other German vocal and instrumental literature. French is needed for French music history and literature and French contributions to music scholarship. However, Italian is also important, particularly for the study of Italian opera and other Italian vocal literature; and Latin is essential for the study of church music and the reading of Mediaeval, Renaissance, and later historical and theoretical treatises and other documentary works.

Thirty-one of the fifty-two professional schools and departments investigated offer the doctorate in musicology. Of these, eleven specifically require a proficiency in German and French and nine require a proficiency in German plus another foreign language. A small number of universities specifically require more than two foreign languages. Columbia University requires German, French, Italian, and Latin; Brigham Young University requires German, French, and Latin; the State University of New York at Buffalo requires German and French plus Latin or Italian; and the University

1Not all the "prestige music schools" are members of NASM. Harvard, Princeton, and Columbia are prominent "non-members."
of Iowa requires German, French, and one other foreign language. Other universities, such as Michigan State University, merely state that foreign-language requirements "vary with program emphasis." Doctoral-degree requirements in ethnomusicology show a similar emphasis on foreign-language proficiency; but there is more flexibility as to the specific languages involved, allowing for different national and ethnic specializations.

In music theory, also, two foreign languages are most commonly required. Of the twenty-four institutions offering doctorates in theory, eight require German and French; seven require German plus another foreign language; two require two foreign languages, subject to approval; one requires German only; one requires one foreign language plus another tool, which may be a foreign language; and the five others have no foreign-language specifications or state that requirements vary with degree emphasis.

Other degrees in music, such as the D.M.A., D.Mus., D.A., and D.M.E. degrees, show much less uniformity as far as foreign-language requirements are concerned. There is a certain amount of "vague conformity" within specific areas of subject emphasis, however.

In applied music/performance, foreign-language requirements are high in the area of vocal performance and choral conducting. In seventeen institutions listing foreign-language requirements specifically in vocal
performance, six specify a requirement of three foreign languages (German, French, and Italian; French and German and one optional language; or three languages); seven require two foreign languages; one requires one foreign language; while the rest do not give specific language requirements. In choral music and choral conducting, most of the institutions require one or two foreign languages. In a number of institutions the requirements are not stated specifically.

In other areas of applied music and performance, however, language requirements are less stringent. In piano, for example, only one university—Catholic University of America—requires three foreign languages; in two universities two foreign languages are required; while in ten universities, one foreign language (French or German, German plus another language, or one foreign language) is required. In nineteen institutions, foreign-language requirements are not specified or it is indicated that they "vary with programs"; but in three institutions there are "no foreign-language requirements" for doctorates in piano or keyboard instruments. In all instances, the performance degrees are the D.M.A. or Mus.D. degrees. In seven of the institutions, foreign-language proficiency requirements for performance degrees are part of a general department-wide or degree-wide (D.M.A.) requirement which does not vary from one performance area to another.¹

¹See appendix C.
In music education, there are no foreign-language requirements for the Ed.D. and D.M.E. degrees, but foreign languages may be used as optional tools. In eighteen schools the Ph.D. degree and in six schools the D.M.A. degree is offered in music education. Little difference is seen between these two degrees, as both degrees are split approximately evenly between requiring foreign languages and not requiring foreign languages. The difference between the "academic" Ph.D. degree and the "professional" doctorates appears to be minimal as far as foreign languages are concerned. When a specific subject area is offered as an option under two different degrees—for example, the Ph.D. and D.M.A.—most often the difference in foreign-language requirements is seen between subject areas rather than between degrees.

In composition, also, there are no general trends regarding foreign-language requirements. In eight universities offering the Ph.D. degree, three require two languages, two require one language, and three make a language requirement optional. In twenty-four universities offering the D.M.A. degree, one requires three languages, two require two languages, six require one language, twelve leave

---

1Nine schools offer the Ed.D. degree and 4 schools offer the D.M.E. degree in music education.
2See appendix C.
the use of languages optional, and three have no foreign-language requirement.

Only twelve degree programs are offered in conducting. Of these, four lead to the Mus.D. degree and eight to the D.M.A. degree. One each requires two foreign languages; in one school the D.M.A. degree calls for one foreign language; while in nine schools the foreign-language requirement "varies" or is optional.

Theology. In theology—as in music—the foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees vary considerably according to the type of degree and the program content. Also in theology there is a distinct difference between "scholarly" degrees and "applied" or "practical" degrees. The degrees offered are the Doctor of Philosophy degree (Ph.D.), the Doctor of Theology degree (Th.D.), the Doctor of Sacred Theology and Doctor of Science in Theology degrees (S.T.D.), the Doctor of Missions degree (D.Miss.), and the Doctor of Ministry degree (D.Min.).

While the Th.D. and Ph.D. degrees represent scholarly research endeavor, the D.Min. and D.Miss. degrees supposedly prepare for practical pastoral competence.

Of the twenty-seven theological seminaries and schools studied, offering the D.Min. degree, only three indicate a foreign-language requirement. A representative statement of

\[1\] Letters of inquiry were not sent to the theological schools which offered no doctorate degree other than the D.Min. degree.
requirements is given by Catholic University of America: "Latin and other foreign languages [are required] as for masters' degrees." It is assumed that the foreign-language proficiency needed is obtained on the undergraduate or masters' degree level. The six schools offering the S.T.D. degree gave no indication of a specific doctoral foreign-language requirement. The only school offering the D.Miss. degree also had no such requirement; and the four schools offering the Ed.D. degree in religious education did not have specific doctoral foreign-language requirements.

For the Th.D. and the Ph.D. degrees in theology, foreign-language requirements were individualized according to program emphasis. No distinct difference in language requirements was seen between the two degrees. The Th.D. degree was offered in fifteen schools and the Ph.D. degree was offered in twenty-seven schools.

For the Th.D. degree, one school indicated a requirement of four foreign languages, one indicated three, two indicated two, and one indicated one foreign-language required, while ten schools indicated the requirement was "variable" or a requirement was not specifically given. For the Ph.D. degree, one school indicated a requirement of five foreign languages, four indicated four, nine indicated two, and two indicated one foreign language required, while ten schools indicated the requirement was variable or it was not specifically given.
The difference between foreign-language requirements indicated in the theological school bulletins and in the individual letters of explanation may be somewhat illusionary, however, as they reflect only the differences in specific requirements and the specific tests administered to all students within a program. They do not necessarily address and do not always incorporate the language proficiency which a doctoral student was expected to have obtained or may somehow have obtained before entering his doctoral studies.

In many theological schools the foreign-language requirements for the Th.D. and the Ph.D. degrees were the same. In almost one-half of the schools offering the Ph.D. degree (12 out of 27), however, German and French were specifically listed as a requirement. The reason for singling out German and French was probably that these modern languages were not necessarily required on the undergraduate level or for the M.Div. degree in theology; and the specific statements were emphasizing that these languages were required for doctoral candidates in addition to whatever languages were required and studied in prerequisite degree programs leading up to the doctoral curriculum.

Several theological schools were very specific as to the exact languages needed in their degree programs, and they often gave a general rationale for their requirements. In a personal letter, John T. Ford, of the Department of Theology...
of the Catholic University School of Religious Studies explained:

In regard to the doctoral programs, the Ph.D. and S.T.D., as academic doctorates, require demonstration of the following languages: Latin, biblical Greek, French and German; in specific instances (especially where the student's dissertation so indicates), a language other than French or German might be approved. The same level of basic proficiency is required of all candidates, regardless of their area of specialty. Obviously, students in biblical studies would have a better command of Greek, just as those in contemporary theology might have a better command of German. However, the same basic proficiency in all four languages must be demonstrated by all academic doctoral students.

The D.Min., as a pastoral degree, does not carry a specific language requirement as such. In fact, since admission to the D.Min. presupposes a master's degree, at least those students who did their master's work here would have fulfilled the basic proficiency in Latin and possibly in one modern language as well.¹

The foreign-language requirements at Concordia Seminary are carefully explained by Wayne E. Schmidt, acting director of the School for Graduate Studies:

The graduate degrees at Concordia Seminary which require students to demonstrate proficiency in foreign languages are the S.T.M. and Th.D. degrees. These degrees are based, of course, on the M.Div. degree at Concordia which requires the use of both Biblical Greek and Biblical Hebrew. Students in the S.T.M. program must demonstrate proficiency in a modern foreign language in addition to their ability to use Greek and Hebrew. The modern language is usually German, although that specific modern language is required only for majors in Exegetical Theology. Other modern languages may be used in other departments.

Th.D. students are required to demonstrate proficiency in Latin and two modern foreign languages in

addition to proficiency in Greek and Hebrew.

The requirements for the demonstration of proficiency are the same in both degree programs. Students must be able to read and translate into the English language theological literature written in the foreign tongue. We have enclosed for your reference a brief outline of what we require in the Latin and German courses which we offer to students who are seeking to prepare themselves for the level of proficiency which we require in those languages.1

The foreign-language requirements at Princeton Theological Seminary are explained in their Doctor of Philosophy Catalogue Supplement for 1983-84:

Modern Languages. All candidates must demonstrate a reading knowledge of German and one other modern foreign language, which in the case of Church History must be French, and in the other fields will ordinarily be French. Petitions may be submitted to the relevant department in these other fields for the substitution of another language than French (excluding English or the candidate's native language). In the case of Mission and Ecumenics, and in all fields of Practical Theology, such a substitution may be petitioned for either German or French. They will be judged according to the relevance of the language requested to the candidate's field of research, plan of study, and career intentions. Such petitions must be recommended by the Department to the Ph.D. Studies Committee for final approval. It is strongly recommended that candidates enter the program with a reading knowledge of both languages. In any case, competence in at least one, in the case of Biblical Studies German, must be established before matriculation as a condition of registration for courses. Similarly, competence in the second modern language must be demonstrated as a prerequisite of registration for the second year of residence.

Tests in reading competence (the Graduate School Foreign Language Test) will be conducted by the Seminary in September, November, January and May. The May test may be taken in absentia by newly admitted candidates. In each case, candidates are to register through the Academic Dean's office, Princeton Seminary. The fee is

1Wayne E. Schmidt to A. R. Holman, 7 February 1984, personal.
$10.00 and is payable at registration to Princeton Theological Seminary.

The level of competence required may be roughly indicated as that to be expected from satisfactory completion of second year college study of the language within two years of matriculation at seminary, or a 550 score on the Graduate School Foreign Language Test in German and a 560 score on the GSFLT in French.

In lieu of the GSFLT, the Seminary accepts a passing grade in the Princeton University graduate language courses given during the summer. Information on these courses is available from the office of the Academic Dean. Other certifications are acceptable only under exceptional circumstances.

Other Languages. In addition, several of the fields require their Ph.D. candidates to demonstrate command of other languages, as set forth below. Languages marked with an asterisk (*) must be mastered before matriculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Old Testament</td>
<td>♦Hebrew, *Greek, Ugaritic and Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) New Testament</td>
<td>♦Hebrew, *Greek, and one of the following: Syriac, Latin, or Coptic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Theology and Communication and Preaching</td>
<td>*Hebrew and *Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Early Church History</td>
<td>Greek and Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Christian Doctrine</td>
<td>Greek and Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Medieval Church History</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation Church History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) In special areas of Church History and Old Testament, other languages may be required as indicated by the subject matter of the field.²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is necessary for the entering doctoral candidate to demonstrate a working knowledge of at least one of the required modern languages, German in the case of Biblical Studies, prior to matriculation either by the Princeton Theological Seminary May test in absentia or at the


²Ibid., p. 6.
latest by the test in early September. Candidates who do not demonstrate satisfactory competence by the opening of term may register only for language courses, financial aid is normally not available, and the term will not count for academic residence. If the language test is not passed in November or January before the beginning of the second term, the candidate's program will be terminated.

In similar fashion the second language test should be passed as early as possible and at the latest in September prior to the opening of the second year of residence, as a condition of registration. Candidates who have not passed the test may not register for other than language courses. Candidates who are just beginning their second language at matriculation are advised to enroll in a language course at Princeton University or elsewhere in their first term of residence.¹

In a personal letter of 23 January 1984, Pat Stockage, secretary to the academic dean of Union Theological Seminary, explained:

Enclosed is the statement of language requirements from the 1983-84 catalog for Union Ph.D. students. Exams in French, German, and Spanish are administered three times a year to students in all degree programs required to pass language exams except for doctoral students in the Biblical Field. Students have the option of passing either a translation exam or the GSFLT. The translation exam (a sample of which is attached) is given in September and April and the GSFLT in February.

The Biblical Field administers their own language exams to doctoral students. I am enclosing two general information booklets, 1) The Ph.D. degree in Old Testament at UTS and 2) The Ph.D. Program in New Testament at UTS and The Ph.D. Degree in the Field of Religion with Specialization in the Literature of the New Testament, which outline the requirements in detail.²

¹Ibid.

²Pat Stockage to A. R. Holman, 23 January 1984, personal.
The specific foreign-language requirements for the Ph.D. degree in different areas are stated as follows:

Each candidate must demonstrate proficiency in reading scholarly materials in two modern languages other than English, normally French and German. Except in the Biblical Field, another modern language may be substituted for German or French if it is more useful for scholarly research in the student's area of special study. (If such substitution is planned, it must be noted in the faculty advisor's report to the Academic Dean on the matriculation conference.) The language requirements can be met by passing qualifying examinations administered by the Seminary on dates stated in the academic calendar or by achieving scores in the fiftieth percentile or above on the Graduate School Foreign Language Test (GSFLT) prepared by the Educational Testing Service.

The student is expected to pass the qualifying examination in one of the modern languages in September of the first year in the program (a reading knowledge of either French or German is expected prior to entrance into the program). The qualifying examination in the remaining modern language must be passed at the beginning of the second year in the program. Students unable to do this will be advised to reduce their course load in order to concentrate study in French and German so that both examinations in the modern languages can be passed no later than the end of the second year in the program. Candidates are not permitted to write field examinations until they have passed qualifying examinations in two modern languages.

Some candidates will also be required to demonstrate proficiency in reading other languages beside French and German which will be necessary for their research, notably ancient and classical languages in which biblical and ecclesiastical texts are written. These special language requirements and the means by which they may be satisfied will be specified at the candidate's matriculation conference. A student's faculty advisor will inform the Academic Dean when special language requirements have been completed.

All Ph.D. students in the Biblical Field are required to pass examinations testing their ability to

---

1Union Theological Seminary Catalogue 1983-84, p. 57.
read and translate German and French. It is now generally accepted as a prerequisite to admission to doctoral study in Bible at Union that the student will have acquired a reading knowledge of either German or French (if not both) prior to matriculation, and hence will be ready to try to pass one of the modern language tests at the beginning of the first semester of graduate study. Students unable to do this will be advised to reduce their course load during the first year to make room for the study of German or French. It is expected that both modern language tests will have been passed no later than the end of the second year of graduate study so that students can participate in advanced graduate seminars presupposing the use of these languages.

(1) The initial exam given in German and French is the standard Graduate School Foreign Language Test (GSFLT) in arts and humanities. A passing score on this exam is equivalent to at least the fiftieth percentile of scores achieved by nationwide testing of graduate students. Copies of "A Description of the GSFLT" are on file in the Biblical Field Office (Room 701 in the Tower of the main administration building) so that it may be consulted before the exam is taken. While the Biblical Faculty recognizes that the GSFLT does not specifically test one's ability to read highly technical articles in biblical studies, they concur that proficiency in basic matters of grammar and syntax on the GSFLT confirms the skills requisite for the reading knowledge desired.

(2) Should you fail to pass the GSFLT on the initial try, a second, and if necessary, a third test may be taken in the form of a departmental exam, consisting of two excerpts of moderate length from books or articles chosen by one of the members of the Biblical Faculty. On this exam, you will be given two hours in which to translate as much of these excerpts as possible, using a dictionary. The results will be read and approved by at least two professors from the Field. In the extraordinary circumstance that neither of these tests are passed, a fourth exam is allowed, but for this purpose the GSFLT must again be taken and passed.

(3) Both the GSFLT and departmental examinations in German and French are given twice a year, first in the fall during the registration period, and then again in the spring during exam week at the end of the second semester. If you wish to be examined in both languages the same examination period, special arrangements can be made for doing this. No later than one week before the exams are scheduled to be given, you should give
notice to the Biblical Field Secretary as to which exam(s) you will be taking.

(4) No student will be allowed to take any of the five required Field Examinations (to be described below) before passing both modern language tests.

All Ph.D. students in Old Testament are required to have a grammatical and reading knowledge of Biblical Aramaic and one other Semitic language (preferably Ugaritic, Accadian, or Arabic), as well as of Hellenistic Greek (for work with the Septuagint in particular). No formal tests are given on these languages outside the courses which offer them to satisfy this part of the language requirements of the Ph.D. in Old Testament.

Ph.D. students in Old Testament are also required to demonstrate their knowledge of Biblical Hebrew through a special oral and written examination which must be taken and passed before any of the Field Examinations can be taken.

(1) The oral exam presupposes that you can read the Hebrew text accurately and fluently, that you can translate the text at sight (assuming a vocabulary mastery of all words occurring at least 100 or more times in the Hebrew Bible), and that you can identify all grammatical forms and constructions that one finds covered in any elementary Hebrew grammar. Help in preparing for the oral exam is provided through a course in Intermediate Hebrew Reading and Grammar, and the course, Rapid Reading of the Hebrew Bible, in addition to your own private study. The oral exam is taken before the written exam.

(2) The written exam presupposes a knowledge of the historical development of Hebrew, and the kind of technical expertise and information necessary for teaching the language. In preparing for this exam, you will be aided by enrolling in the two courses in Advanced Hebrew Grammar (which may be taken for R-credit rather than E-credit). The written exam is a closed book exam, except for the allowed use of the the Hebrew Bible and a comprehensive Hebrew lexicon with etymological listings. You are allowed two days in which to write and complete the exam.

---

Union Theological Seminary, "The Ph.D. Degree in Old Testament at Union Theological Seminary in New York City" (Typewritten), pp. 2-4.
The New Testament Department interprets [the special matriculation conference and examinations in appropriate languages] in the following manner:

If the student shows marked weakness in the Bible matriculation examination, at the time of the special matriculation conference arrangements will be made for an oral examination to be given to the student some time later in the fall semester to determine whether or not he should be encouraged to pursue studies in New Testament at the doctoral level.

A person engaged in New Testament research must be able directly to converse with the New Testament authors, and other relevant witnesses. For this reason thorough linguistic and methodological skills are necessary.

Greek: The goals of the Greek program are 1) to enable students to take maximum advantage of courses; 2) to enrich and facilitate the students' preparation for field exams by enabling them to read numerous primary sources in Greek; 3) to cause them, prior to dissertation work, to be reasonably relaxed and "at home" in Hellenistic Greek. Courses are offered in both intermediate and advanced levels, emphasizing syntactical analysis, morphology, and rapid sight reading. As the courses in Greek are designed to accomplish the three goals stated above, the field examination in Hellenistic Greek (see below) should be viewed as a step in the Greek program, rather than as an isolated and threatening trial.

Coptic. Instruction in this language is provided from time to time.

Hebrew. Here the goals are similar, though less ambitious. Students need that level of competence that will enable them to use the Old Testament and Jewish sources without undue expenditure of time, while achieving a level of accuracy that will enable them to have and defend their own scientific opinions. To this end courses in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew are offered by the Old Testament Faculty, and Professor Landes provides a Hebrew examination specifically designed for New Testament doctoral students. It is recommended that students confer with Professor Landes early in the first year of residence, and that they take the Hebrew
exam at the end of that year or by December of the second year.

**Aramaic.** Students must be able to evaluate the work of specialists who advance theses relating to Aramaic traditions behind the Gospels and be able to employ Jewish sources written, in whole or in part, in Aramaic. Hence a course in Biblical Aramaic is offered every second year; successful completion of this course is required. Courses in advanced Aramaic are offered in certain years.

**Latin etc.** Although there is no exam in Latin, students must have an acquaintance with that language sufficient to carry out necessary textual criticism. In some cases the dissertation topic may require competence in other ancient languages.

**German, French.** All Ph.D. students in the Biblical Field must be able to consult the works of scholars writing in French and German. Hence they are required to pass an examination testing their ability to translate with a dictionary selected passages from books or articles in German and French. These texts are set and read by Faculty from the Biblical Field. They are normally given twice a year—on an afternoon during registration for the fall and spring semesters; a third exam time in the late spring is available by special arrangement. It is expected that each student will have acquired a reading knowledge of either German or French (if not both) before matriculation, and hence will be ready to try to pass one of the modern language texts at the beginning of the first semester of graduate study. If you are unable to do this, you will be advised to reduce your course load during the first year to make room for the study of German and/or French. It is expected that these modern language tests will have been passed no later than the end of the first school year of graduate study, so that you can participate in advanced graduate seminars presupposing knowledge of these languages.

**Tannaitic Literature.** Doctoral students in New Testament must be able to consult pertinent strains of rabbinic tradition in an intelligent, critical, and empathetic manner. To this end a course is regularly offered in Tannaitic Literature; successful completion of this course is
Summary

While the study of foreign languages in the United States decreased drastically between 1960 and 1984, and while the traditional proficiency requirements in German and French were dropped for Ph.D. degrees and professional degrees in many universities, foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees did not disappear. They merely became more closely connected with specific academic subject areas and programs in which foreign languages are demonstrably needed. In many areas the old language requirements were dropped to be replaced by other tools or non-linguistic "languages" needed to master a subject area.

In disciplines in which foreign languages are utilitarian or essential for research and other scholarly activities—such as in theology and musicological research—foreign-language requirements remained strong. In many ways, the rationale for foreign-language study did not change drastically. In the classical curriculum, foreign languages were essential tools for the understanding of classical philosophy and literature—the primary subjects within early nineteenth-century academic life. Foreign languages are

---

1Union Theological Seminary, "The Ph.D. Program in New Testament at Union Theological Seminary and The Ph.D. Degree in the Field of Religion with Specialization in the Literature of the New Testament at Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary in New York City" (Typewritten), pp. 3-4.
still stressed in reputable educational institutions when needed for professional competence. In disciplines that are dominated by new technology, new technical languages will continue to replace the old tools. According to John Naisbitt, "To be really successful, you will have to be trilingual: fluent in English, Spanish, and computer." The key influential concept in the American academic linguistic evolution is "relevance." The need for "linguistic tools" remains—but in many areas the languages have changed.

CHAPTER VI

A RATIONALE FOR FOREIGN-LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR DOCTORAL DEGREES IN SELECTED PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINES

Introduction

In this chapter, the rationale with notes developed in this study is presented and described. The basis for the rationale is outlined, the process and the details of its validation are explained and the comments and suggestions by the members of the panel of evaluators are summarized.

The Basis for the Rationale

The rationale for foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines in American educational institutions was developed on the basis of:

(1) Concepts gathered from general historical literature and documentary materials regarding the use of foreign languages in higher education in America over the past century and a half. Emphasis was placed on discerning the purpose for and the rationale behind foreign-language requirements and possible changes in rationale accompanying changing attitudes to and practices in foreign-language study. (2) Data gathered from a number of statistical studies of twentieth-
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century trends in foreign-language study in the United States. (3) Data gathered from public commissions and committees which within the past decade have studied current trends and made recommendations for future action. (4) Ideas gathered from letters and notes from 235 deans, chairmen, and other administrators connected with doctoral foreign-language requirements, to whom personal letters of inquiry were sent in January of 1984.¹

In order to obtain a comprehensive view of the need for foreign languages in American doctoral programs, the curricular requirements were traced. Particularly useful was the study of language requirements in the catalogues in representative colleges and universities. Many university publications—catalogues and other informational materials—not only stated the specific foreign-language requirements in the individual educational institutions but also the purpose for, the function of, and the administration of such requirements.

The study of the general historical literature was useful for obtaining a concept of the factors involved in changing the attitudes to and the practices in foreign-language study in America—factors which made American foreign-language study and involvement different from that in most other parts of the world.

¹See p. 154. Of a total of 307 inquiries sent, administrators in 235 institutions (schools, colleges) sent replies.
While most of the statistical studies of American twentieth-century foreign-language requirements and practices did not address the issue of rationale or changes in the rationale behind changing requirements, they measured reasonably accurately the gradual and continuous evolution in foreign-language requirements. The uniqueness of this evolution can be seen as American foreign-language developments are compared with those of other countries.

The detailed explanations given by ninety-seven of the 235 college and university administrators who answered the initial inquiry—together with excerpts from their current departmental handbooks, student guides, academic program outlines, and general bulletins—were especially helpful in understanding the present situation. Often, this literature not only described which foreign languages were required but also why foreign languages and other tools were required. It became evident that even though requirements have changed drastically over the past century and a half, the change in rationale behind the requirements may not be equally substantial.

Validation of the Rationale

The original version of the rationale for foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees presented in this chapter was first given to seven local university administrators and professors in the fields of education, business, music, theology, and modern languages for their
preliminary evaluation and comments. It was considered important to obtain the reaction to the proposed rationale by professionals who had not yet read the rest of the dissertation. The written replies and some of the extensive oral elaborations were very helpful, giving greater insight into the special foreign-language needs and concerns within the disciplines under investigation. The rationale was slightly modified as a result of these comments.

The modified rationale was then sent to a panel of forty evaluators randomly selected from a total of 307 deans,\(^1\) chairmen, other administrators, and professors associated with the administration of foreign-language requirements in doctoral degree-granting institutions. There were ten evaluators each in the fields of education, business, music, and theology.\(^2\) By 20 January 1985, a total of nineteen persons had replied to the inquiry regarding the completed rationale—four in education, four in business, six in music, and five in theology. In most cases, individuals who had not

---

\(^1\)See footnote, p. 182.

\(^2\)It was found that several of the schools (colleges, departments) listed by the respective accrediting associations did no longer offer the doctoral degree(s) for which they were accredited. These schools were not included in the randomization process. Also, several institutions had had a change in personnel, or the principal administrator had sent the letter of inquiry to some other administrator more closely associated with the administration of foreign-language requirements for reply. In such situations, in the randomly selected institutions, the individuals answering the first inquiry were selected to represent the institutions as evaluators. A list of the nineteen administrators evaluating the rationale is found in appendix J.
answered the initial inquiry (January 1984) about the foreign-language requirements in their institutions also failed to reply when they were randomly selected as evaluators.

The rationale, as sent to the randomly selected administrators for evaluation, was made into a little "booklet," with a cover letter inviting the evaluators to indicate "strengths" and "weaknesses" in the margin beside each of the numbered sections of the rationale.¹ The manner of form used in evaluating the rationale by the different individuals replying to the inquiry differed considerably from one administrator to another, however. Three evaluators returned the rationale as sent to them without making any comments whatever;² five did not mark the rationale but sent personal letters commenting on the

¹See the cover letter, appendix I; and the rationale as sent to the evaluators, appendix K. The rationale is three parts (1. Preamble; 2. Main Body of the Rationale; and 3. Notes on the Rationale).

²These individuals have not been included in the list of evaluators in appendix J. One of the three returned the rationale with the following form letter:

"Dear _____________,

"Please forgive the impersonal nature of this response. Although I would like to assist you in your project, the frequency of such requests coupled with the increased workload of this office has necessitated a decision to return all such projects with a polite refusal.

"I wish you success with the project and regret that my perceptions will not be included.

"Sincerely,"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
rationale and on the foreign-language situation in their own schools and disciplines (1 education; 1 business; 3 theology); two sent a cover letter and also wrote a set of general comments in front of the rationale, as well as specific comments in the margin beside the numbered items in the document itself (1 business; 1 theology); three sent general comments only (1 business; 1 music; 1 theology); four sent a combination of general and specific comments (2 education; 1 business; 1 music); and two sent specific comments in the margin only (2 music). See Figure 13.

1Most of the evaluators who made individualized comments in the margin commented on the relationship between an item in the rationale and the corresponding practice in their own institution or discipline.
Fig. 13. Table of the Nature of Evaluators' Replies.

The narrative responses and the individual comments, intended to support or improve the proposed rationale, were important to the understanding of the usefulness—within the four professional disciplines under investigation—of the
concepts presented in the rationale. The letters and the general responses are quoted in the following paragraphs. The respondents are not identified in order to maintain the privacy of the selected panel of experts.¹

Letters and General Comments²

***The material which you have sent to Dr. _______ has been passed on to me as the recently installed _______ at _______. I have received with great interest the materials that you sent and am pleased to return them as you have requested. I am keeping a copy of them, if I may. In fact, I am duplicating them for members of our Graduate Committees so that they will be able to understand that the language guidelines in degrees of higher education are under review and there are some positive insights which we are able to point out. I am especially grateful for the insistence that language studies should precede graduate work in every case.

Thank you for your concerted effort on behalf of all of us in quality education. In the future if you would be so kind as to address materials concerning the graduate program to my office, I would appreciate it and be pleased to respond to them.

***I have read the rationale with interest and profit. In general it does describe the situation and practices of our doctoral program. The general requirement for all of our programs is for a reading competence in two modern foreign languages, most commonly French and German in the historical, philosophical, Biblical and psychological fields, with Spanish more common in the American field. In Religion and Psychological Studies and in American Religion and Culture a substitution of competence in statistics for one of the modern foreign languages may be permitted where the course work or dissertation will be likely to require this skill. The grounds for this are described in your rationale in terms of relevance and

¹In order to insure confidentiality, the following letters and general comments have been cited in a random fashion. Seven letters and nine general comments (sixteen entries), representing fourteen respondents, have been reproduced under sixteen asterisks.

²A group of three asterisks [***] indicates the beginning of each new evaluator's comments.
professional use. Secondly, all doctoral students in particular fields where foreign languages are customarily needed for advanced research and specialization are required to have proficiency in those fields. This applies especially to the area of Biblical Interpretation where Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic are required of all students, in addition to the two modern languages. Several reading courses using materials in these languages are included in each student's curriculum. Thirdly, we will permit a major figure, movement, or subject to be a primary object of dissertation research only if the student can work with the necessary materials in the original language. In historical theology Latin is almost always necessary. This proficiency in additional languages needed for dissertation research is usually measured more informally by appropriate dissertation advisors. Finally, we permit students to petition for the approval of other languages where they can show that this language gives them access to a relevant body of research literature (including journals) or where it is particularly relevant to the use to be made of their professional skills. We do not substitute philosophical or historiographical tools for the foreign language requirement.

While we thoroughly agree with point (9) of your rationale, the backgrounds presented by students often require that we permit concurrent study in doctoral courses and in languages. We require that all language study (except specialized additional languages needed for the dissertation) be completed before coursework is complete, and encourage assignments which will employ foreign languages in doctoral courses. We measure proficiency primarily by the GSFLT in appropriate languages, using the 51% as the minimum level. Capacity to work effectively in reading courses measures the proficiency in Biblical languages.

We might add to your rationale our conviction that the use of modern foreign languages enables the doctoral student in religion to enter fully into the rather specialized conversations of the exceptionally literate persons who give leadership in this field. Languages are important for access to research materials but also for effective participation in the world of advanced scholarship.

***Thank you for your efforts on our behalf. I look forward to the opportunity to distribute your final draft.

***The rationale for foreign language proficiency in selected doctoral programs appears to cover most of the issues related to the debate. I imagine much discussion
has gone into bringing the document to this stage; any quibbles I might have about statements would not be helpful to you.

I wish you well in this work. Happily, the study of foreign languages is now a topic of discussion far more than it has been for decades. Since colleges of education were among those who abandoned the study of languages, I believe we should rethink our position.

I favor competence in another language or in cross-cultural studies as a requirement for advanced graduate study. Which language or how competence is acquired is not the issue. In this regard, I do not see computer skills or statistical methodology as appropriate substitutions. What we need is a far stronger cross-cultural emphasis and language study and cross-cultural studies are vehicles to this end. Given this age of jet travel, opportunities for persons to gain insights into other cultures and languages by spending time in other nations are now far easier to arrange.

***After reading the text on foreign language proficiency I find that I have no specific comments to make. I do want to encourage you and your colleagues in what I think you are trying to do. Over the last decades education, including higher education, has become more universal. I hail this development, but I regret that the conception of what makes an educated person has been changed— one might say diluted. High among these changes (dilutions) has been a weakened emphasis upon coming to a knowledge and understanding of one's own cultural heritage and the cultural heritages of other peoples. Within this area mastery of one's own language and the languages of other peoples is of supreme importance. It is commonly known that the greatest facility for learning languages comes in childhood and youth. There is not much we can do to bring about radical change in primary and secondary education. However, those of us with responsibility for professional and graduate education can, if we dare, establish requirements for our degree program which, painful though they may be, will help.

***Thank you for sharing the guidelines with me. I have made a few comments within. The study answers a need clearly felt within the _______ School of _______.

***The current emphasis on education excellence tends to suggest that foreign language study will be required for college admission. Thus a well-educated person will be expected to have foreign language. I personally would not want foreign language requirements deleted from the
requirements for music doctorates.

**A well-prepared and meaningful paper. See evaluation marks in the paper (C means fine).**

**The rationale you present has been in effect at our institution for a number of years.**

**I agree with the arguments made regarding the decreasing emphasis on foreign language requirements.** We have also followed this trend. We replaced the foreign languages with statistics and computer proficiency requirements. Recently, we even dropped these in lieu of courses in these areas. I do not think, however, that all students need a foreign language.

**The availability of the proficiency/competency tests in French and German (and other languages), developed by the Educ. Testing Service, standardize expectations to a certain extent—at least for institutions that use them.**

I wonder to what extent the standing of a Graduate School determines its language requirements, that is, Princeton University can demand a lot because it has the pick of the applicants, while other institutions cannot (or will not) demand as much.

Generally, I am not sure how far it is possible and desirable to "establish reasonably consistent foreign language requirements" beyond the confines of a discipline.

**Only important aspect of rationale are needs tied to pursuit of doctorate itself—post graduate needs or historical precedent are not relevant.**

**Foreign-language training is useful for a selected subset of business students who go into the practice of business (MBA as a terminal degree) as opposed to those who go into the profession of teaching and doing research about the practice of business (PhD or DBA as terminal degrees).**

**Important research about business, and to a lesser extent economics, only surfaces in English-language research journals. Note where every winner of the Nobel prize in economics has published his work which established his reputation.**

**Knowledge of foreign languages in Europe is mandatory due to geographic, social and economic proximity. While as an educator I may lament the decline in American knowledge of foreign languages and cultures, to some extent the situation must also be viewed as...**
evolutionary. More crystallized demands for internationalization and [?] will resuscitate the need for these competencies.

***It is recognized that there is a need for increased fluency in foreign languages for Americans in general, including doctoral candidates. However, if a level of familiarity with a foreign language (and the level differs considerably in academe) is simply a requirement that has no further utility, it is a waste of time. In professional schools, for example, computer and quantitative skills are probably far more important for the average candidate than is foreign language capability.

The question which must be answered is "to what use would a particular foreign language be to a given doctoral candidate?" If study is focused on one country (or more), where one language is spoken, there might be utility. However, in many countries ranging from China to Nigeria, many languages are spoken and if you learn one dialect you are often unable to communicate in another dialect. Furthermore, if you are undertaking a study of major capital markets and you wish to communicate and research in native languages, you would need to understand French, German, Arabic, Japanese, and Chinese. However, most of the literature published on this subject is in English and those who are working in the international financial arena are fluent in English.

The opinion expressed by our International Business Faculty is that foreign language skills are important if an individual is going to specialize on a particular country or a particular region where a language is common. It would then be assumed that the doctoral candidate would not only undertake research as a student where the language would be utilized as a tool, but would also continue to become a specialist in that country or region during his or her professional career. On the other hand, to require a language competency for all doctoral candidates in business would be unproductive.

Consequently, my opinion is that a language should be a requirement depending upon the nature of the individual's program of study, research to be undertaken, and availability of source data. The more languages we know, the better we are able to communicate. However, it is not essential that every person in a professional program at the doctoral level be required to undertake language study.

Summary of General Comments

As seen, almost all the comments were favorable. The
strongest support for foreign-language study came from the fields of theology and music. Also in education and business there was support for foreign-language study, but not as a requirement for all doctoral degrees. It was generally felt that foreign languages—when required on the doctoral level—should be demonstrably utilitarian, not only for graduate study and research, but for the students' future professional careers. It was suggested that more emphasis be put on cross-cultural studies and cross-disciplinary communication, but that this not be part of specific doctoral requirements.

The Rationale as Sent to the Evaluators and the Summaries of the Specific Comments Provided

(1) In the United States, the need for and the usefulness of a foreign-language competence differ greatly from one professional discipline to another. While some disciplines require and make practical use of several foreign languages, others—including education and business—often appear to be in need of none. In Europe, in contrast, it is unthinkable for a teacher, a businessman, an engineer, etc., to be monolingual. As English has become the dominant international language of the world, increasingly larger numbers of American students receive little or no foreign-language instruction during their elementary, secondary, and college years. Doctoral foreign-language requirements in the United States are inserted in the doctoral curriculum because—unlike in other countries—there is no assurance that a foreign-language proficiency has been achieved on the elementary, secondary, or undergraduate level of study.

While it is desirable that most Americans—like the younger citizens of most European and other highly developed nations—be proficient in more than one language, it is hardly realistic to expect all or most Americans to become bilingual or multi-lingual. In certain professional disciplines, however, the lack of a foreign-language

1The modified (final) rationale—including all three parts—begins on p. 205.
proficiency will seriously limit the mono-lingual individual. It is therefore reasonable to expect individuals preparing for professional careers to develop foreign-language competences that are utilitarian and commensurate with the needs of the disciplines and the areas of specialization under consideration.

**Summary of Evaluators' Comments.** Among the fifteen specific comments provided for this item, there was general consensus that foreign-language study is desirable and that, ideally, foreign languages should be learned on the elementary, secondary, and undergraduate levels of study as it is done in Europe. The support came from education, music, and theology, and it corresponded to that found in the letters and general comments provided by the evaluators [see above]. The four evaluators in education were in complete agreement that foreign language proficiency should be achieved prior to graduate studies. One commented that "this would be the best case policy if implemented nationally." Three evaluators in music also agreed, one emphasizing that "this is where skills should be learned;" another saying, "this [lack of a foreign-language proficiency will seriously limit the mono-lingual individual] is not quite as serious now as it once was. [but] foreign language skills are quite useful and I strongly favor such abilities." One person in theology noted that completing of foreign-language requirements before doctoral studies is "important." Another person--in business--disagreed, saying that "if the limitations were so severe and noticeable, programs would spring up." One
evaluator in music felt that there is "too much emphasis on
career preparation rather than the tools for continuing
one's own education after the doctorate." A theologian
observed that since later educational/professional needs of
an individual cannot be predicted at any of the three levels
mentioned (elementary, secondary, undergraduate) early basic
and sound language training will contribute to the career of
any member of society. This observation has been included
in the modified rationale (see p. [209]).

(2) A thorough working knowledge in the use of one or more
foreign languages is often needed by students working on
doctoral degrees outside the fields of languages. It is
needed for several purposes, among which are

a. reading, translating, and interpreting source
   materials written in different languages in the
   subject area(s) of the dissertation

b. checking and verifying professional literature
   connected with the subject area(s) of the
   dissertation

c. understanding the general or professional
   background of the area(s) of study for a degree

d. allowing for international travel and communica-
   tion, making it possible to obtain materials
   needed and discussing them with professionals and
   others abroad

e. gaining a general insight into the literature of
   and literary, cultural, and related professional
   developments in other countries and cultures

f. enabling a professional to work and study outside
   the United States

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. In the thirteen
specific comments provided, the six purposes given for
studying foreign languages were supported. But it was
implied that their relative importance may vary from one discipline to another and from one area to another. The respondents in education were in complete agreement with all six purposes. In business, it was noted under purpose 'd.' that it was an "excellent reason," but under "a." that "these could be handled by an interpreter." Business also observed that foreign languages are important for foreign travel and communication, but that they are "not so vital in economics, generally." In music, one of the two respondents observed that all six purposes were "reasonable," while the second felt that the "purposes are too vocation oriented. What about a better understanding of one's principal language?" The only respondent in theology underlined "strength" beside each purpose. Item 2 of the rationale was retained as stated.

(3) The number of foreign languages to be required will vary from discipline to discipline and from degree to degree, and it is related to the following factors

a. the number of foreign languages involved and needed in the specific disciplines studied for the doctorate

b. the number of foreign languages needed for the general subject area and the topic of the dissertation

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. Five of the six comments made were favorable. One evaluator each from the fields of education and music agreed with both factors. One evaluator in business suggested that "this [the study of languages] could reduce the time necessary to study relevant
topics because of the time spent on studying languages."
One evaluator each in the fields of theology and music noted that "all this [the number of languages to be required must be related to general needs, types of degrees, and disciplines] is true, but exposure to one language at high school level will assist doctoral candidates in learning other required languages," and that it is "better to learn one language well than to have two at a useless minimal level." The rationale was supported.

(4) When specific languages are required in a doctoral program, the requirement(s) should reflect
   a. the languages commonly used in the student's general discipline
   b. the languages customarily needed in the student's general area of specialization
   c. languages needed for adequately working with the topic of the dissertation

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. Seven evaluators--two in education, one in business, three in music, and one in theology--were all in agreement with item 4. One evaluator from business observed that it was a "good statement and rationale." In theology, the word "strengths" beside each statement was checked. In music, it was observed that "b." and "c." are more appropriate than "a." The rationale was supported.

(5) The function of doctoral foreign-language proficiency requirements is to provide
a. a language competence that assures facility in the understanding and use of technical language and terminology within a specific professional discipline

b. ability to read and understand general materials commonly used within a discipline

c. ability to be unencumbered if and when there is foreign-language work associated with the dissertation

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. Three evaluators—one each in education, business and theology—strongly supported item 5. Three evaluators in music basically agreed, but there was disagreement as to the relative importance of "a.", "b.", and "c." One thought "a" to be "more appropriate" than "b." and "c.", while another felt that "a." is "not [appropriate] in music." As stated in the rationale, it is to be expected that each discipline should have different emphases. No changes were made in the rationale as a result of these comments.

(6) The degree of foreign-language competence (proficiency) to be required for a doctoral degree—when needed within a program of study—depends on several factors, among which are

a. the amount of professional literature and other foreign-language materials written or otherwise available and used within the discipline or the general area of study for the specific degree

b. the amount of foreign-language source material written and needed in the area of the dissertation

c. the nature of the foreign-language involvement in the dissertation

d. the need to understand the non-American cultural background or professional developments within the
discipline

e. the extent to which representative or pertinent foreign-language materials in the discipline have not been and are not currently being translated into English

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. Six persons commented. Two evaluators in education felt that parts "a." and "e." were not as appropriate as "b.", "c.", and "d." One person from the area of business suggested that "a." and "b." were "true and obvious." One evaluator in music felt that "all are reasonable," while another suggested rank ordering from highest to lowest in importance as follows: "e.", "b.", "c.", "a." and "d." One suggestion from theology was that "the degree of 'understanding' this [non-American cultural] background need not be overemphasized. In reading foreign-language materials, the background becomes automatically clearer." The influencing factors were rank-ordered, as suggested.

(7) Foreign languages are among many tools customarily used to facilitate study within professional disciplines. In some disciplines, foreign languages are essential in transmitting basic concepts and subject materials. In others, they are not. Tools needed and to be used--depending on discipline and area of concentration--may include

a. foreign languages
b. statistics
c. computer science (computer languages)
d. mathematics
e. analytic techniques
f. history and documentary methods (historical methods)

g. philosophy

h. law

i. other tools

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. The tools proposed were supported by the four evaluators commenting. In education, there was complete support by the two respondents. No comments were received from business and theology. In music there was once again disagreement as to the relative importance or usefulness of the tools proposed. Foreign languages were supported. For computer science, the comment was made that "there is much smoke but little fire here." Not all tools are of equal importance in each discipline, and the order of importance may change even from one individual study program to another within the same discipline. No changes were made in the rationale.

(8) Foreign-language requirements for a degree should serve specific purposes and should be divided into (1) general requirements, appropriate and needed for all students in a specific discipline in a specific institution (e.g., music, theology), (2) general requirements appropriate for an area within a discipline (e.g., musicology, New Testament theology, comparative education, international business), and (3) specific requirements, appropriate and necessary for a particular research field or dissertation topic (e.g., "Religious education in Japan;"

1Non-linguistic languages or tools should not be used as substitutes for university-wide foreign-language requirements in disciplines where foreign languages are commonly needed and used for professional purposes. Other professional tools should be acquired in addition to needed general foreign-language competences.
"Recurring melodic motives in the dance-songs of Norway;" etc.).

**Summary of Evaluators' Comments.** The five evaluators responding agreed with the division of requirements proposed. Music felt that "(2) is most appropriate for doctoral students." In business, however, it was suggested that "general requirements might not need any foreign language. Also, much of the foreign literature may already be translated into English." From comments made in two letters from evaluators (music and theology), it was seen that the division of foreign-language competence into general and specific requirements, as proposed, is used and found advantageous in American universities. This was also observed when studying doctoral foreign-language requirements in American professional schools—especially in the field of theology. No changes were made in the rationale.

(9) General foreign-language studies, in disciplines where

---

1In many professional disciplines, the knowledge of one or more foreign languages is a fundamental prerequisite for professional competence. For example, a doctoral theology student in a Catholic university would be educationally and professionally crippled without the knowledge of Latin and—considering the vast amount of professional source materials and literature found in German in musicology—any musicologist is severely limited professionally without a working knowledge of German, regardless of field of musicological specialization. Language competence in special instances need to be established on an individual basis.

2See appendices A-D.
needed and required, should be completed before entering specialized graduate studies, and general foreign-language requirements should be met before acceptance into a doctoral program in order for the language competence to serve as a practical and useful tool. The acquisition of a needed basic foreign language competence should not detract from advanced specialized studies within a professional discipline.

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. Nine persons making comments on this item, including two letters, supported this aspect of the rationale in a variety of different ways. The one respondent in education agreed fully. The concept was particularly strong in theology that foreign-language requirements should be completed before entering doctoral studies. One of the evaluators wrote: "I am especially grateful for the insistence that language studies should precede graduate work in every case." However, of the three theologians commenting, one made the observation that "foreign-language requirements should be met before candidates are admitted to writing their comprehensive examinations." This was a concept generally reflected also in music and business. In business, the one respondent felt that "some students may not want to delay the onset of their doctoral studies and would prefer to study topics and languages concurrently, with one complimenting the other." In music, one evaluator agreed that foreign-language studies should be completed before entering doctoral studies, while the three others felt that this would not be necessary. One commented that "students in music should be permitted to engage in foreign-language study simultaneously with degree
study. [However,] in ten years, with a resurgence of foreign-language study, I would not [might not?] take this position." The wording of the rationale was modified as a result of these comments (see below).

(10) General foreign-language requirements within specific disciplines should normally be set by individual departments within the framework of the overall policies of a particular school (college) and university. Specific foreign-language requirements should be personalized according to the needs within the area of study and the dissertation topic. They should be set by or in consultation with appropriate doctoral committees. General blanket requirements by a school or institution may not always be in the best interest of individual departments.

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. The five evaluators commenting on this item agreed with the statement in the rationale, but it was suggested that "some overall approval process should be considered so individual students have a similarity of requirements across committees" (music) and that "though consultations with doctoral committees will always serve good purposes, specific foreign-language requirements should not easily override the general foreign-language requirements" (theology). This concept was incorporated in the rationale.

(11) General foreign-language requirements should be administered in accordance with established institutional and departmental policy; and specific requirements should be adequately representing the needs of individual research areas and topics. Unique characteristics of an institution may historically mandate specific language requirements.

Summary of Evaluators' Comments. Only one evaluator
commented on this: "I agree."

The Reaction to the Rationale

As in the letters and in the general comments made by the evaluators, in the specific comments there was firm support for foreign-language study in all four professional disciplines. However, the support given to doctoral foreign-language proficiency requirements differed considerably from one discipline to another. The strongest support was found in theology and music and the weakest in education and business. But—as might be expected—the comments made by the randomly selected evaluators supported and duplicated in most instances the comments made in the personal communications contributed by the approximately one hundred administrators who answered in detail the initial inquiries sent to all doctoral degree-granting institutions in the disciplines under study, as well as those made by the seven professors and administrators on campus commenting on the preliminary draft of the rationale.¹ Several of the evaluators made comments on items in the rationale, often pointing out how they were applicable in their disciplines. An examination of the reactions shows that the evaluators basically agreed with the rationale. The reactions and suggestions of the panel regarding items 6, 9, and 10 above,

¹See chapter 5, pp. 154-180.
however, were taken into consideration in arriving at the
the final form of the rationale (see below).

Rationale for Foreign-language Proficiency

Preamble to the Rationale

Current foreign-language requirements for doctoral
degrees in American universities and professional schools
differ greatly in different disciplines and vary
considerably from one university to another. The language
requirements within a particular discipline are often so
diversified that for many professional degrees—such as the
Ph.D. degree in education, the D.M.A., Mus.D., and Ph.D.
degrees in music, and the Ph.D., S.T.D., and D.Min. degrees
in theology (religion)—there is no national consensus and
it is often difficult to ascertain what is generally
expected of undergraduate and graduate students preparing to
eventually pursue doctoral studies.

Foreign-language study and general academic language
requirements in the United States have changed drastically
over the past century and a half. While language study used
to be central to collegiate education—as it still is in
Europe and other parts of the world—a situation has
developed in American education in which foreign-language
requirements have been virtually abolished in many

---

1The modified final form of the rationale begins
here. The modifications suggested by the evaluators have
been incorporated. See appendix K for the rationale as
sent to the evaluators.
disciplines. This has been considered appropriate and practical in the view of many professionals; but it has also been contended that, as a result of his general lack of foreign-language competence, the mono-lingual American businessman is at a decided disadvantage when competing with his multi-lingual Japanese and European counterpart in the international markets and that the contributions of American scholars are often inferior to what they might have been.¹

Many studies have been conducted over the past fifty years in order to document and measure the gradual relaxation of foreign-language requirements and to trace the changing attitudes to language study in the United States. Many have deplored the decreasing foreign-language competence of American professionals. Others have been concerned over artificial and burdensome general foreign-language requirements which in many cases have been "out-of-step with reasonable practicality" and thought to hinder rather than help in the pursuit of advanced professional studies. According to the 1979 report of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies,

"Americans' incompetence in foreign languages is nothing short of scandalous."\(^1\) In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education called for re-instatement and strengthening of foreign-language requirements in American secondary schools and in higher education.\(^2\)

In the present study an attempt has been made to establish a rationale for foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines.\(^3\) In order to narrow the topic and make the study manageable, the study has been limited to the fields of education, business, music, and theology. The disciplines were selected so as to represent two areas from among those which traditionally require considerable language proficiency (music and theology) and two from those which in the United States usually do not require a broad language background (education and business).

In the process of establishing a comprehensive rationale for doctoral foreign-language requirements in American

\(^1\)The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, *Strength Through Wisdom*, p. 5.


\(^3\)A "rationale" is a reasoned theory or the fundamental logical principles accounting for the why and how of an action or a practice or process. It gives guidelines with accompanying reasons. The guidelines suggest appropriate application and implementation as conditions or circumstances vary. A rationale is contrasted to a "model" or "pattern," to which all applications are attempting to conform.
educational institutions, this study has involved (1) tracing the factors contributing to the changing of attitudes to and practices in language study affecting foreign-language requirements in American colleges and universities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; (2) comparing American language study and requirements with those in European countries; and (3) correlating current professional needs with current attitudes to foreign-language study in the American institutions offering doctorates in the fields of education, business, music, and theology.

While the proposed rationale arrived at is reflecting what has been and what is currently being done, it attempts in addition to serve as a guide as to what might in the future reasonably and profitably be expected and done. The rationale is specifically addressing the language situation found in education, business, music, and theology, but it is hoped that through generalization it might be helpful in other disciplines as well.

The Rationale

(1) In the United States, the need for and the usefulness of a foreign-language competence differ greatly from one professional discipline to another. While some disciplines require and make practical use of several foreign languages, others—including education and business—often appear to be in need of none. In Europe, in contrast, it is unthinkable for a teacher, a businessman, an engineer, etc., to be monolingual. As English has become the dominant international language of the world, increasingly larger numbers of American students receive little or no foreign-language
instruction during their elementary, secondary, and college years. Doctoral foreign-language requirements in the United States are inserted in the doctoral curriculum because—unlike in other countries—there is no assurance that a foreign-language proficiency has been achieved on the elementary, secondary, or undergraduate level of study.

While it is desirable that most Americans—like the younger citizens of most European and other highly developed nations—be proficient in more than one language, it is hardly realistic to expect all or most Americans to become bilingual or multi-lingual. In certain professional disciplines, however, the lack of a foreign-language proficiency will seriously limit the mono-lingual individual. It is therefore reasonable to expect individuals preparing for professional careers to develop foreign-language competences that are utilitarian and commensurate with the needs of the disciplines and the areas of specialization under consideration. However, since later educational/professional needs of an individual cannot always be predicted at the elementary, secondary, or undergraduate levels, early basic and sound language training will contribute to the successful career preparation of any member of society.

(2) A thorough working knowledge in the use of one or more foreign languages is often needed by students working on doctoral degrees outside the fields of languages. It is needed for several purposes, among which are

a. reading, translating, and interpreting source materials written in different languages in the subject area(s) of the dissertation

b. checking and verifying professional literature connected with the subject area(s) of the dissertation

c. understanding the general or professional background of the area(s) of study for a degree

d. allowing for international travel and communication, making it possible to obtain materials needed and discussing them with professionals and others abroad

e. gaining a general insight into the literature of and literary, cultural, and related professional developments in other countries and cultures
f. enabling a professional to work and study outside the United States

(3) The number of foreign languages to be required will vary from discipline to discipline and from degree to degree, and it is related to the following factors

a. the number of foreign languages involved and needed in the specific disciplines studied for the doctorate

b. the number of foreign languages needed for the general subject area and the topic of the dissertation

(4) When specific languages are required in a doctoral program, the requirement(s) should reflect

a. the languages commonly used in the student's general discipline

b. the languages customarily needed in the student's general area of specialization

c. languages needed for adequately working with the topic of the dissertation

(5) The function of doctoral foreign-language proficiency requirements is to provide

a. a language competence that assures facility in the understanding and use of technical language and terminology within a specific professional discipline

b. ability to read and understand general materials commonly used within a discipline

c. ability to be unencumbered if and when there is foreign-language work associated with the dissertation

(6) The degree of foreign-language competence (proficiency) to be required for a doctoral degree—when needed within a program of study—depends on several factors, among which are
a. the extent to which representative or pertinent foreign-language materials in the discipline have not been and are not currently being translated into English

b. the amount of foreign-language source material written and needed in the area of the dissertation

c. the nature of the foreign-language involvement in the dissertation

d. The amount of professional literature and other foreign-language materials written or otherwise available and used within the discipline or the general area of study for the specific degree

e. the need to understand the non-American cultural background or professional developments within the discipline

(7) Foreign languages are among many tools customarily used to facilitate study within professional disciplines. In some disciplines, foreign languages are essential in transmitting basic concepts and subject materials. In others, they are not. Tools needed and to be used—depending on discipline and area of concentration—may include

a. foreign languages

b. statistics

c. computer science (computer languages)

d. mathematics

e. analytic techniques

f. history and documentary methods (historical methods)

g. philosophy

h. law
i. other tools

(8) Foreign-language requirements for a degree should serve specific purposes and should be divided into (1) general requirements, appropriate and needed for all students in a specific discipline in a specific institution (e.g., music, theology), (2) general requirements appropriate for an area within a discipline (e.g., musicology, New Testament theology, comparative education, international business), and (3) specific requirements, appropriate and necessary for a particular research field or dissertation topic (e.g., "Religious education in Japan;" "Recurring melodic motives in the dance-songs of Norway;" etc.).

(9) General foreign-language studies, in disciplines where needed and required, should ideally be completed before entering specialized graduate studies, and general foreign-language requirements should be met before acceptance into a doctoral program in order for the language competence to serve as a practical and useful tool. The acquisition of a needed basic foreign language competence should not detract from advanced specialized studies within a professional discipline. When this is not feasible, all foreign-language requirements should be met before a student is allowed to take the doctoral comprehensive "mastery-of-field" examination.

1Non-linguistic languages or tools should not be used as substitutes for university-wide foreign-language requirements in disciplines where foreign languages are commonly needed and used for professional purposes. Other professional tools should be acquired in addition to needed general foreign-language competences.

2In many professional disciplines, the knowledge of one or more foreign languages is a fundamental prerequisite for professional competence. For example, a doctoral theology student in a Catholic university would be educationally and professionally crippled without the knowledge of Latin and—considering the vast amount of professional source materials and literature found in German in musicology—any musicologist is severely limited professionally without a working knowledge of German, regardless of field of musicological specialization. Language competence in special instances need to be established on an individual basis.
(10) General foreign-language requirements within specific disciplines should normally be set by individual departments within the framework of the overall policies of a particular school (college) and university. Specific foreign-language requirements should be personalized according to the needs within the area of study and the dissertation topic. They should be set by or in consultation with appropriate doctoral committees. General blanket requirements by a school or institution may not always be in the best interest of individual departments. However, doctoral committees should not easily override general and specific institutional and departmental foreign-language requirements.

(11) General foreign-language requirements should be administered in accordance with established institutional and departmental policy; and specific requirements should be adequately representing the needs of individual research areas and topics. Unique characteristics of an institution may mandate specific language requirements.

Notes on the Rationale

1. Purposes for Doctoral Foreign-Language Requirements

The primary purpose for having foreign-language requirements on the doctoral level in professional disciplines is to assure the possession of language skills needed for scholarly work in a doctoral student's area of professional specialization. The function of doctoral foreign-language requirements is not primarily to provide "culture". Rather, it is to aid in the student's program of advanced studies and in the preparation of the dissertation; and foreign-language competence is to assist in post-doctoral study and research.

It is desirable and expected, however, that doctors in professional fields--like doctors in "academic" fields--will
be knowledgeable in terms of the history, literature, social and philosophical environment, and mores of other nations and past civilizations, as well as in their own national and ethnic background. But such a cultural linguistic background should be separated from specialized studies on the doctoral level.

2. The Number of Foreign Languages To Be Required

Inasmuch as the amount of pertinent professional literature and other materials in foreign languages customarily used for research varies greatly from one professional discipline to another, the use of foreign languages as study and research tools needs to be established within each discipline and area of specialization or concentration. The general and specific foreign-language tool requirements for a professional degree and area of specialization will usually be different from the foreign-language expectations serving general cultural purposes.

3. Degree of Language Proficiency Required

The term "language proficiency" is vague and relative, as it is difficult to define what constitutes being "proficient" except in relationship to what is needed for a particular task or purpose. Measuring foreign-language acquisition and proficiency in terms of college credit or
years of study will produce little uniformity. In 1979, however, the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies asserted that "four years is considered a minimum prerequisite for usable language competence."¹

Inasmuch as foreign-language proficiency or competence must be established in relationship to the need for accomplishing a specific task, proficiency levels must be established for specific purposes or functions within each institution requiring a foreign-language proficiency in various professional fields. The proficiency level required must match the purposes for which it is required. A general foreign-language requirement will normally demand less competence than what is expected from a scholar doing intensive research within the same language area.

Proficiency levels should normally be set by individual departments in cooperation with the agency or agencies teaching the foreign languages, such as the ancient/modern languages departments of a university. Detailed departmental handbooks outlining the specifics of the foreign-language preparation required for individual degrees, general areas, and specializations must be made available to prospective students.

4. Appropriate Time to Study

¹The President's Commission, Strength Through Wisdom, p. 7.
Foreign Languages and
Fulfill Requirements

Experience has shown that individuals learn foreign languages more quickly at an early age. Therefore, general foreign-language studies should begin in elementary school or at least no later than in secondary school. A general language proficiency should in most cases be acquired before entering graduate studies. General foreign-language requirements for a doctorate should ideally be met before acceptance into a doctoral program of study. Special language skills needed for a unique research task, on the other hand, might under certain circumstances be made part of the doctoral program.

5. Acquiring Tools Needed for Research and Study in Professional Disciplines

The intellectual integrity of an educational institution may to some degree be measured by the way needed professional competences are built through the systematic acquisition of special skills and use of research tools. In applied professional fields where foreign languages are not commonly used, tools such as computer science, statistics, and others may be essential. Often, foreign-language skills are combined with other research tools. However, whether foreign languages are used extensively in a professional discipline or not, language competence is a profitable tool
useful for better understanding the world in which academic professionals work and live.

It has been suggested that lack of language proficiency is reflected in certain "attitudes," which tend to prevent "scholarly development." It is recommended that foreign languages be learned sufficiently early so they will become utilitarian, facilitating the reaching of graduate academic goals.

Summary

In this chapter, the development of a rationale for foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in selected professional disciplines (education, business, music, and theology) was outlined. The validation of the preliminary rationale has been described. First, it was presented to a local group of professionals in the areas of education, business, music, theology, as well as in modern languages. As a result of the input from these professionals, the preliminary rationale was modified. The modified rationale was then sent to a group of forty randomly selected administrators--ten each from the four disciplines under study.1 Of these, a panel of nineteen responded. Sixteen replies were usable.2 The replies were tabulated and analyzed. In general, they supported the

---

1See p. 184
2See p. 185.
rationale. As a result of the replies from these evaluators, minor modifications were incorporated in four of the eleven numbered items of the rationale.

The next chapter contains a summary of this study, recommendations, and conclusions drawn. Finally, suggestions are made as to possible implementation of the rationale.

\(^1\)See items 1, 6, 8, and 10; pp. 193-5; 198-9; and 201-3.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to develop a rationale for foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines in American institutions of higher education, with emphasis on education, business, music, and theology. In order to provide a viable basis for the rationale, pertinent literature was reviewed, historically relevant college and university catalogues and academic curricula were surveyed, and personal contacts were made with the principal administrator (dean, chairman) and with other administrators in all accredited professional schools (colleges, departments) offering doctoral degrees in education, business, music, and theology.

In the review of literature, the structure of and the developments seen in the American college and university curriculum—especially as related to foreign-language requirements—was studied. The uniquely American proliferation of professional curricula and course offerings, the increasing demands for a more utilitarian function and everyday relevance and practicality in higher education, and
the resulting impact on foreign-language study and language requirements were traced.

Increasing international dominance by American technology and the emergence of English as the major international language of the world was noted, and the impact of this on foreign-language study and language requirements in the United States was observed. The relative uniformity of foreign-language needs and the function of and rationale for language study in other countries—especially in continental Europe—were reviewed as contrasted to the American diversity caused by varying needs, practices, and attitudes. On the basis of the data gathered, a comprehensive rationale for foreign-language requirements was developed and presented.¹

The rationale was divided into three parts, the second part addressing eleven specific issues as follows:

1. The need for foreign-language requirements on the doctoral level in professional disciplines
2. The purposes for doctoral foreign-language requirements
3. The number of foreign languages to be required
4. The specific languages to be required
5. The function and use of a foreign-language competence
6. The degree of foreign-language competence (proficiency) to be required
7. The need for other (non-linguistic) tools in doctoral studies
8. The relationship between general and specific foreign-

¹See chapter 6, pp. 207-219.
9. The appropriate time for studying foreign languages and for completing foreign-language requirements

10. The administration of foreign-language requirements

11. Institutional policies and administrative flexibility in individual disciplines

The preliminary rationale was sent to a panel of experts in the four disciplines emphasized for their evaluations.¹ The rationale proposed that foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees must be flexible; and the randomly selected evaluators supported the rationale, making comments as to how issues presented in the rationale might be applied in their individual disciplines. A small number of modifications and additions were made.

Conclusions

The major conclusions drawn on the basis of the information and insights gained in the course of doing this study are summarized as follows:

1. Foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines vary greatly from one discipline to another. This, however, does not necessarily imply that the rationale behind foreign-language requirements differs substantially in the different professional disciplines represented in this study. Rather, it suggests that in American professional schools there is a general attitude

¹See chapter 6, pp. 185-219.
that all subjects taught within a doctoral degree program must be demonstrably useful to those who have earned the doctorate. So much knowledge and so many skills are required for doctoral degrees today that there is a need to establish priorities and to pursue what appears to be immediately most important. Therefore, in fields that have a considerable body of materials in foreign languages—such as music and, especially, theology—the foreign-language requirements are still strong, while in other fields—such as education and business—a foreign-language competence need not be and usually is not emphasized whether the degree to be earned is the academic Ph.D. degree or a "professional" degree (Ed.D., D.M.A., etc.).

2. There is a current trend in American professional schools to favor foreign-language study and language competence, but it is generally felt that basic foreign-language study—when appropriate and necessary in a discipline or for a degree—should have been completed before a student is entering doctoral studies. When additional foreign-language competences beyond the basic minimum needed within a field, however, foreign language studies may be done simultaneously or parallel with other doctoral studies. In order to be utilitarian, all such competences should be demonstrated before the student is taking the doctoral general (comprehensive) field examinations.

3. The American tradition of requiring proficiency in
one foreign language (most often German or French) for a master's degree and two foreign languages (German and French) for a doctor's degree is out of step with practical reality. It implies that a second foreign language can and must be learned between the conclusion of a master's degree program and the beginning of doctoral studies, or within a doctoral program. Experience indicates that practical mastery of a new foreign language seldom is obtained in this manner. However, adding another Romance language to a previous competence in Romance languages or another Semitic language to other Semitic languages may well be feasible when needed for dissertation research.

4. In the United States, there is a considerable difference between the need for a foreign-language proficiency for research degrees and for teaching degrees, even within a unified discipline, and the differences should be adequately spelled out in the publications of professional schools.

5. As English has become the major international language of the world, it is perceived that a knowledge of foreign-languages by all citizens is highly desirable but not essential, and it is not practically feasible. The situation in the United States differs from that found in most other countries, where the need to use foreign languages is absolutely essential through geographic proximity and
international economic and cultural interaction.

**Recommendations**

1. In the United States, foreign-language needs in different professional disciplines vary sufficiently to make it difficult to set specific foreign-language requirements that can be applied uniformly across disciplinary boundaries. Still, administrators, professors, and students like to know what different professional schools expect and require. Therefore it is recommended that individual studies of current foreign-language needs and requirements be conducted within specific areas of study in professional fields and that recommendations be made regarding acceptable norms within individual disciplines.

2. It is recommended that a survey be conducted to determine expected competency levels of foreign-language requirements in American schools offering doctorate degrees.

3. Foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines need to be flexible. The American tradition of requiring German and/or French needs to be reconsidered. Whenever there is a demonstrable purpose, any foreign language should qualify to fulfill doctoral foreign-language requirements.

4. Students learning a new foreign language on the doctoral level in order to fulfill a doctoral foreign-language requirement seldom acquire a sufficient level of competence to make the study meaningful within a discipline.
According to the National Commission on Excellence in Education,

Achieving proficiency in a foreign language ordinarily requires from 4 to 6 years of study and should, therefore, be started in the elementary grades. We believe it is desirable that students achieve such proficiency because study of a foreign language introduces students to non-English-speaking cultures, heightens awareness and comprehension of one's native tongue, and serves the Nation's needs in commerce, diplomacy, defense, and education.¹

While a student's possible future doctoral foreign-language needs usually cannot be predicted on the elementary, secondary, and undergraduate levels of study, it is recommended that foreign-language study be begun in elementary or secondary school whenever feasible, as early exposure to one foreign language will assist in learning other required languages in the future.

5. More attention and encouragement should be given to ethnic students with a special language background to have them specialize in study and research in areas where their special language competences may be profitably utilized. In the case of foreign students, they also should be allowed to use their national languages whenever their area of specialization or their dissertation topic warrants it.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; School</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Required FL</th>
<th>Alt Res Tools</th>
<th>Source(s) of Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:614</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr College (Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stu Hdbk p 2; pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Los Angeles (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:615</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 or 2 FL stat or comp sc</td>
<td>82-84 Ed Ann p 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America (Dept. of Rel. and Rel. Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Fr &amp; Ger</td>
<td>83-84 Rel Stu Ann pp 98-99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Required FL</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Graduate School (Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu p 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University (Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:616 no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Field of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie University (Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta State University (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake University (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of</td>
<td>D.A.S.</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td>p 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sci.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>p 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Lincoln Center</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>stat and ed res meth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed. and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu. Dev.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required PL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:620;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Sch Ed Cat;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstra University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82-83 Un Bu pp 90, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 PL opt</td>
<td>comp sc,</td>
<td>83-85 Gr Bu pp 28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1 PL opt</td>
<td>stat (2 res</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>skills req)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Bloomington</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res</td>
<td>tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>insuf info</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Grad. Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or stat or comp sc</td>
<td>82-83 Doc Pr Ed p 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Grad. Div. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:622; 82-84 Gr Sch Cat pp 131-146; pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Chicago (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1 FL or</td>
<td>Gr Ed Hdbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis State University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:62;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-85 Gr Pr Hdbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>84-86 Gr Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University of Raleigh</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:623;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University (Prog. in Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:624; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern State University of Louisiana (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:624; no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova University (Ctr. for Adv. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:624; no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:624;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 FL opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepperdine University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:625;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-85 PSU Bu p 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>adm none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed. and Hu. Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td>instr lea none</td>
<td>couns ed none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL (Fr, or 1 FL &amp; PetAGGS 2:626</td>
<td>Ed.D. none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ger or Sp 1 res tool or 2 res tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Doc Pro Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D. none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>no info</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York at Albany</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or comp sc or 82-84 Gr Bu</td>
<td>Ed.D. none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>adv stat pp 16, 85-106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York at Buffalo</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Ed. Stud.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D. none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>82-84 Gr Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FL opt (if rel to res)</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:628; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern</td>
<td>D.Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL (opt)</td>
<td>&amp; res meth or stat</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1 FL (opt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pp 59-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Women's</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>insuf info</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:629;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International U.</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL &amp; comp lang or Am sign lang</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universite de</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>82-83 Annuaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL or 1 FL &amp; res</td>
<td>lang &amp; res</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL or 1 FL &amp; res</td>
<td>tech or res tech &amp; 3rd minor or 1 FL &amp; 3rd minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL rdg kn or 1 FL comp kn</td>
<td>80 Doc Req</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley (Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Riverside (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara (Grad. Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1 FL opt</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Sch of Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago (Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comp ed Fr or Ger</td>
<td>others</td>
<td>1 FL opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado at Boulder (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>83-84 Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>p 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:630;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>PhD tool req inf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FL opt, quant</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:631;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>meth, qual</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meth, comp sc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td>stat comp &amp;</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ed res or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp sc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii at Manoa (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-85 Gr Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas (Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>insuf info</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 or 2 FL</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp 19, 27-28;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>81-83 Gr Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Orono</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:631;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PhD Prog Ed Ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p 3;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Info f Prosp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr Stu p 9;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Park</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Prog. in Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>PhD Proced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>EdD Proced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 or 2 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr Hdbk pp 22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri at Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>opt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri at St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>1 FL opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri at St. Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>81-83 Gr Stu Bu pp 36-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska at Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada, Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; School</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 or 1 FL opt</td>
<td>82-84 Gr Pro Bu p 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FL opt, comp lang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(? )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td>comp pr, stat, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ctr. for Teaching and Learning)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>83-85 Gr Bu pp 61-62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Florida</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Cat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed. and Hu. Services)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pp 16, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL opt</td>
<td>82-83 Gr Hdbk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td>p 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL opt</td>
<td>82-83 Gr Bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp 27-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Ed. and Hu. Dev.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Diego</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res</td>
<td>tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or comp lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL opt or l FL &amp; stat or comp or minor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or stat or comp lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or comp lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required PL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Pacific</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL &amp;/or</td>
<td>comp or stat</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:634;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>FL opt, ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept Memo;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>res, stat</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL or</td>
<td>1 FL &amp; stat</td>
<td>83-85 Gr Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pp 95-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Madison</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:634;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PL opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pp 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>Ph D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PL opt</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Inst. of Ed.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required PL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:635;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 PL</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:636;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu p 38;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 PL &amp;</td>
<td>stat</td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (Col. of Hu. Resources and Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 PL &amp; stat</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu pp. 79, 110-11;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama (Grad. Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL or 1 FL &amp; quant</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:296; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University (Col. of Bus. Adm.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>bus adm none</td>
<td>FL optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FL optional</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Commerce and Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Berkeley</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:297</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:297</td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:282</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Weatherhead Sch. of Management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s) Required</td>
<td>FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of D.B.A. Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or comp lang</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FL optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fuqua Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:285</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Gov. and Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia (Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu pp 34-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology (Col. of Man.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:285</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University (Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>comp prog</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus adm 1 FL &amp;/or comp prog, economics 1 FL or math</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu p 94;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>J.D./M.B.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Col. of Commerce and Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University (Grad. Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td>PhD &amp; D.B.A.</td>
<td>interna bus 1 FL</td>
<td>Doc Stu Hdbk pp 29-31; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas (Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University (Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:287 pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky (Col. of Bus. and Econ.)</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State U.</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>stat</td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Tech U.</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Man.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. (Sch. of Bus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required PL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis State University</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:289</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fogelman Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:299</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>FL or stat or comp lang</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>D.A.</td>
<td>83-85 Gr Bu pp 18-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td>83-84 Bus &amp; Ind pp 1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. and Industry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri at Columbia</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska at Lincoln</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:299; no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:299; pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. and Public Admin.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University (J. L. Kellogg Grad. Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University (Col. of Admin. Sc.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>PhD Bus Adm Hdbk; pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma (Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s) Required</td>
<td>FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University (Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:291</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon (Grad. Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace University (Lubin Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td>D.P.S.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania (Wharton School)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>M.B.A./J.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.B.A./M.D.</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.B.A./D.M.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University (Krannert Grad. Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:292</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jesse H. Jones Grad. Sch. of Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Bus. and Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or comp lang</td>
<td>Pol Sta Bus dm for PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:301; pers letter (unsigned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>J.D./M.B.A.</td>
<td>none(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter (unsigned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (Col. of Bus. and Admin.)</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York at Buffalo (Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none (?)</td>
<td>Dept Memo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University (Sch. of Man.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University (Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:295 no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville (Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:301; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s) Required</td>
<td>FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:301</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Austin (Grad. Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>82-83 Gr Cat pp 99, 107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>D.B.A. none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:3u2</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Man. Studies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:295</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>pers note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grad. Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; school</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Required FL Alt res tools</th>
<th>Source(s) of info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:302</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia (Colgate Darden Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Col. of Bus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>PetAGGS 2:303</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington (Grad. Sch. of Bus. Admin.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University (Grad. Sch. of Bus. Adm.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bus Bu pp 11, 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.B.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required PL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Bus. and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>econ &amp; quant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Bus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL or stat</td>
<td>comp lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td>or stat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

DOCTORAL FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS IN MUSIC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; school</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Required FL</th>
<th>Alt res tools</th>
<th>Source(s) of info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>83-85 Doc Pro in Mus p 4; pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>instr mu none</td>
<td>2 FL keyb Fr or Ger vo perf 2 FL (Fr, Ger, It, or Sp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td>GR, Fr, Rus, or opt FL</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu p 59; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>D.A.</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>musical Ger &amp; 1 FL</td>
<td>82-83 Gr Bu p 151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>compos Fr &amp; Ger or subst FL</td>
<td>82-83 Arts Bu p 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compos perf mus ed</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOCTORAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS IN MUSIC

APPENDIX C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; school</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Required FL</th>
<th>Alt res tools</th>
<th>Source(s) of info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. musicol Ger, Fr, &amp; Lat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western University (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. insuf info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83 NASM Dir p 4 83-85 Gr Pr p 286, no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. Fr &amp; Ger Lat opt mu hist mu theo D.M.A. 3 FL (Ger, perf Fr &amp; It) comp mu ed vo ped &amp; perf pf ped mu lit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-85 Cat pp 104, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Institute of Music (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>D.M.A. none comp perf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu p 5; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester Ph.D.</td>
<td>comp</td>
<td>Fr &amp;/or Ger or compu lang pp 16, 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eastman Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>musicol</td>
<td>Fr &amp; Ger</td>
<td>other FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu theo</td>
<td>Fr &amp; Ger</td>
<td>other FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>(2) FL, stat,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp sc, res</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>des, or comp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>comp</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf &amp; lit</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cond</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University Ph.D.</td>
<td>mu theo</td>
<td>Ger &amp; l FL Fr, It, Lat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>opt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>opt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mus.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vo</td>
<td>Fr, Ger, It</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>musicol</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Fr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu theo</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Fr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.E.</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mus.D.</td>
<td>mu lit (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; perf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ww</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mu lit &amp; ped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perf &amp; opr lit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inst cond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chor cond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. musicol/ethnomu 2 FL (Fr &amp; Ger) or other FL (ethnomus) mus ed 1 FL or stat or other theo/comp 1 FL or other res tool</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu pp 137-138; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University (Sc. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. varies w comp mu ed musicol appl mu/ theo &amp; lit D.M.A. varies w appl mu progr cond</td>
<td>83-84 Bu p 94 no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University (Dept. of Mus. and Mus. Ed.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. mu ed 2 tools FL, stat, comp lang, or other D.A. none Ed.D. none</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. musicol Fr &amp; Ger mu theo Fr &amp; Ger comp 2 FL or 1 FL &amp; comp sc</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu pp 161-164; pers note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. comp</td>
<td>1 FL (Fr or Ger) perf</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. mu hist &amp; lit Ger &amp; Fr subst other FL</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. mu theo Ger &amp; Fr mu ed none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mus.D. ch mu 2 FL comp 2 FL perf 2 FL cond 2 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>mu hist/lit</td>
<td>Fr &amp; Ger</td>
<td>82 Gr Hdbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>theo</td>
<td>or other FL</td>
<td>p VIII; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>Fr &amp; Ger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>no info</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-85 Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>mu hist</td>
<td>3 FL (Ger,Fr,</td>
<td>83-85 Gui Gr Stu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of New York at</td>
<td></td>
<td>mu theo</td>
<td>It or Lat)</td>
<td>pp 41-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ger &amp; 1 FL</td>
<td>(Fr, It, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83 NASM Dir p 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>82-84 Gr Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp lang</td>
<td>p 209; pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>fine arts</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>81-84 Gr Hdb p 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FL opt if needed for diss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>mu theo</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Fr or opt FL (Gr, Lat, It)</td>
<td>80 Gr Stu Hdbk p 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Col. of Mus.)</td>
<td>D.M.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>perf ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cond ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lit &amp; perf Fr &amp; Ger &amp; opt FL or subst tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cond Fr &amp; Ger &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp Fr &amp; Ger &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado (Col. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. musicol</td>
<td>1 FL or 2 FL (for res purp)</td>
<td>mu ed, D.M.A. comp, perf vo</td>
<td>83-84 Cat pp 169, 220, 222, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. comp</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 opt FL (for perf purp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cho mu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ped &amp; lit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. mu hist</td>
<td>2 FL</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. fine arts</td>
<td>no info</td>
<td></td>
<td>83 NASM Dir p 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Cat p 16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ed.D. ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83 D.M.A. Cat p 1; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. vo perf</td>
<td>2 FL (Ger, Fr, or It)</td>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opt FL, stat, dict, comp sc, biblio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; school</th>
<th>Degree(s) Required</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>Alt res tools</th>
<th>Source(s) of info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>83 NASM Di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>musicol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p 97;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>2 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>comp</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cho mu</td>
<td>Ger &amp; 1 FL Fr, It, or Sp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>app mu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pf</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>org</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vl</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vla</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>winds</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| University of Iowa                  | Ph.D.              | Ger & Fr & one other FL          |
| (Sch. of Mus.)                      | musicol            | (Lat or It)                      |
|                                     | comp               | ?                                |
|                                     | mu ed              | none                            |
| D.M.A.                              | comp               | 1 FL                              |
|                                     | pf perf             | 1 FL                              |
|                                     | (Ger or other)     | (Ger or other)                   |
|                                     | (Ger or other)     |                                   |

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; school</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Required FL</th>
<th>Alt res tools</th>
<th>Source(s) of info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Ph.D. musicol</td>
<td>Fr &amp; Ger</td>
<td></td>
<td>82-83 Gr Cat pp 212, 266, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>mu theo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D. mu ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>Ph.D. no spec</td>
<td>FL options</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu p 70;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>musicol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu theo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. 1 FL (Fr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or Ger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res</td>
<td>tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. musicol/ethnomu</td>
<td>Ger &amp; 1 FL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D. mu ed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. comp</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf vo</td>
<td>FL diction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FL opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. musicol Fr &amp; Ger mu theo</td>
<td>1 FL &amp; 1 other opt tool</td>
<td>opt tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D. mu ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. comp</td>
<td></td>
<td>opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cond</td>
<td></td>
<td>opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td></td>
<td>opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>musicol</td>
<td>Ger &amp; 1 FL</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Stu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
<td>1 or 2 FL</td>
<td>p 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mu theo</td>
<td>Ger</td>
<td>(Ger, Fr, It,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>or Sp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stgs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>winds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>musicol</td>
<td>Ger &amp; 1 FL</td>
<td>Dept Memo;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>comp/</td>
<td>2 FL or</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>theo</td>
<td>2 FL or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mus ed</td>
<td>2 res tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pf</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>org</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clar</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trpt</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>D.A.</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p 69;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri, Kansas City (Conserv. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>mu hist &amp; lit 2 FL</td>
<td>1 FL or comp sc</td>
<td>84-86 Gen Ca pp 243, 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>mus ed none</td>
<td>opt</td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>D.M.E.</td>
<td>mu ed none</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Cat p 183; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>D.A.</td>
<td>mu hist &amp; lit 1 FL &amp; 1 opt FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>mu ed none</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept Memo; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>vo perf Ger, Fr, It</td>
<td>comp 1 opt FL or res tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cho cond 1 opt FL or res tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Bu p 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>perf 1 FL, pref Ger</td>
<td>vo Fr, Ger, &amp; It prof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed 1 FL, pref Ger</td>
<td>mu hist &amp; muship 1 FL, pref Ger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comp 1 FL, pref Ger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Pacific</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>83 NASM Di p 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res</td>
<td>tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. mu ed</td>
<td>&quot;variable&quot; FL, stat, or comp sc</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu pp G14, G96; Doc Gui p l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. comp</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pf ped</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. musicol</td>
<td>Ger &amp; 1 FL Fr, It, or Lat</td>
<td>84 Campus Me 83-84 Gr Bu p 227; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. mu theo</td>
<td>Ger &amp; 1 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cho mu</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ch mu</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. mu ed</td>
<td>2 FL or 1 FL &amp; comp</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu lang or stat p 42, 94-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.E. mu ed</td>
<td>none (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. perf</td>
<td>1 FL (Fr, Ger, or It)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; ped</td>
<td>or comp lang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s) Required</td>
<td>FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin (Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D. musical/ethnomu Ger &amp; Fr mu theo Ger &amp; Fr mu ed 2 FL or Ger &amp; sta</td>
<td>82 FL Req fo Gr Stu p 1; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A. perf comp</td>
<td>Fr, It, Sp, Port, opt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mus ed</td>
<td>comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| University of Utah (Dept. of Mus.) | Ph.D. comp mu ed | 1 FL opt | 83 NASM Dir p 113; 83-84 Gr Sch Bu no response |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Washington (Sch. of Mus.)</th>
<th>Ph.D. Ger &amp; 1 FL (Fr, It, Lat, 82-84 Bu or other appr p 110; FL) pers note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Madison (Sch. of Mus.)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Div. of Mus.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mu ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; lit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX D

DOCTORAL FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS IN THEOLOGY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; school</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Required FL</th>
<th>Alt res tools</th>
<th>Source(s) of info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover Newton Theological</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>&quot;yes&quot;</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>83 Joint Pr Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degr Req Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL (Ger &amp; Fr)</td>
<td>Sp subst if res related</td>
<td>Gr Stu Hdbk pp 7-8; 83-84 Gr Bu p 157; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Theology</td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Fr</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>insuf info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Candler Sch. of Theol.)</td>
<td>S.T.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td>none(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Lat, Koine Ger, Fr &amp; Ger or other FL (4 FL)</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dept. of Theol.)</td>
<td>S.T.D.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>other FLs, as for masters' degr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td>Lat &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOCTORAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS IN THEOLOGY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution &amp; school</th>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Required PL</th>
<th>Alt res tools</th>
<th>Source(s) of info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 PL or</td>
<td>1 PL &amp; stat, PhD Progr Br ch comp sc, or p 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Seminary Seminex</td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont School of Theology</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ger or Fr &amp; stat or res 83-84 Bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td>none(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>p 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Theological Seminary</td>
<td>S.T.D.</td>
<td>none(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Co Sem Va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td>none(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia Seminary Theological School</td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td>Heb, Koine, Lat, 1 mod</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PL (pref Ger)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew University Theological School</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Fr Heb, Koine, 83-85 Bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td>med Lat opt pp 130f; Reg Gr Sch pp 6-9; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University Divinity School</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 FL, Ger &amp; Fr or Heb, Lat or Gr</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel College of Victoria University</td>
<td>PhD &amp; Th.D. theology Heb, Gr, Fr, &amp; Ger bible ch hist pastoral D.Min. none</td>
<td>83-84 Sch Theo Bu pp 30-35; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>DT Gr (NT majors) other FLs as useful</td>
<td>84-85 Gr Cat pp 85, 60-61 Gr Stu Hdbk pp 1, 4, 8-11; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2 anc 6/or mod FL or &quot;equiv tools&quot;</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Pro in Rel &amp; Theo pp 10-11, 21 23; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>83-84 Bu p (?) Appl f Th.D. P ogr pers note</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Theological Seminary</td>
<td>PhD &amp; Th.D.</td>
<td>1 mod FL</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-85 Gr The Cat pp 39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University Divinity School</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>varies with programs</td>
<td>Fr or Ger &amp; 1 FL (Lat, Gr, or Heb)</td>
<td>83-84 Bu pp 20-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliff School of Theology</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-denominational Theological Center</td>
<td>S.T.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>opt Heb &amp; Gr</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox College</td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Sch Theo Bu; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago</td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Fr Heb, Gr, Sanscr</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans Baptist</td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td>bibl st Heb, Gr, &amp; 1 FL (Lat Fr, or Ger)</td>
<td>83-84 Bu p 89; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Seminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>theol &amp; hist st &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EdD none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min. none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins School of</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>bibl st 4 FL &quot;as approved&quot;</td>
<td>83-84 Ded Col Bu pp 216-217; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td>others 2 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min. none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Ph.D. ch hist, Ger &amp; Fr others</td>
<td>O T: Heb, Gr, Ugar or Aram N T: Heb, Gr, &amp; 1 FL (Syr, Lat, or Copt) theolog &amp; prea: Heb &amp; Gr ear ch hist: Gr &amp; Lat med ch hist: Lat ref ch hist: Lat</td>
<td>83-84 PhD C t Su pp 4, 5; pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis College</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>83-84 To Sch Theo Bu pp 31-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary of the Lake Seminary</td>
<td>S.T.D. &quot;variable&quot; Lat, Koine, Pers letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min. none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s) Required</td>
<td>FL Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Ph.D. &amp; Th.D.</td>
<td>FLs &quot;as necessary&quot;</td>
<td>84 Bu p 25;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.S.T. &amp; D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr Theo Un Bu p ?;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Baptist Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Lat or subst FL</td>
<td>82-84 So Ba Th Sem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(other Bibl FL for adm)</td>
<td>p 31, 41 no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Baptist Theological</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Bu no response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College Faculty of Divinity</td>
<td>Th.D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 To Sch Theo Bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp 29-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Evangelical Divinity School</td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td>pers letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Miss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Fr</td>
<td>opt anc FLs</td>
<td>83-84 Cat pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>old test</td>
<td>Ger, Fr,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gr, Aram,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; 1 FL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ugar, Arcad, or Arab)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new test</td>
<td>Ger, Fr,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koine &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Theological Seminary in Virginia</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Bu; pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago Divinity School</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>bibl</td>
<td>Gr &amp; Heb</td>
<td>pers letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>others</td>
<td>Ger &amp; Fr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other FLs opt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 anc FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1 FL</td>
<td>(relev in ma field)</td>
<td>83-84 Gr Bu p 24; no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Michael's College</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fac. of Theol.)</td>
<td>Th.D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution &amp; school</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Required FL</td>
<td>Alt res tools</td>
<td>Source(s) of info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University Divinity School</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Fr &amp; Ger &amp; as nec (Lat, Gr, Heb, etc)</td>
<td>p 43, 47, 50</td>
<td>no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td>FLs as nec in progr</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycliffe College</td>
<td>Th.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83-84 Bu pp 30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

PERSONAL LETTERS SENT TO DEANS
AND CHAIRMEN IN EDUCATION
January 23, 1984

This is a request for information about the foreign language proficiency requirements for doctoral degrees in your school. We have your current graduate bulletin, but we would like to know if you may also have a departmental handbook or information sheet outlining your foreign language requirements in greater detail.

We are particularly interested in knowing how foreign language proficiency requirements differ with each doctoral degree (Ed.D., Ph.D.) and how they differ in different areas, such as educational administration, curriculum, comparative education, etc. Are alternate research tools accepted?

I would appreciate greatly if you or your secretary would let me know whether your foreign language requirements are fully explained in your official bulletin(s) or in a special departmental handbook. If not, could you refer me to a member of your staff with whom I might correspond to get this information? Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Aurelia Rae Holman

(1) The foreign language requirements for our doctoral degrees are fully explained in our ___________ bulletin for 19____-____, pp. __________.

(2) We are sending you additional information regarding our foreign language requirements for the doctorate (yes____; no____).

(3) In order to obtain the information you are requesting, you may contact:
APPENDIX F

PERSONAL LETTERS SENT TO DEANS AND CHAIRMEN IN BUSINESS
January 16, 1984

This is a request for information about the foreign language proficiency requirements for doctoral degrees in your school. We have your current bulletin, but we would like to know if you may also have a departmental handbook or information sheet outlining your foreign language requirements in greater detail.

We are particularly interested in knowing how foreign language proficiency requirements (if any) differ with each doctoral degree (D.B.A., Ph.D., etc.) and how they differ in different areas, such as administration and management, accounting, business education, etc.

I would appreciate greatly if you or your secretary would let me know whether your foreign language requirements are fully explained in your official bulletin(s) or in a special departmental handbook. If not, could you refer me to a member of your staff with whom I might correspond to get this information? Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Aurelia Rae Holman

(1) The foreign language requirements for our doctoral degrees are fully explained in our ____________ bulletin for 19___-___, pp. ____________.

(2) We are sending you additional information regarding our foreign language requirements for the doctorate (yes____; no______).

(3) In order to obtain the information you are requesting, you may contact:
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APPENDIX G

PERSONAL LETTERS SENT TO DEANS
AND CHAIRMEN IN MUSIC
January 10, 1984

This is a request for information about the foreign language proficiency requirements for doctoral degrees in your school. We have your current graduate bulletin, but we would like to know if you may also have a departmental handbook or information sheet outlining your foreign language requirements in greater detail.

We are particularly interested in knowing how your foreign language proficiency requirements differ with each doctoral degree (Ph.D., D.Mus.Ed., etc.) and how they differ in different areas, such as musicology, music theory, music education, and performance (voice, keyboard), etc.

I would appreciate greatly if you or your secretary would let me know whether your foreign language requirements are fully explained in your official bulletin(s) or in a special departmental handbook. If not, could you refer me to a member of your staff with whom I might correspond to get this information? Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Aurelia Rae Holman

(1) The foreign language requirements for our doctoral degrees are fully explained in our ____________ bulletin for 19____–____, pp. ________.  

(2) We are sending you additional information regarding our foreign language requirements for the doctorate (yes____; no____).

(3) In order to obtain the information you are requesting, you may contact:
APPENDIX H

PERSONAL LETTERS SENT TO DEANS
AND CHAIRMEN IN THEOLOGY
January 16, 1984

This is a request for information about the foreign language proficiency requirements for doctoral degrees in your school. We have your current bulletin but we would like to know if you may also have a departmental handbook or information sheet outlining your foreign language requirements in greater detail.

We are particularly interested in knowing how your foreign language proficiency requirements differ with each doctoral degree (Ph.D., Th.D., D.Min., etc.) and how they differ in different areas, such as New Testament, Old Testament, Church History, etc.

I would appreciate greatly if you or your secretary would let me know whether your foreign language requirements are fully explained in your official bulletin or in a special departmental handbook. If not, could you refer me to a member of your staff with whom I might correspond to get this information? Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Aurelia Rae Holman

(1) The foreign language requirements for our doctoral degrees are fully explained in our bulletin for 19___-___, pp._____________.

(2) We are sending you additional information regarding our foreign language requirements for the doctorate (yes_____; no_______).

(3) In order to obtain the information you are requesting, you may contact:
APPENDIX I

COVER LETTER SENT TO EVALUATORS
OF RATIONALE
15 November 1984

The enclosed paper is part of a study undertaken to develop guidelines for establishing reasonably consistent foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees within four selected professional disciplines. The intention has been—on the basis of current requirements in accredited professional schools offering doctorates—to develop guidelines that are uniform and still sufficiently flexible to suggest appropriate application and implementation as conditions and circumstances vary.

The study has included current foreign-language practices in institutional member schools and departments in the accrediting associations in education (NCATE), business (AACSB), music (NASM), and theology (ATS). We appreciate greatly your kindness in answering our inquiry in January.

The enclosed paper is sent to a randomly selected small group of administrators for evaluation. It will probably take you about fifteen minutes to read it through. I recognize that you have a very busy schedule and I hope I am not making unreasonable demands on your time. However, I would be most grateful to receive your evaluation. It only calls for your personal comments. Your input will be reflected in the revised rationale. Confidentiality is assured. Thank you very much.

Cordially yours,

Aurelia Rae Holman

arh
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APPENDIX J

PANEL OF EVALUATORS
PANEL OF EVALUATORS

Dr. Dwayne L. DeMedie
Professor of Curriculum
College of Education
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606

Dr. Milton L. Ferguson, Dean
College of Education
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA 70148

Dr. Richard Wisniewski, Dean
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37966-3400

Dr. Robert Dailey
School of Business
Tulane University
New Orleans, LA 70118

Dr. Norma Maine Loeser, Dean
School of Government and Business Administration
George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052

Dr. Richard S. Savich, Director
Doctoral Program
Graduate School of Business Administration
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1421

Dr. Francis D. Tuggle, Dean
Jesse H. Jones Graduate School of Administration
Rice University
P. O. Box 1892
Houston, TX 77257

Dr. Warren George, Acting Dean
College-Conservatory of Music
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45221
Dr. Harold Luce, Chairman  
Department of Music  
Texas Tech University  
Lubbock, TX  79409

Dr. Allan Ross, Director  
School of Music  
University of Oklahoma  
Norman, OK  73019

Dr. Charles H. Webb, Dean  
School of Music  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN  47401

Dr. H. Jackson Forstman, Dean  
Divinity School  
Vanderbilt University  
Nashville, TN  37240

Dr. Heinz Guenther  
Director for Advanced Degree Studies  
Emmanuel College of Victoria University  
75 Queen's Park Crescent, East  
Toronto, Ontario  M5S 1K7  
Canada

Dr. William L. Hendricks  
Director of Graduate Studies  
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary  
2825 Lexington Road  
Louisville, KY  40280

Dr. James A. Kirk, Director  
Joint Ph.D. Program  
Iliff School of Theology  
2201 South University Boulevard  
Denver, CO  80210

Dr. Wolfgang Roth, Dean  
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary  
2121 Sheridan Road  
Evanston, IL  60201
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Preamble to the Rationale

Current foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in American universities and professional schools differ greatly in different disciplines and vary considerably from one university to another. The language requirements within a particular discipline are often so diversified that for many professional degrees--such as the Ph.D. degree in education, the D.M.A., Mus.D., and Ph.D. degrees in music, and the Ph.D., S.T.D., and D.Min. degrees in theology (religion)--there is no national consensus and it is often difficult to ascertain what is generally expected of undergraduate and graduate students preparing to eventually pursue doctoral studies.

Foreign-language study and general academic language requirements in the United States have changed drastically over the past century and a half. While language study used to be central to collegiate education--as it still is in Europe and other parts of the world--a situation has developed in American education in which foreign-language requirements have been virtually abolished in many disciplines. This has been considered appropriate and practical in the view of many professionals; but it has also been contended that, as a result of his general lack of foreign-language competence, the mono-lingual American businessman is at a decided disadvantage when competing with his multi-lingual Japanese and European counterpart in the international markets and that the contributions of American scholars are often inferior to what they might have been.¹

Many studies have been conducted over the past fifty years in order to document and measure the gradual relaxation of foreign-language requirements and to trace the changing attitudes to language study in the United States. Many have deplored the decreasing foreign-language competence of American professionals. Others have been concerned over artificial and burdensome general foreign-language requirements which in many cases have been "out-of-step with reasonable practicality" and thought to hinder rather than help in the pursuit of advanced professional studies. According to the 1979 report of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, "Americans' incompetence in foreign languages is nothing short of scandalous." In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education called for reinstatement and strengthening of foreign-language requirements in American secondary schools and in higher education.

In the present study an attempt has been made to establish a rationale for foreign-language requirements for doctoral degrees in professional disciplines. In order to narrow the topic and make the study manageable, the study has been limited to the fields of education, business, music, and theology. The disciplines were selected so as to represent two areas from among those which traditionally require considerable language proficiency (music and theology) and two from those which in the United States usually do not require a broad language background (education and business).

---

1 The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, *Strength Through Wisdom*, p. 5.


3 A "rationale" is a reasoned theory or the fundamental logical principles accounting for the why and how of an action or a practice or process. It gives guidelines with accompanying reasons. The guidelines suggest appropriate application and implementation as conditions or circumstances vary. A rationale is contrasted to a "model" or "pattern," to which all applications are attempting to conform.
In the process of establishing a comprehensive rationale for doctoral foreign-language requirements in American educational institutions, this study has involved (1) tracing the factors contributing to the changing of attitudes to and practices in language study affecting foreign-language requirements in American colleges and universities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; (2) comparing American language study and requirements with those in European countries; and (3) correlating current professional needs with current attitudes to foreign-language study in the American institutions offering doctorates in the fields of education, business, music, and theology.

While the proposed rationale arrived at is reflecting what has been and what is currently being done, it attempts in addition to serve as a guide as to what might in the future reasonably and profitably be expected and done. The rationale is specifically addressing the language situation found in education, business, music, and theology, but it is hoped that through generalization it might be helpful in other disciplines as well.
The Rationale

(1) In the United States, the need for and the usefulness of a foreign-language competence differ greatly from one professional discipline to another. While some disciplines require and make practical use of several foreign languages, others—including education and business—often appear to be in need of none. In Europe, in contrast, it is unthinkable for a teacher, a businessman, an engineer, etc., to be mono-lingual. As English has become the dominant international language of the world, increasingly larger numbers of American students receive little or no foreign-language instruction during their elementary, secondary, and college years. Doctoral foreign-language requirements in the United States are inserted in the doctoral curriculum because—unlike in other countries—there is no assurance that a foreign-language proficiency has been achieved on the elementary, secondary, or undergraduate level of study.

While it is desirable that most Americans—like the younger citizens of most European and other highly developed nations—be proficient in more than one language, it is hardly realistic to expect all or most Americans to become bilingual or multi-lingual. In certain professional disciplines, however, the lack of a foreign-language proficiency will seriously limit the mono-lingual individual. It is therefore reasonable to expect individuals preparing for professional careers to develop foreign-language competences that are utilitarian and commensurate with the needs of the disciplines and the areas of specialization under consideration.
(2) A thorough working knowledge in the use of one or more foreign languages is often needed by students working on doctoral degrees outside the fields of languages. It is needed for several purposes, among which are

a. reading, translating, and interpreting source materials written in different languages in the subject area(s) of the dissertation

b. checking and verifying professional literature connected with the subject area(s) of the dissertation

c. understanding the general or professional background of the area(s) of study for a degree

d. allowing for international travel and communication, making it possible to obtain materials needed and discussing them with professionals and others abroad

e. gaining a general insight into the literature of and literary, cultural, and related professional developments in other countries and cultures

f. enabling a professional to work and study outside the United States
(3) The number of foreign languages to be required will vary from discipline to discipline and from degree to degree, and it is related to the following factors:

a. the number of foreign languages involved and needed in the specific disciplines studied for the doctorate

b. the number of foreign languages needed for the general subject area and the topic of the dissertation

(4) When specific languages are required in a doctoral program, the requirement(s) should reflect:

a. the languages commonly used in the student's general discipline

b. the languages customarily needed in the student's general area of specialization

c. languages needed for adequately working with the topic of the dissertation

(5) The function of doctoral foreign-language proficiency requirements is to provide:

a. a language competence that assures facility in the understanding and use of technical language and terminology within a specific professional discipline

b. ability to read and understand general materials commonly used within a discipline

c. ability to be unencumbered if and when there is foreign-language work associated with the dissertation
(6) The degree of foreign-language competence (proficiency) to be required for a doctoral degree—when needed within a program of study—depends on several factors, among which are

a. the amount of professional literature and other foreign-language materials written or otherwise available and used within the discipline or the general area of study for the specific degree

b. the amount of foreign-language source material written and needed in the area of the dissertation

c. the nature of the foreign-language involvement in the dissertation

d. the need to understand the non-American cultural background or professional developments within the discipline

e. the extent to which representative or pertinent foreign-language materials in the discipline have not been and are not currently being translated into English

(7) Foreign languages are among many tools customarily used to facilitate study within professional disciplines. In some disciplines, foreign languages are essential in transmitting basic concepts and subject materials. In others, they are not. Tools needed and to be used—depending on discipline and area of concentration—may include

a. foreign languages

b. statistics
c. computer science (computer languages)

d. mathematics

e. analytic techniques

f. history and documentary methods (historical methods)

g. philosophy

h. law

i. other tools

(8) Foreign-language requirements for a degree should serve specific purposes and should be divided into (1) general requirements, appropriate and needed for all students in a specific discipline in a specific institution (e.g., music, theology), (2) general requirements appropriate for an area within a discipline (e.g., musicology, New Testament theology, comparative education, international business), and (3) specific requirements, appropriate and necessary for a particular research field or dissertation topic (e.g., "Religious Non-linguistic languages or tools should not be used as substitutes for university-wide foreign-language requirements in disciplines where foreign languages are commonly needed and used for professional purposes. Other professional tools should be acquired in addition to needed general foreign-language competences.

1Non-linguistic languages or tools should not be used as substitutes for university-wide foreign-language requirements in disciplines where foreign languages are commonly needed and used for professional purposes. Other professional tools should be acquired in addition to needed general foreign-language competences.
education in Japan; "Recurring melodic motives in the dance-songs of Norway;" etc.).

(9) General foreign-language studies, in disciplines where needed and required, should be completed before entering specialized graduate studies, and general foreign-language requirements should be met before acceptance into a doctoral program in order for the language competence to serve as a practical and useful tool. The acquisition of a needed basic foreign language competence should not detract from advanced specialized studies within a professional discipline.

(10) General foreign-language requirements within specific disciplines should normally be set by individual departments within the framework of the overall policies of a particular school (college) and university. Specific foreign-language requirements should be personalized according to the needs within the area of study and the dissertation topic. They should be set by or in consultation with appropriate doctoral committees. General blanket requirements by a school or institution may not always be in the best interest of individual departments.

---

2In many professional disciplines, the knowledge of one or more foreign languages is a fundamental prerequisite for professional competence. For example, a doctoral theology student in a Catholic university would be educationally and professionally crippled without the knowledge of Latin and—considering the vast amount of professional source materials and literature found in German in musicology—any musicologist is severely limited professionally without a working knowledge of German, regardless of field of musicological specialization. Language competence in special instances need to be established on an individual basis.
General foreign-language requirements should be administered in accordance with established institutional and departmental policy; and specific requirements should be adequately representing the needs of individual research areas and topics. Unique characteristics of an institution may historically mandate specific language requirements.

Notes on the Rationale

Purposes for Doctoral Foreign-Language Requirements

The primary purpose for having foreign-language requirements on the doctoral level in professional disciplines is to assure the possession of language skills needed for scholarly work in a doctoral student's area of professional specialization. The function of doctoral foreign-language requirements is not primarily to provide "culture". Rather, it is to aid in the student's program of advanced studies and in the preparation of the dissertation; and foreign-language competence is to assist in post-doctoral study and research.

It is desirable and expected, however, that doctors in professional fields--like doctors in "academic" fields--will be knowledgeable in terms of the history, literature, social and philosophical environment, and mores of other nations and past civilizations, as well as in their own national and ethnic background. But such a cultural linguistic background should be separated from specialized studies on the doctoral level.
Appropriate Time to Study Foreign Languages and Fulfill Requirements

Experience has shown that individuals learn foreign languages more quickly at an early age. Therefore, general foreign-language studies should begin in elementary school or at least no later than in secondary school. A general language proficiency should in most cases be acquired before entering graduate studies. General foreign-language requirements for a doctorate should be met before acceptance into a doctoral program of study. Special language skills needed for a unique research task, on the other hand, might under certain circumstances be made part of the doctoral program.

Acquiring Tools Needed for Research and Study in Professional Disciplines

The intellectual integrity of an educational institution may to some degree be measured by the way needed professional competences are built through the systematic acquisition of special skills and use of research tools. In applied professional fields where foreign languages are not commonly used, tools such as computer science, statistics, and others may be essential. Often, foreign-language skills are combined with other research tools. However, whether foreign languages are used extensively in a professional discipline or not, language competence is a profitable tool useful for better understanding the world in which academic professionals work and live.

It has been suggested that lack of language proficiency is reflected in certain "attitudes," which tend to prevent "scholarly development." It is recommended that foreign languages be learned sufficiently early so they will become utilitarian, facilitating the reaching of graduate academic goals.

The Number of Foreign Languages To Be Required

Inasmuch as the amount of pertinent professional literature and other materials in foreign languages customarily used for research varies greatly from one professional discipline to another, the use of foreign languages as study and research tools need to be established within each discipline and area of
specialization or concentration. The general and specific foreign-language tool requirements for a professional degree and area of specialization will usually be different from the foreign-language expectations serving general cultural purposes.

Degree of Language Proficiency Required

The term "language proficiency" is vague and relative, as it is difficult to define what constitutes being "proficient" except in relationship to what is needed for a particular task or purpose. Measuring foreign-language acquisition and proficiency in terms of college credit or years of study will produce little uniformity. In 1979, however, the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies asserted that "four years is considered a minimum prerequisite for usable language competence."¹

Inasmuch as foreign-language proficiency or competence must be established in relationship to the need for accomplishing a specific task, proficiency levels must be established for specific purposes or functions within each institution requiring a foreign-language proficiency in various professional fields. The proficiency level required must match the purposes for which it is required. A general foreign-language requirement will normally demand less competence than what is expected from a scholar doing intensive research within the same language area.

Proficiency levels should normally be set by individual departments in cooperation with the agency or agencies teaching the foreign languages, such as the ancient/modern languages departments of a university. Detailed departmental handbooks outlining the specifics of the foreign-language preparation required for individual degrees, general areas, and specializations must be made available to prospective students.

¹The President's Commission, Strength Through Wisdom, p. 1.
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Bettman, James R., Director, Ph.D. Program; Duke University, Fuqua School of Business; 25 January 1984.

Birch, Eleanor, Associate Dean; University of Iowa, College of Business Administration; 20 January 1984.

Blatt, Burton, Dean; Syracuse University, School of Education; 30 January 1984.

Blumenfeld, Harold; Washington University, Department of Music; 13 January, 1984.

Bock, Robert H., Dean; University of Wisconsin at Madison, School of Business; 25 January 1984.

Borthwick, Paul, Chairman; Delta State University, Division of Curriculum and Instruction; 25 January 1984.

Bosworth, Kathleen, Graduate Counselor; Louisiana State University, College of Business Administration; 20 January 1984.

Brais, Joanne, Administrative Secretary; McGill University, Faculty of Religious Studies; 6 February 1984.

Brandt, Richard M., Dean; University of Virginia, Curry Memorial School of Education; 31 January 1984.

Bryant, Cathie, Secretary to the Dean; Western Kentucky College of Education; 25 January 1984.

Buchner, Howard W., Dean Emeritus; Trinity College, Toronto; 1 February 1984.

Bunch, Barbara, Associate Dean; Memphis State University College of Education; 27 January 1984.

Burkhalter, S. Brian, Administrative Director; Columbia University, Graduate School of Business; 21 February 1984.
Buttram, Director; University of Kentucky, School of Music; 13 January 1984.

Cain, Edmund, Dean; University of Nevada at Reno, College of Education; 27 January 1984.

Cain, Leo F., Coordinator, Joint Doctoral Programs; San Francisco State University; 30 January 1984.

Campbell, Dennis M., Dean; Duke University, Divinity School; 20 January 1984.

Carroll, Mary Ann; Indiana State University, School of Education; 25 January 1984.

Cassidy, Bernard J., Dean; St. John's University, School of Education and Human Services; 6 February 1984.

Chaffee, Leonard M., Dean; Wichita State University, College of Education; 26 January 1984.

Chambers, Jeanne, Academic Advisor; University of California at Santa Barbara, Graduate School of Education; 26 January 1984.

Cobb, Sharon, Doctoral Counselor; Georgia State University, College of Business Administration; 23 January 1984.

Colclough, Colleen, Ph.D. Programme Secretary; University of British Columbia, Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration; 25 January 1984.

Collins, S. Mary, Chairperson; Catholic University of America, Department of Religion and Religious Education; 31 January 1984.

Colton, David L., Dean; University of New Mexico, College of Education; 31 January 1984.

Connelly, Sylvia, Secretary to the Dean; Andover Newton Theological School; 27 January 1984.

Cross, Frank, Head Adviser; Oregon State University, School of Education; 27 January, 1984.

Crump, W. Donald, Associate Dean; University of Alabama, College of Education; 25 January 1984.

Davis, James, Director; University of Denver, School of Education; 2 February 1984.
DeRoche, Edward R., Dean; University of San Diego, School of Education; 25 January 1984.

Dixon, David N., Coordinator of Doctoral Studies in Education; University of Nebraska at Lincoln, Teachers College; 30 January 1984.

Doi, James I., Dean; University of Washington, College of Education; 26 January 1984.

Dow, I. I., Director; University of Ottawa, Faculty of Education; 30 January 1984.

Dunn-Rankin, Peter, Associate Dean; University of Hawaii at Manoa, College of Education; 30 January 1984.

Dye, Charles M., Director, Graduate Studies in Education; University of Akron, College of Education; 27 January 1984.

Ehlen, Judith R., Administrative Secretary; Northeastern University, College of Business Administration; 26 January 1984.

Elsaid, Hussein, Director of Doctoral Programs; Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, College of Business and Administration; 9 February 1984.

Fedyszyn, Billie, Academic Affairs Administrative Assistant; Old Dominion University; 30 January 1984.

Fenhagen, James C., Dean; General Theological Seminary; 21 January 1984.

Fletcher, Arlene, Administrative Assistant; University of New York at Buffalo; 31 January 1984.

Ford, John T., Associate Professor; Catholic University of America, School of Religious Studies; 25 January 1984.

Forstman, H. Jackson, Dean; Vanderbilt University, Divinity School; 17 February 1984.

Fradin, Florence, Assistant Dean; State University of New York at Buffalo; 31 January, 1984.

Franzen, William, Dean; University of Missouri at St. Louis, School of Education, 26 January 1984.

Freeland, J. R., Director, Doctoral Programs; University of Virginia, Colgate Darden Graduate School of Business Administration; 25 January 1984.
Freeman, Robert, Director; University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music; 13 January 1984.

Gant, James L., Dean; Florida State University, College of Education; 2 February 1984.

Gardner, James H., Dean; University of Utah, Graduate School of Business; 2 February, 1984.


Godfrey, Rollin, Director of Graduate Studies; University of South Carolina, College of Education; 11 February 1984.

Gordon, Stewart, Chairman; University of Maryland, Department of Music; 12 January 1984.

Graham, Louise, Program Coordinator; University of Manitoba, Faculty of Education; 3 February 1984.

Grandpre, Roland G., Dean; University of Manitoba, Faculty of Administrative Studies; 1 February 1984.

Grosjean, Yasuko M., Administrative Assistant to the Dean; Drew University, Graduate School; 20 January 1984.

Grubbs, John W., Director of Graduate Studies; University of Texas at Austin, Department of Music; 16 January 1984.

Guenther, Heinz, Director for Advanced Degrees Studies; Emmanuel College, Toronto; 24 January 1984.

Guy, George V.; Portland State University, School of Education; 30 January 1984.

Hached, A.; University of Wisconsin at Madison, School of Music; 17 January 1984.

Hackbarth, Steven; University of Southern California, School of Education; 3 February, 1984.

Haley, L. E., Chairman; Dalhousie University, Department of Education; 1 February, 1984.

Hamreus, Dale G., Dean; United States International University, School of Education; 16 February 1984.
Hanshumaker, James, Associate Director; University of Southern California, School of Music; 18 January 1984.

Harris, M., Director of Doctoral Studies; Northwestern University, J. L. Kellogg Graduate School of Management; 27 January 1984.

Hassey, Joseph C., Dean; Trinity Evangelical Divinity School; 1 February 1984.

High, Joseph; School of Theology at Claremont; 24 January 1984.

Hill, John D., Assistant Director; University of Iowa, School of Music; 23 January 1984.

Hook, James G., Associate Dean; University of Wyoming, College of Education; 30 January 1984.

Hoopes, Janet, Chairman; Bryn Mawr College, Department of Education; 25 January 1984.

Hunt, Constance F., Secretary to Associate Dean for Ph.D. Studies; University of Chicago, Graduate School of Business; 19 January 1984.


Irvine, John M., Director of Student Services; San Francisco Theological Seminary; 30 January 1984.

Jacoby, Philip, Acting Associate Dean; American University, Kogod College of Business Administration; 31 January 1984.

Jaffee, Bruce L., Chairperson, Doctoral Programs in Business; Indiana University, School of Business; 31 January 1984.

Jarvis, Oscar T., Dean; University of the Pacific, School of Education; 14 February 1984.

Jay, Stephen, Dean; Cleveland Institute of Music; 9 February 1984.

Jenkins, Roger L., Associate Dean; University of Tennessee, College of Business Administration; 10 February 1984.

Johansen, John H., Dean; Northern Illinois University, College of Education; 27 January, 1984.
Jones, Gardner M., Associate Dean for Administration; Michigan State University, Graduate School of Business Administration, 24 January 1984.

Juell, Mary A., Graduate Student Assistant; University of California at Berkeley, School of Education; 31 January 1984.

Kapel, D. E., Associate Dean; University of Louisville, School of Education; 27 January 1984.


Kearns, William, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies; University of Colorado at Boulder, College of Music; 17 January 1984.

Kellner, Ann W., Administrative Assistant; Northeastern University, Office of the Provost; 13 February 1984.

Kiefer, David E., Assistant to the Provost; Fuller Theological Seminary; 24 January 1984.

Kirby, James E., Dean; Southern Methodist University, Perkins School of Theology; 20 January 1984.

Klitz, B., Director of Graduate Studies; University of Connecticut, Department of Music; 25 January 1984.

Koff, Robert, Dean; State University of New York at Albany, School of Education; 2 February 1984.

Kofoid, Charles, Dean; Indiana University of Pennsylvania, School of Education; 27 January 1984.

Kohl, John, Dean; Montana State University, School of Education; 1 February 1984.


Koriath, Kirby L., Coordinator, Graduate Programs in Music; Ball State University, College of Fine Arts and Applied Arts; 18 January 1984.

Kracht, James B., Chair, Graduate Programs; Texas A & M University, Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction; 6 February 1984.

Krampf, Robert F.; Kent State University, College of Business Administration; 20 January 1984.
Kuhn, Terry Lee, Coordinator of Graduate Studies; Kent State University, School of Music; 14 January 1984.

LaForce, J. Clayburn, Jr., University of California at Los Angeles, Graduate School of Management; 26 January 1984.

Laird, Helen L., Dean; Temple University, College of Music; 30 January 1984.

Lamkin, Bill D., Dean; Baylor University, School of Education; 31 January 1984.

Lamone, Rudolph P., Dean; University of Maryland, College of Business and Management; 28 January 1984.

Lanzillotti, Robert F., Dean; University of Florida, Graduate School of Business Administration; 23 January 1984.

Latham, William P., Director, Graduate Studies in Music; North Texas State University, School of Music; 20 January 1984.

Lehman, Paul; University of Michigan, School of Music, 19 January 1984.

Lewis, James W., Dean of Students; University of Chicago, Divinity School; 19 January 1984.

Liberman, Fredric, Director; University of Washington, School of Music; 17 January 1984.

Lievano, R. J., Associate Dean; University of New Mexico, Robert O. Anderson School and Graduate School of Management; 1 February 1984.

Lili, W. Lurie [?]; University of South Carolina, College of Business Administration; 26 January 1984.

Linscome, Sanford A., Coordinator of Graduate Studies; University of Northern Colorado, College of Performing and Visual Arts; 17 January 1984.

Lowe, Donald R., Director of Graduate Studies; University of Georgia, School of Music; 19 January 1984.

Luce, Harold, Chairman; Texas Tech University, Department of Music; 18 January 1984.

Lynn, Robert A., Dean; Kansas State University, College of Business Administration; 18 January 1984.
McCord, James I.; Retired President; Princeton Theological Seminary; 20 January 1984.

McCreery, Ronald, Chairman; University of Southern Mississippi, School of Music; 20 January 1984.

McKenry, Carl E. S., Acting Dean; University of Miami, School of Business Administration; 30 January 1984.

McNew, Ben B., Dean; Middle Tennessee State University, School of Business; 24 January 1984.

Magestro, Patricia, Chairperson; Cardinal Stritch College, Education Department; 27 January 1984.

Martin, Thomas J., Assistant Dean; Marquette University, School of Education; no date.

Marx, George L., Assistant Provost for Education; University of Maryland, College of Education; 27 January 1984.

Mathiesen Tomas J., Head, Musicology Area; Brigham Young University, Department of Music; 18 January 1984.

May, William F., Dean; New York University, Graduate School of Business Administration; 30 January 1984.

Mehaffie, [?]; Texas Tech University, College of Education; 31 January 1984.

Merrill, Lindsey, Dean; University of Missouri at Kansas City, Conservatory of Music; 29 January 1984.

Messer, Donald E., President; Iliff School of Theology; 2 March 1984.

Miller, James O., Director; Emory University, Division of Educational Studies; 27 January 1984.

Miller, John K., Associate Dean for Graduate Studies; University of Rochester, Graduate School of Education and Human Development; 2 February 1984.

Miller, W. R., Director of Graduate Studies in Education; University of Missouri at Columbia, College of Education; 27 January 1984.

Millette [?], Michel, Vice Dean, Assistant for Academic Studies; Universite de Montreal, Faculte des Sciences de l'Education; 30 January 1984.
Misiolek, Walter S., Associate Professor of Economics; University of Alabama; 14 February 1984.

Miskel, [?], Dean; University of Utah, Graduate School of Education; 2 February 1984.

Mixter, Keith E., Chairman, Graduate Studies in Music; Ohio State University, School of Music; 23 January 1984.

Monahan, William G., Dean; West Virginia University, College of Human Resources and Education; 15 February 1984.

Monet, Jacques, President; Regis College, Toronto; 27 January 1984.

Moody, William J., Chairman; University of South Carolina, Department of Music; 27 January 1984.

Moore, Arnold, Dean; Mississippi State University, College of Education; no date.

Mull [?], P. N.; Lehigh University, School of Education; 26 January 1984.

Muro, James J., Dean; North Texas State University, College of Education; 31 January 1984.

Murray, Frank B., Dean; University of Delaware, College of Education; 26 January, 1984.

Muse, William V., Dean; Texas A & M University, College of Business Administration; 3 February 1984.

Myers, Allen, Dean; Ohio University, College of Education; 6 February 1984.

Neal, Bart C., Director of Admissions and Registrar, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary; 10 February 1984.

Nestor, Oscar W., Director, Doctoral Programs; Pace University, Doctoral Programs; 27 January, 1984.

Niemi, Albert W., Jr., Acting Dean; University of Georgia, College of Business Administration; 19 January 1984.


Nunnery, Michael Y., Assistant Dean; University of Florida, College of Education; 16 February 1984.
Nussel, Edward J., Associate Dean for Academic Affairs; College of Education and Allied Professions; 6 February 1984.

Oliker, L. Richard, Dean; Syracuse University, School of Management; 26 January 1984.

Over, Elizabeth K., Assistant Dean; Graduate Theological Union; 1 February 1984.

Owen, John P., Dean; University of Arkansas, College of Business Administration; 16 January 1984.

Owens, John Joseph, Chairman, Th.M/Ph.D. Committee; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; 15 February 1984.

Palmer, John, Dean; University of Wisconsin at Madison, School of Education; 26 January 1984.

Parker, Simon, Associate Dean; Boston University, School of Theology; 16 February 1984.

Partri [?], Robert, Assistant Dean; University of Miami, School of Music; 19 January 1984.

Pattison, W. D., Assistant Professor and Secretary of Department; University of Chicago, Department of Education; 27 January 1984.

Pernecky, Jack M., Associate Dean; Northwestern University, School of Music; 18 January 1984.

Perrone, Vito, Dean; University of North Dakota, Center for Teaching and Learning; 30 January 1984.

Phelps, Roger P., Chairman; New York University, Department of Music and Music Education; 16 January 1984.

Piersol, Jon R., Associate Dean; Florida State University, School of Music; 17 January, 1984.

Platt, Melvin C., Coordinator, Graduate Studies; University of Oklahoma, School of Music; 23 January 1984.

Porter, Andrew C., Associate Dean for Program Development; Michigan State University, College of Education, 17 February 1984.

Powers, Lynn Jarrett, Coordinator; Purdue University, Department of Education; 27 January, 1984.
Prosise, Roger D., Assistant to the Dean; Loyola University of Chicago, School of Education; 8 February 1984.

Pugh, Thomas J., Vice President for Academic Services; Interdenominational Theological Center; 25 January 1984.

Reese, Judith, Director, Ph.D. Programs; Ohio State University, College of Administrative Science; 24 January 1984.

Reinmuth, James E., Dean; University of Oregon, Graduate School of Management; 26 January, 1984.

Rider, Morette L., Dean; University of Oregon, School of Music; 20 January 1984.

Rodd, Jill, Administrative Assistant; Yale University, Department of Music; 25 January 1984.

Rogers, Gaines M., Dean; Mississippi State University, College of Business and Industry; 27 January 1984.

Roth, Wolfgang, Director of the Graduate Programs; Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary; 20 January 1984.

Ross, [?], Dean; University of Kansas, School of Fine Arts; 19 January 1984.

Ruch, Charles P., Dean; Virginia Commonwealth University, School of Education; 26 January 1984.

Rupp, George E., Dean; Harvard University, Divinity School; 24 January 1984.

Ryan, Thomas F., Chairman, Educational Leadership, Counseling, and Personnel; Western Michigan University, College of Education; 26 January 1984.

Sagen, Dwayne, Chairman; University of Mississippi, Department of Music; 20 January 1984.

Sanders, Nancy L., Ph.D. Secretary; University of Rochester, Graduate School of Management; 25 January 1984.

Scannell, Dale P., Dean; University of Kansas, School of Education; 26 January 1984.

Schmelzer, Mary Jane, Student Services Coordinator; American University, School of Education; 31 January 1984.
Schmidt, Wayne E., Acting Director; Concordia Seminary, School for Graduate Studies; 7 February 1984.

Schneider, Donald O., Coordinator of Academic Affairs; University of Georgia, College of Education; 31 January 1984.

Schwartz, Alfred, Dean; Drake University, College of Education, 26 January 1984.

Settles, William, Assistant to the Associate Dean for Student Affairs; Northwestern University, School of Education; 31 January 1984.

Sher, Jonathan P. [Office of the Dean]; North Carolina State University, School of Education; 8 February 1984.

Sherbon, James J., Director, Graduate Studies in Music; University of North Carolina, School of Music; 17 January 1984.

Sherrill, James M., Associate Director; University of British Columbia, Faculty of Education; 3 February 1984.

Simone, Albert J., Dean; University of Cincinnati, College of Business Administration; 23 January 1984.

Simpkins, J. Edward, Dean; Wayne State University, College of Education; 29 February 1984.

Small, Robert C., Jr., Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, College of Education; 27 January 1984.

Smith, Fred M., Director; Louisiana State University, Graduate Division of Education; 27 January 1984.

Smith, Stanton, Associate Dean; Washington State University, College of Business and Economics; 30 January 1984.


Skadden, Donald H., Senior Associate Dean; University of Michigan, Graduate School of Business Administration; 14 February 1984.

Stackhouse, Reginald, Principal; Wycliffe College, Toronto; 30 January 1984.
Steimel, Raymond J., Dean; Catholic University of America, School of Education; 31 January 1984.

Stem, Carl H., Dean; Texas Tech University, College of Business Administration; 2 February 1984.

Stimac, Michele, Associate Dean; Pepperdine University, Graduate School of Education and Psychology; 16 February 1984.

Stockage, Pat, Secretary to the Academic Dean; Union Theological Seminary; 23 January 1984.

Stout, Robert T., Dean; Arizona State University, College of Education; 1 February 1984.

Suess, John G., Chairman; Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland Institute of Music, Department of Music; 18 January, 1984.

Thomas, David A., Dean; Cornell University, Graduate School of Business; 1 February 1984.

Thompson, Bruce, Associate Dean; University of New Orleans, College of Education; 15 February 1984.

Tierney, Dennis S., Executive Secretary; Claremont Graduate School, Department of Education; 27 January 1984.


Tollefson, John O., Dean; University of Kansas, School of Business; 19 January 1984.

Tuggle, Francis D., Dean; Rice University, Jesse H. Jones Graduate School of Administration; 25 January 1984.

Turner, Richard, Dean; University of Colorado at Boulder, School of Education; 27 January 1984.

Turrentine, Edgar M., Director of Graduate Studies; University of Minnesota, School of Music; 3 February 1984.

Umberson, George, Director; Arizona State University, School of Music; 18 January 1984.

Unruh, Fred P., Acting Dean; Wayne State University, School of Business Administration; 25 January 1984.

Utsey, Jordan, Dean; Kansas State University, College of Education; 25 January 1984.
Vescolani, Fred J., Dean; University of Arkansas, College of Education; 26 January 1984.

Virgil, Robert L., Dean; Washington University, Graduate School of Business Administration; 26 January 1984.

Waddock, Sandra A., Director of Admissions and Financial Aid; Boston University, School of Management; 23 January 1984.

Walter, Elaine R., Dean; Catholic University of America, School of Music; 13 January 1984.

Walters, Stanley D., Advanced Degree Director; Knox College, Toronto; 2 February 1984.

Warren, Paul B., Dean; Boston University, School of Education; 8 February 1984.

Webb, Charles H., Dean; Indiana University, School of Music; 19 January 1984.

Werner, Robert J., Director; University of Arizona, School of Music; 17 January 1984.

West, Earle H., Associate Dean; Howard University, School of Education; 30 January 1984.

Westfall, Ralph, Dean; University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Business Administration; 19 January 1984.

Williams, Jan, Chairman; State University of New York at Buffalo, Department of Music; 18 January 1984.

Wilson, C. B. Chairman; West Virginia University, College of Creative Arts; 23 January 1984.

Yalch, Richard, Director, Ph.D. Program; University of Washington, Graduate School of Business Administration, 30 January 1984.

Ylvisaker, Paul, Dean; Harvard University, Graduate School of Education; no date.

Zimmerman, Vernon K., Dean; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, College of Commerce and Business Administration, 21 January 1984.
VITA
VITA

Name: Aurelia Rae Holman

Date and Place of Birth: 1 June 1934
Windsor, Ontario, Canada

Undergraduate and Graduate Education

Ph.D.; Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI; 1985
M.A.; Andrews University; 1965
B.M.E.; Andrews University; 1960
Wayne State University, Detroit, MI; 1960
Michigan State University, E. Lansing, MI; 1961-63
Staatliche Hochschule für Musik, Vienna, Austria; 1968-69

Professional Experience

Director of Community, Adult, and Migrant Education;
Berrien Springs Public Schools, Berrien Springs, MI; 1984-present
Director of Community and Adult Education, Berrien Springs Public Schools; 1981-84
Teacher; Berrien Springs Public Schools; 1970-81
Teacher; Fairplain Public Schools, Fairplain, MI; 1965-70
Teacher; Brandywine Public Schools, Brandywine, MI; 1962-64
Instructor in Voice; Walla Walla College, College Place, WA; 1960-62
Administrative Assistant; American Summer Sessions for Music in Vienna, Austria; 1964-73

Professional Memberships

American Musicological Society
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Berrien/Cass Continuing Education Association;
President
Berrien Springs/Eau Claire Chamber of Commerce;
Board Member
International Folk Music Council
Michigan Association for Bilingual Education
Michigan Association of Community and Adult Education
Michigan Council on Learning for Adults
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Michigan School Public Relations Association
Phi Delta Kappa
Pi Kappa Lambda
State of Michigan Migrant Parent Advisory Council;
Administrative Member
Tri-County Council of Women in Educational Administra­tion; Corresponding Secretary