Legal Statement

For personal use only. All rights reserved by Eyamba Bokamba.

All parts of the document "The Evolution of the Field of African Languages in the U.S." are for personal use only. They are owned in whole solely by Eyamba Bokamba. All rights reserved. No part of these pages or parts thereof, either in text or image form, may be used for any purpose other than personal use. Therefore, reproduction, modification, storage in a retrieval system or retransmission, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, or otherwise, for reasons other than personal use, is strictly prohibited without prior written permission.

Inquiries should be directed to:

Eyamba Bokamba
Department of Linguistics
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Eyamba Georges Bokamba
Department of Linguistics
707 S. Mathews Ave., Suite 4088 FLB
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Pre-Final Draft

CHAPTER 2: DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS IN AFRICAN LANGUAGES IN U.S.

2 Introduction

2.1 Impetus for international studies

2.2 Post-1958 developments

2.2.1 Decolonization of African states

2.2.2 Civil Rights and "Black Power" movements

2.2.3 Birth of the Annual Conference on African Linguistics

2.2.4 Learned Societies and international studies

2.2.5 President's commission on foreign language and international studies

2.3 Post-President's commission developments

2.3.1 Directions and prioritization of African languages for the 1980s

2.3.2 African languages and the ACTFL-based proficiency movement

2.3.3 Establishment of NFLC and NCOLCTL

2.3.4 Creation of the African Language Teachers Association

2.3.5 Establishment of ALTA's Annual International Conference

2.3.6 Founding of the National African Language Resource Center

2.4 Summary

Chapter 2

DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS IN AFRICAN LANGUAGES IN the U.S.

2. Introduction. The development of PALs in the United States is intricately tied to the country's post-World War II political history. A proper appreciation of this evolution and the potential future direction that these programs may take requires an understanding of their genesis, the factors that informed subsequent developments, and the constraints under which they may continue to operate. This chapter presents a summary of this historical development. Particular attention is directed towards those developments that were pivotal to the creation and shaping of these programs nationally.

2.1 Impetus for international studies. In its 1987 edition of the *Directory of African & Afro-American Studies in the United States* (Rana &. Distefano 1987) lists 389 colleges and universities[1] in forty-four states (including Puerto Rico) where programs in these areas are offered. General Africana courses (i.e., area studies) are offered at all these institutions, whereas African languages (including *Arabic*)[1] are taught in at least 110 of them. Forty-nine different African languages are offered, with the following eleven being listed as the most frequently taught on a regular basis: *Kiswahili* (at 52 institutions), *Arabic* (24), *Hausa* (15), *Yoruba* (9), *Amharic* and *Zulu* (6), *Bambara/Manding*, *Krio*, *Lingala*, and *Shona* (5 each), and *Afrikaans* and *Igbo* (3 each).

In the latest published edition of the same directory (Christy 1993), a larger number of colleges and universities in forty-five states are listed as offering twenty African languages[2] on a regular basis each academic year in fifty-five of these institutions (see

[1] This is out of an estimated 3500 colleges and universities in the country.
[2] On an international basis, the 1994 International African Institute (London) documents several hundred institutions of higher education in Africa, Asia, Europe, and (South America) where African languages and areas studies are offered.

Appendix A). As of November 2000, these institutions included the eleven HEA Title VI National Resource Centers and the Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowship centers given in Table 1:

Table 1: National Resource Centers & Foreign Language & Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowships

1. Boston University, African Studies Center (FLAS only)
2. Indiana University, African Studies Program (NRC & FLAS)
3. Michigan State University, African Studies Center (NRC & FLAS)
4. Stanford University, Joint Center for African Studies with University of California/Berkeley (NRC & FLAS)
5. University of California/Los Angeles, JSC African Studies Center (NRC & FLAS)
6. University of Florida/Gainesville, Center for African Studies (NRC & FLAS)
7. University of Illinois/Urbana-Champaign, Center for African Studies (NRC & FLAS)
8. University of Pennsylvania, African Studies Consortium (w/.Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore colleges (NRC, FLAS, Undergraduate))
9. University of Wisconsin-Madison, African Studies Program (NRC & FLAS)
10. Yale University, New Haven, Council on African Studies (NRC & FLAS)
11. University of Kansas, Lawrence, African Studies Resource Center (NRC/Undergraduate)

The international directory of African studies published by the International African Institute, London (Baker, Philip (1994).presents an extensive inventory of African Studies world-wide. The existence of these programs in the U.S. has become today such a relatively prevalent feature of tertiary educational institutions which have African studies that one is given the impression that their establishment was initially motivated mainly by intellectual considerations as in any other academic discipline or program. A review of the history of African studies in particular, and of international studies in general, in the United States, however, indicates that this was not the case. There were two separate sets of driving forces that laid the general foundation for campus-based language and area studies programs of

which African languages was a beneficiary (Lambert 1973, 1984, Thompson 1980, Clements 1989). The first set of these forces was apparently an intellectual pursuit motivated by the need to provide graduate students expanded opportunities to study and conduct research in Africa as elsewhere after World War II. In the case of Africa, this interest led to the founding of the first five (5) programs in African studies: Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois 1948), Boston University (Boston, Massachusetts, 1953), Howard University (Washington, D.C., 1954), Columbia University (New York City, New York, 1958), and the University of California at Los Angeles (Los Angeles, CA 1959). Data on M.A. and Ph.D. theses on African studies compiled by Sims and Kagan (1976), Stutzman and Harmon (1979) and by Clements (1989), with some dating as far back as the 1930s, clearly support this 'intellectual motivation' hypothesis. For example, Clements' (1989) study on "African linguistics and its contributions to linguistic theory" shows that there were six doctoral theses on African languages completed between 1933 and 1955 at four different universities: Chicago, Columbia, Pennsylvania, and Hartford. The University of Pennsylvania accounted for three of these dissertations.

Additional pieces of evidence in support of the intellectual motivation hypothesis come from a number of recent studies that document the pivotal role played by institutions of higher education, learned societies, and major national foundations (Lambert 1973, 1980, 1984, Kurtt 1999, and Swenson 1999). For example, Lambert (1973) reports that in 1958 before the introduction of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 there were only 7 students studying African languages (viz., Swahili and Yoruba). As will be seen later in this section, this enrollment rose dramatically to 440% five years later (Lambert 1973). This impressive increase seems to reflect a general trend in international studies during a seven-year period that commenced in 1948 and ended in 1965. Lambert (1984) states that

between 1948 and 1951, the number of Ph.Ds. in international studies granted annually by American universities more than doubled from 100 in 1948 to 225 in 1951. This occurred again between 1955 and 1965, and five years later. It is further known that some major national foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, and the Ford Foundation, along with state legislatures in states such as California and Michigan subsidized international studies, including languages, at selected universities. Lambert (1984: 8-9) points out that:

> A crucial development in the history of campus-based language and area studies programs occurred in the early 1950s, with the emergence of the recently reorganized and greatly enriched Ford Foundation as the principal outside underwriter of such programs. Between 1953 and 1966, when its International Training and Research Program was terminated, the Ford Foundation made grants exceeding $270 million to some 34 universities specifically and exclusively for international studies, a substantial portion of it in support of language and area studies.

We can infer from these types of reports that the teaching of African languages and area courses, especially on the eve and advent of African political independence in the late 1950s, became part of these international studies programs.

It is entirely possible, as recent history demonstrates, that intellectual pursuits in the era of decolonization would have driven comprehensive research universities in the U.S. to expand the establishment of programs in African studies as in other world regions. Whether this would have occurred and to the extent that it had in the 1960s and 1970s is uncertain in view of the role that funding plays at various research institutions. The most ostensible and catalytic force that provided the impetus for the teaching of African languages and area studies on a nation-wide scale appears to be U.S. national defense interests arising out of the Cold War that began in 1946 and accelerated to the onset of the Space Age (1957). This is the second set of driving forces in the establishment of centers for foreign language and area studies (FLAS) in general, and African studies in particular. This force actually grew out of a combination of three complementary interests:

(1) U.S. Army's interests in developing a national capacity or manpower in five key areas: mathematics, physics, electricity, engineering, and foreign languages during World War II,

(2) U.S. perceived need for international education with particular reference to the study of foreign languages and cultures,

(3) Colleges' and universities' continued intellectual pursuits (Lambert 1984, 1992, Dougherty 1993, Ruther 1994, Kuntz 1996, Swenson 1999, Kurtt 1999, and Hare 1999).

In response to the first concern, the Army and the Navy initially launched training programs overseas for military personnel during World War II (W.W. II). These programs were eventually moved to major American university campuses: University of Virginia, Harvard University, Yale University, Stanford University, University of Chicago, University of Michigan, Pittsburgh, Boston University, Northwestern, Case Western Reserve, and University of Wisconsin-Madison. In December 1942 the secretaries of the Army and the Navy jointly launched the establishment of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) to train specialists in the five areas indicated in (1) above (Lambert 1984). According to Lambert (1984), at least 60% of the training in ASTP located at the above-mentioned eleven universities was devoted to intensive language instruction for which the country experienced a dire need. The ASTPs became the prototype of the comprehensive foreign language and area studies on campuses that would be used by universities, private foundations, and eventually by the federal government to address in part concerns (2) and (3) above.

A core issue underpinning interests (2) and (3) was American competitiveness in major spheres of international life. According to Oshinsky (1998), the establishment of the United Nations (U.N.) in 1945 was seen and hoped to be the beginning of world peace signaled by the end World War II, that caused the loss of millions of lives. While this hope did materialize with regard to the avoidance of world wars, other forms of competition between the western and the eastern countries continued. From 1946 onward the U.S.S.R.,

which was an ally of the U.S. and the rest of the West during W.W.II, was perceived by the West as an enemy who was determined to spread communism in Eastern Europe and Asia, especially in China and North Korea. This perception and rivalry led the U.S. to increase exponentially the funding of research and development programs conducted by its Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD), a department that was created in 1941 (Foner & Garraty, eds., 1991). The Korean War (1950-53) and the emergence of McCarthyism during this period (February 9, 1950) heightened the tensions between the two powers.

For about eight years (1948–1956) the few programs that existed on African studies operated without subsidies from the U.S. federal government. They, like other international study programs for other regions, relied on funding from large private foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation, and Rockefeller Foundation for support (Dougherty 1993, Swenson 1999). This situation, however, began to change dramatically on October 4, 1957, when the U.S.S.R. shocked the U.S. by launching the first artificial satellite, *Sputnik 1*, which weighed less than 200 pounds. The launching of *Sputnik 2*, a 1,100 pound capsule, just a month later (November 4, 1957), not only shattered America's confidence in its self-attributed technical superiority, but also "wounded its pride" (Oshinsky 1998: 206). One senator was quoted as exclaiming that:

> The time has clearly come to be less concerned with the depth of pile of the new broadloom or the height of the tail fin of the new car and to be more prepared to shed blood, sweat, and tears.

The shock and embarrassment caused by the launching of the *sputniks*, combined with the unsuccessful launching of the U.S. Navy vanguard rocket in December 1957 led to the McCarthyism lambasting of the U.S. schools as "a bastion of mediocrity" in which the teaching of mathematics and science lagged behind that of Russian schools (Oshinsky 1998). These criticisms, the pressure from large private foundations, and the associated concerns of the Cold War compelled President Dwight D. Eisenhower to propose and secure the enactment by Congress of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. The NDEA

launched not only the creation of what came to be known as Title VI Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) centers, but also the national Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in October of that year (Foner & Garraty 1991, National Geographic 1998).

At the university level, the NDEA provided competitive grants to support the establishment of FLAS centers, subsequently known as Title VI centers, and graduate fellowships for U.S. citizens to pursue such studies (Dougherty 1993, Ruther 1994, Swenson 1999). In 1965 the NDEA was revised and re-authorized as the Higher Education Act Title VI (HEA). Continued interest in the promotion of international education in furthering U.S. national interest led to the enactment of two other acts: the International Education Act of 1966 (IEA), and the National Security Education Act of 1991 (NSEA). As Swenson (1999) and others (Lambert 1984, Ruther 1994, Kuntz 1996) have persuasively argued, these acts represent the kind concerted effort undertaken by the U.S. federal government to initiate and spur the establishment of foreign languages and cultural programs as integral components of Title VI National Resource Centers (NRC) generally. PALs, which constitute a critical component of African study NRCs, are by and large the results of this government largess and interest.

As indicated above, the initial and primary objective of the FLAS centers was to develop U.S. intellectual capacity in key areas, with an emphasis on foreign languages and cultural studies for military defense purposes. Knowledge in these areas for selected world regions constituted a priority in the defense of U.S.' 'national strategic interests'. Massive funding provided under the NDEA expanded considerably not only the FLAS centers, but also research and development programs in science and technology at various institutions, and inspired the establishment of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (Lambert 1973, 1984, Moore 1994, Ruther 1994, Swenson 1999). In the case of African studies, NDEA fellowships made it possible for U.S. graduate students to study African languages and conduct field research in Africa. The impact of the act was felt in a variety of disciplines, and particularly in the studies of African languages and linguistics.

For example, prior to 1960 there were only six Ph.D. theses written on African languages. Between 1961 and 1969, in contrast, there were forty-three dissertations completed—an impressive seven-fold increase (Clements 1989). Similarly, in 1958 there were only seven students who enrolled in African languages (viz., Kiswahili and Yoruba); this enrollment increased dramatically to 161 in 1963, 203 in 1965, and more than quadrupled to 974 in 1968 (Lambert 1973).

2.2 Post-1958 developments. That the NDEA Title VI constituted the bulwark of the USDE that initiated and sustained the establishment of African languages and area study programs in the late 1950s as a component of its drive for international education at the university level is an indisputable fact. The Act, however, was not the only force that fostered the subsequent expansion of these programs. The continuation and expansion of the African region FLAS centers, especially their PALS, that are the object of this book, appeared to have been accelerated by the following aggregation of complementary pivotal forces that developed independently in the 1960s through the mid-1980s:

(1) Decolonization of African states

(1) Peace Corps returnees

(3) Civil Rights and "Black Power" movements

(4) Birth of the Annual Conference on African Linguistics (1970)

(5) Directions and prioritization of African languages for the 1980s

(6) African languages and the ACTFL-based proficiency movement (1985)

The influence of these factors on the expansion of FLAS centers nationally beyond their NDEA-based strategic national interests is in part evident in the list and location of PALs given in Appendix A. Let us consider each of these developments briefly.

2.2.1 Decolonization of African states. The wave of decolonization of African nations from their European powers beginning with Ghana in 1957 and moving on to most other states throughout the 1960s represented one of the most interesting political developments in the 20th century. These nations that had been under colonial rule since the

Berlin Conference of 1884-85 that guaranteed the scramble for the African continent saw themselves suddenly opened to the world-wide political, economic and educational systems from which they had been largely shielded by the narrow master-servant relationship that characterized colonialism. The opening of these colonial boundaries had two major effects on the young nations. First, it exposed them to beneficial educational, political, economic, and cultural ideas from Western and Eastern countries that had no colonies in the continent. And second, it subjugated them to the on-going Cold War between the West and the East that was led by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. (Rotberg 1991). Foreign aid provided through bilateral programs, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and international agencies such as U.N., UNESCO, WHO, FAO, etc., willy-nilly made the liberated African states participants in the Cold War. The U.S. and the U.S.S.R. competed directly and indirectly through their satelites for geopolitical and economic access to the continent.

Influenced undoubtedly by the NDEA Title VI legislation and the policy it entailed, President John F. Kennedy, who followed President Dwight Eisenhower, launched a series of educational and cultural exchange programs in 1961 that took full advantage of the decolonization of Africa and of other regions. One of these programs that played an influential role in strengthening the bonds between the U.S. and Africa, on the one hand, and in expanding African studies in general and PALs in particular, was the Peace Corps. President Kennedy established it six weeks after his inaugural speech in which he challenged his countrymen to "[a]sk not what your country can do for you, [but] ask what you can do for your country", and he further urged them to become engaged with the rest of the world and its environment in the process of "creating … a new world of law" (National Geographic 1998).

The Peace Corps sent U.S. volunteers, mostly young college graduates, to selected African states for two to three years to live with and teach rural inhabitants how to develop certain self-sufficiency projects. Prior to their final assignment, the volunteers were subjected to intensive study of the lingua franca spoken in their country or region of work.

This program became so popular that, according to Rotberg (1991: 18), by the end of 1989 "three thousand volunteers were living in twenty-seven African countries." Peace Corps returnees in the 1960s contributed significantly to the increased interest in and expansion of PALs wherever African studies programs existed or could be created.

2.2.2 Civil Rights and "Black Power" movements. Another major contributing factor to the development of PALs in the U.S. was the Civil Rights movement that gathered considerable momentum in the late 1950s with the establishment of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in 1957 under the leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. SCLC, a branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), adopted the Indian nationalist Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent philosophy and strategies to secure citizenship rights for African-Americans.

In April 1960 the activities of the SCLC led to the creation of a university-oriented sub-branch: the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). This was a black consciousness movement, popularly known as the “Black Power" movement, among university African-American students that expressed their alienation from SCLC, and emphasized direct action non-violent tactics to advocates their rights and dramatize their African cultural heritage. Black power during that period referred to black self-reliance, racial pride, cultural pride in African roots, and economic and political empowerment in a manner fairly reminiscent of the Black Nationalism movement advocated by Marcus Garvey in the 1920s. The launching of a series of annual conferences in 1966 under the leadership of Stokely Carmichael, later known as Nkwameh Touré, served as the vehicle for expressing black power (Carson 1991, Stuckey 1991).

Operating as it did during the height of the Civil Right movement, SNCC served as one of the key forces that compelled many universities in the U.S. to establish Afro-American studies programs wherever none existed. From 1966 to the mid-1970s the movement expressed itself in different ways in such institutions: demands for the establishment of Afro-American studies programs and cultural centers, demands for the

teaching of African languages and cultures, wearing of dashkis, the Afro hair-do, rejection of 'white power' and the influence of its culturally-inspired behaviors on black people, and generally the development of a positive attitude towards people of African descent as being beautiful. "[Being] Black is beautiful" became a common motto on various university campuses.

Inspired perhaps by Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere's political philosophy of Ujamaa, or African socialism, and the policy of using Kiswahili[3] as the national language of Tanzania, black students viewed Kiswahili as the language of Africa and therefore of their ancestors. Accordingly, they demanded that it be taught wherever they could agitate for it. It is largely because of this activism by black students, who were often supported by their African brethren during the height of the Vietnam War (1964-1973), that several universities included the study of Kiswahili in their course offerings. The language has since spread to become the most widely taught African language in the U.S. today.

Occurring at the height of the Civil Rights Movement (1964-69) and the Vietnam War protests, the black power movement constituted one of the key socio-cultural forces that redirected significantly the NDEA-inspired programs in African studies. It initiated, in some sense, the popularization of these programs from the narrow confines of NDEA Title VI African area studies to African-American studies for both intellectual and cultural purposes without NDEA funding.

2.2.3 Birth of the Annual Conference on African Linguistics. The birth of the Annual Conference on African Linguistics (ACAL) has turned out to be one of the most pivotal forces that has contributed to the evolution of PALs. The launching of ACAL at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in April 1970, and its eventual establishment as an annual conference that rotates to African studies-based institutions, offered the first forum

[3] *Kiswahili*, instead of *Swahili*, is the term used by native speakers of this language to refer to it. This usage is adopted in this work.

in which theoretical and applied African linguistics would be discussed in the U.S. Members' interests focused mainly on formal linguistics (viz., historical linguistics, phonetics, phonology, and syntax) and one area of applied linguistics (viz., sociolinguistics, including creolistics). As the only conference of its type in the U.S., ACAL appeared to be the ideal forum for the advocacy of the sub-fields of African languages and linguistics.

Unfortunately, however, discussion of issues in foreign language acquisition (FLA), with regard to the teaching and learning of African languages in the U.S., received very little attention, except at meetings of the Title VI coordinators and occasional special sessions arranged to address such concerns. ACAL's primary contributions are that it brought African language program coordinators together consistently, and it inspired many of them and their graduate students to eventually develop PALs at their home institutions. This development allowed students to learn and conduct linguistic research on African languages in situ. Most of the discussions that the coordinators held at ACAL concerning aspects of FLA, were only tangentially related to the actual substance of the teaching and learning of these languages. They focused on the coordination of language teaching with particular emphasis on attempts to develop common standards, coordination of summer offerings in African languages, and evaluation of applications for the summer Fulbright-Hays Group Project Abroad (GPA) programs involving the advanced study of Kiswahili, Hausa, and, later on, Yoruba.

This marginalization of FLA issues in African languages constitutes one of the factors that contributed to the creation of ALTA in 1988. In hindsight, this development appears to be a third contribution that ACAL unwittingly made to the emergence of the field of African languages teaching and learning in the United States. From the perspective of graduate programs in African linguistics, which often co-exist in the same department with African languages, the publication of the journal, *Studies in African Linguistics (SAL),* by UCLA from 1970 onward offered an excellent vehicle for the scholarly exchange of ideas, debates, and information on African languages. The existence of ACAL and SAL in the United States initially defined a community of African language scholars.

ALTA essentially began with the Title VI African language coordinators who met frequently at ACAL and ASA conferences to address various issues concerning the teaching of these languages. Since its inception, ALTA has evolved into a solid professional organization that has established its own parallel annual international conference, and has developed other infrastructural features that characterize such organizations (see discussion in Section 2.2.7). This development is particularly important, because it has pushed Africanist linguists interested in the teaching, learning, and administration of African languages to professionalize the field as was often advocated by some of its members[4].

2.2.4 American Council of Learned Societies and international studies. That the NDEA Title VI has been the primary and critical catalytic force which initiated and sustained the implementation of foreign language and area studies in tertiary education, is a well-known and indisputable fact (Lambert 1973, 1984, Thompson 1980, Dougherty 1993, Swenson)[5] . However, its underpinning generators, except for the *Sputnik*, are much less known. As indicated briefly above, the NDEA Title VI replaced the ASTPs that were located in several major U.S. universities, and were administered by faculty members at such institutions. Once these programs collapsed after World War II due to their absorption into the federal government and cessation of funding, the support for these campus-based language and area studies had to be shouldered for over a decade primarily by private foundations and state funds (Lambert 1984). These institutions were motivated by intellectual considerations to develop international studies on American colleges and universities. It appears that the vision for this programming came from and was reinforced by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) in which the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) played a leading role.

[4]4. These included Patricia Kuntz, who was an ardent critic of the lack of professionalization in the teaching and learning of African languages in the country, and Ivan Dihoff, who often advocated in the early days the adoption of teaching methods used by CTL communities such as ESL and French.

This direction of interest explains largely the rapid adoption of the NDEA Title VI legislation in 1958, and the subsequent phenomenal growth of language and area studies programs that occurred in the 1960s (Thompson 1980, Lambert 1984, Swenson 1999). Lambert, for example, points out that "[t]he number of organized campus-based language and area studies programs increased to about 600 self-identified programs, or about 300 that met the minimal organizational criteria for a strong program as defined by Hall [1947] and Bennett [1951]. Lambert (1984: 8) states further that "[t]he major impetus for this growth was the intellectual engagement of American higher education internationally, particularly with the Third World and its development efforts." This type of engagement constituted then and now one of the principal factors that accounted for the growth itself and the privileging of the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs)[i] in these programs by ACLS and NDEA Title VI. So overall, ACLS have been instrumentally involved since World War I in the promotion and sustainment of international studies. Thompson (1980: 53), while acknowledging the critical role played by the NDEA "Language Development Program," argues quite eloquently that it was the result of a collective effort involving the academic community:

> It was more important than any of the earlier programs that preceded it, yet it owed its very existence to the efforts of all the linguists, foreign language teachers, and education specialists who contributed to the major foreign language programs mentioned above… . The fabric of the NDEA was woven primarily from the separate threads of concerned programs and interests that had represented both the commonly and uncommonly taught languages in the pre- and post-World War II periods.

The history of international studies in the United States documents numerous instances in which members of ACLS or some other professional organizations have been the driving force behind federal legislation or the planning underlying such a policy. An excellent recent example of this kind of involvement was the President's Commission on Language and International Studies that was appointed by President Jimmy Carter.

2.2.5 President's Commission on Language and International Studies. Another development that has had a far-reaching impact on the evolution of PALs in particular and international studies in general, was the President's Commission on Language and International Studies that was appointed by President Jimmy Carter in 1978. The Commission was established in response to a series of studies on foreign languages and cultures that was conducted by the American Council on Education (ACE), MLA, and ACLS in the 1970s, with support from the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities (Thompson 1980, Burn & Perkins 1980, Lambert 1984, Dougherty 1993, Swenson 1999). The results of these studies, published in 1975 and 1978 as reports on the commonly taught languages, the uncommonly taught languages, and institutional language policy urged the U.S. government to address the country's growing deficiencies in foreign language and international studies[ii].

In the transmittal letter of its report submitted on October 15, 1979, the Commission emphasized the importance of building capacity in foreign languages and international studies as a *sine qua non* condition for leadership in international affairs and national interest (Thompson 1980: 47):

> 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. This growing deficiency must be corrected if we are to secure our national objectives as we enter the twenty-first century (cited by Thompson 1980: 47, from *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*. A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies).

Burn and Perkins (1980: 21) point out that international expertise in the Commission's report was meant to cover "a capability in specialized knowledge on: foreign societies or cultures [,] including professional proficiency in the languages; and on the major issues in international

relations, political, economic, military, demographic and social." They add that this capability is deemed as necessary both inside and outside of the federal government,

> especially in the universities, so that they can train new specialists, maintain and extend our international expertise through research, and serve as a reservoir of knowledge accessible to government, business and labor, the media and other. Government needs this capability in the private sector as a resource to draw on and because its own research benefits from a vigorous dialectic relationship with the nation's private research capability users (Burn & Perkins 1980: 21).

Four of the major outcomes of the Commission's report were (1) the re-authorization of HEA Title VI in 1987; (2) increased support for and expanded coverage of international studies to include business; (3) the demand for proficiency or outcome-based language instruction in NRCs; and (4) the enactment of the National Education Security Act of 1991 (NSEP) whose main objectives are:

> to enhance the national security of the U.S. by increasing [its] national capacity to deal effectively with foreign cultures and languages …[through the] produc[tion] of a pool of educated applicants for work in the departments and agencies of the U.S. government with national security responsibilities who will make an effective U.S. security policy (NSEP Annual Report 1999: 3).

These objectives are obtained through the provision of scholarships to undergraduate students "to study abroad in geographic areas critical to U.S. national security and in which U.S. students are traditionally under-represented"; fellowships to graduate students to study foreign areas, languages and other international fields crucial to U.S. national security;" and grants to institutions of higher education" to build and/or enhance programs of study in areas, languages, and other fields critical to U.S. national security" (NSEP Annual Report 1999: 3). According to a number of scholars and other advocates of international studies, a crucial component of this "national security" is a "national capacity … to respond to demands for language competencies in particular languages for whatever reason, including the ability to create instruction in languages not currently or generally offered. … " (Brecht & Walton 1994), to facilitate economic competitiveness globally, and to strengthen cultural understanding nationally by studying LCTLs (Simon 1980, García and Otheguy 1994).

These perspectives clearly privilege the pursuit of international studies for intellectual and practical purposes over military defense objectives.

2.3 Post-President's Commission developments. The President's Commission on Language and International Studies has had a greater impact than NDEA in shaping the direction of international studies, especially the language and cultural study programs. One indication of this is the kinds of inter-institutional activities and institutional programs it has generated directly or indirectly, as well as the types of legislation it has engendered. In the field of African languages the developments in which the work of the Commission has been influential for the professionalization of the field include the following: (1) national conference at Michigan State University on "directions and priorities for African languages for the 1980s," (2) ACTFL-based workshops on proficiency assessment in African languages, (3) establishment of NFLC and NCOLCTL, (4) creation of ALTA, (5) establishment of ALTA's Annual International Conference on the Teaching and Learning of African Languages in the U.S., and (6) founding of NALRC at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

2.3.1 Directions and prioritization of African languages for the 1980s. The development of African languages teaching in a systematic fashion took a decisive step forward in 1979 when the Center for African Studies at Michigan State University (MSU), East Lansing, organized the first conference on the establishment of “direction and priorities” for teaching these languages. The conference was convened to respond to pressure placed on all Title VI centers by the USDE (then known as the U.S. Office of Education) in 1979 to identify and rank-order so-called critical languages for strategic U.S. national interests as characterized in the President's Commission report. The USDE’s rationale for this type of classification was to establish priority languages in certain countries or sub-regions that would be given priority consideration for funding as “critical languages.” Participants at this first and only national conference of its kind included selected Title VI directors, senior Africanist linguists, and selected coordinators of PALs.

Instead of following the USDE's directives, the conference opted to adhere to the reality of language use in African societies by identifying and ranking major languages in clusters according to their estimated demographics. The result was a classification of African languages into four major groups: A, B, C, and D. Group A consisted of "major national and international languages," Group B comprised "national and regional languages," C represented "regional and significant local languages," and Group D consisted of "all other African languages" (Wiley and Dwyer, 1980; Dwyer 2000). Prior to this conference and the publication of its results, the selection of which African language(s) to teach at any particular PAL was determined by each Title VI coordinator and center director based on either articulated mission statements or local conditions. Thereafter the proceedings of the conference became a useful set of guidelines that informed language programming, as suggested in part by the range of languages offered at most of the PALs listed in Appendix A.

2.3.2 African languages and the ACTFL-based proficiency movement. A further development that informed the direction of the field of African languages was the HEA Title VI-driven national language proficiency movement. In a series of ten workshops held at eight different Title VI centers between 1986 and 1990 the American Council on Teachers of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) provided oral proficiency workshops to reluctant teachers and coordinators of African languages. The aim of these workshops was two-fold: (1) to teach these instructors the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) technique for evaluating students of African languages, and (2) to explore ways of adapting OPI and other models to accommodate the African languages situation (Dwyer 2000). A bi-product of these workshops was the development of generic guidelines for Hausa, Kiswahili, Lingala, and Yoruba to serve not only as evaluative criteria, but also as curricula standards for these languages. A number of African language coordinators and/or teachers took advantage of these workshops to undergo further training to become certified ACTFL OPI interviewers.

In spite of the African language coordinators' initial resistance to the ACTFL training which they perceived as inapplicable or less useful to African languages, the training eventually proved useful in inspiring and enforcing further the idea of language-specific curriculum standardization across programs nationally. It also spurred the development of generic guidelines for several of the languages, and strongly injected proficiency-based language instruction as a crucial component for PALs. In fact, a number of PALs use OPI, or its Team Approach correspondent, to evaluate local students and GPA applicants.

2.3.3 Establishment of NFLC and NCOLCTL. As should be evident from the preceding discussion, the development of PALs in this country and the emergence of a professional field of African languages teaching and learning in the past few years has been incremental, and has involved several developments. From a professionalization perspective, however, two major developments that occurred in the late 1980s were more critical than any other in the history of PALs. The first was the creation of the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) in January 1987 at the Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies (hereafter SAIS) in Washington, D. C.. The second was a series of annual conferences on the Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs) that NFLC initiated in January, 1987.

The NFLC, a product of the President's Commission of language and international studies, was established with funding from a number of major private foundations that have had a history of interest in foreign languages. NFLC's principal objective is "the improvement of the foreign language capacity of the United States … [through] the formulation of public policy to make [U.S.] language teaching systems responsive to national needs" (Brecht and Walton 1993: inside cover jacket). The Center pursues this objective by conducting various surveys on U.S. needs and capacity in foreign language instruction; by organizing seminars/conferences of national policy planning groups "to address major foreign language policy issues;" and by conducting research on learner-focused strategies on language acquisition (Brecht & Walton 1993: inside cover jacket).

Consistent with these objectives, NFLC convened a national conference on January 9-10, 1987 at SAIS for the ostensible purpose of assisting the USDE in the articulation of policy guidelines for the revised and re-authorized HEA Title VI (of 1986). The conference, however, inadvertently provided the first opportunity nationally for the different LCTL communities to discover their common interests and problems. Invitees included federal government functionaries, representatives from private foundations, foreign language teachers and administrators, representatives from the business sectors, two senior African language coordinators (viz., Eyamba G. Bokamba (UIUC) and Will Leben (Stanford University), and other academics.

After the 1987 conference a series of additional conferences were held annually at the NFLC under the leadership of Prof. Ronald Walton (a specialist in Chinese language and linguistics, University of Maryland at College Park) and Prof. Richard Brecht (Russian language and linguistics, University of Maryland at College Park). Grants from the Ford Foundation subsidized the conferences and covered part of the salary of a staff member. Professor Richard D. Lambert, then director of NFLC, provided strategic guidance and material support. From 1987 until 1990 the conferences promoted not only further discussion of the mutual problems identified at the first meeting and possible solutions to them, but it also became a cohesive group of spokespersons for LCTLs in the nation. Africanist linguists[3] played a number of instrumental roles in shaping the direction of the these conferences, their agendas, and the structure of what emerged eventually as a national federation of associations concerned primarily with LCTLs.

---

[3] These included Eyamba G. Bokamba (University of Illinois) who served as the first Vice-President of the Council (1990-92), then as President (1992-94), and as immediate past President member of the Executive Board (1994-96); David Dwyer (Michigan State University) who served on several key committees, including the Constitutional Committee, and the Executive Board; Lioba Moshi (University of Georgia), who served as a member of the Executive Board (1993-95), Vice-President (1995-97), and then as President (1997-99). Antonia Y. Folarin-Schleicher (university of Wisconsin-Madison), was recently elected President (2000-).

After three years of meeting regularly as an amorphous body with funds from the Ford Foundation and material support from NFLC, the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages (NCOLCTL), generally referred to as the Council, was officially established in May 1990 as a federation of ten different associations:

12. African Language Teachers Association
13. American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages
14. American Association of Teachers of Arabic
15. American Association of Teachers of Turkic Languages
16. American Council of Teachers of Russian
17. Association of Teachers of Japanese
18. Chinese Language Teachers Association
19. Consortium of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages
20. National Association of Professors of Hebrew
21. National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs

Up to 1992 the Council devoted most of its annual conference to discussions of a number of common problems in the teaching and learning of LCTLs: strategies for the development of field-wide infrastructures for its founding members, expansion of Council membership, presentation and critical evaluation of pedagogical materials developed by its members, and examination of the application of second language acquisition (SLA) theories to LCTLs. The last two years in this five-year first phase (1990-92) were devoted to effecting "changes in those organizational, policy and instructional domains having major implications for improved teaching/learning of the less commonly taught languages in the United States" (Brecht and Walton 1994a: 5).

With a second grant obtained from the Ford Foundation at the end of 1992, NCOLCTL embarked in January 1993 on its second phase of activities that focused on three key areas: (1) development of Language Learning Frameworks (LLF); (2) organization strengthening; (3) organization building; and (4) networking. All these activities were

attempts at solutions for the common problems discovered during the first phase. Perhaps the most important of these were activities (1) and (3). The first activity was intended to address issues of uniformization of curricular designs at program and courses level, establishment of guidelines for material development, utilization of instructional technologies in classrooms, on-the-job teacher training, research in LCTLs offered in one's home institution, and on-going evaluation of one's program (Brecht & Walton 1994a). The third activity was aimed at encouraging the founding of additional national associations of LCTLs in the interest of building a larger network of organizations that would foster the teaching of such languages, and thereby enhance U.S. capacity in foreign languages and cultures. In all four activities, NCOLCTL benefited considerably from the singular visions of its co-directors, Richard D. Brecht and A. Ronald Walton, who led in the articulation of strategies and wrote forcefully about them (see Brecht & Walton 1994b, c) and policies for achieving greater strength in LCTLs.

NCOLCTL has made enormous contributions to ALTA. First, the participation of the African language representatives at the 1987 and 1988 conferences inspired the founding of ALTA in 1988. The NCOLCTL conferences served as catalytic eye-openers to ALTA whose representatives made several important discoveries: (1) the existence of similar problems to theirs in other LCTL communities regarding the paucity of pedagogical materials, (2) inadequacy of trained instructors, (3) low enrollments, (4) curriculum development issues of various sorts, (5) and high per capita instructional costs. They also found out that these other communities had established professional organizations under which they attempted to address these and related problems in a concerted fashion. The creation of ALTA soon after the 1987 conference, therefore, filled a major imperative: the establishment of a vehicular forum in which issues concerning the teaching and learning of African languages in the U.S. were to be systematically pursued.

Second, NCOLCTL offered mini-grants to its ten founding member associations[4] for infrastructural development, and to undertake priority projects such as language frameworks or standardization criteria that were based on LCTL characteristics rather than derived from CTLs. Third, NCOLCTL's annual conferences served as important forums for representatives of the different LCTL communities to brainstorm about mutual problems and to attempt to discover novel and cost-effective solutions to them. Fourth, the conferences offered workshops that provided experience-based solutions to the various practical and theoretical issues in the teaching and learning of LCTLs, including the presentation of research findings on second language acquisition in LCTLs, and utilization of computer and video-tape technologies. Fifth, ALTA's involvement with NFLC and NCOLCTL provided opportunities for some of its members to obtain summer Mellon fellowships from NFLC to conduct research on various aspects of African language instruction. Beneficiaries included the following scholars: Dr. Patricia Kuntz (1992, University of Wisconsin-Madison), Professors David Dwyer (1993, MSU) and Lioba Moshi (1993, University of Georgia at Athens), and Prof. Antonia Y. Folarin Schleicher (1994, University of Wisconsin-Madison). Sixth, and perhaps more important, under the leadership of Professors Walton and Brecht, NCOLCTL conferences helped share a vision of how to build a language teaching profession. ALTA representatives, who played a central role in all the conferences, took many of these ideas and implemented them in the development of the association, and ALTA's subsequent success made it a role model for other associations in the Council.

2.3.4 Creation of the African Language Teachers Association. The establishment of ALTA in 1988 represented not only the culmination of the developments

[4] In addition to ALTA, the remaining associations then were: American Association of Teachers of Slavic and Eastern European Languages, American Association of Teachers of Arabic, American Association of Teachers of Turkic Languages, American Council of Teachers of Russian, Association of Teachers of Japanese, Chinese Language Teachers Association, Consortium of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages, National Association of Professor of Hebrew, and National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs.

discussed above, but also the fulfillment of the community's long-held aspirations for the creation of a professional association. Most ALTA senior members are linguistics scholars, teachers, language coordinators, and very active participants in various linguistic forums. Their involvement in these areas made them, more than any other group of Africanist linguists, aware of the necessity of establishing an association that would drive the professionalization of the field of African languages and thereby stop its marginalization in African linguistics.

To achieve these objectives, ALTA initiated the publication of a semi-annual newsletter, *Lugha* (which means "language" in Kiswahili), in 1991 to serve as a national vehicle for the exchange of information on various aspects of African language programming, publication of pedagogical materials, faculty achievements, conference announcements, graduate students' achievements (including completion of dissertations), and job opportunities. Under the leadership of its second and third presidents, Professor Lioba Moshi (University of Georgia at Athens) and Professor Antonia Y. Folarin-Schleicher (UW-M), respectively, ALTA organized parasessions at ACAL on the teaching and learning of African languages. Interests in these parasessions eventually led to the establishment of the ALTA's Annual International Conference, and the publication of the association's journal, *JALTA*. The association continued to play an instrumental role in the development of NCOLCTL, and engaged itself in the preparation of language frameworks which in turn inspired some of its members to produce a variety of pedagogical materials (e.g., textbooks, videos, on-line courses, and interactive CDs) in Hausa, Kiswahili and Yoruba.

2.3.5 Establishment of ALTA Annual International Conference. One of ALTA's most recent accomplishments that epitomizes its professional ascendance is the launching, in March 1997 at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, of the ALTA Annual International conference on the Teaching and Learning of African Languages under the leadership of Professor Folarin-Schleicher. The conference, though small, offered presentations on different topics in the field, demonstrations of computer-assisted

instructional materials, and one workshop on teaching methodology. The proceedings of the conference have been published in the first volume of *JALTA*.

Subsequent ALTA Annual International Conferences have been held at Michigan State University, East Lansing (1998), Howard University, Washington, D.C. (1999), the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia (2000), and the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2001). The number of paper presentations by both established scholars and graduate students has increased each year, thus indicating the viability and attractiveness of the conference as a major forum. In addition to these advantages, one of the best components of the conference is the organization of targeted workshops on various aspects of the field to benefit graduate teaching assistants and established scholars. In addition to its own expert members, invitees for the workshops have included renowned scholars in SLA and pedagogues to address issues of general interest in the various aspects of foreign language teaching and learning, including teaching methods, utilization of computer-based technologies, classroom management, etc. The workshops at the ALTA conferences serve a three-fold purpose: (1) to expose all interested participants to developments and advances in language acquisition (both FLA and SLA) that have been occurring and implemented in CTL communities; (2) to provide teachers-training to Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs); and (3) to inspire both language coordinators and GTAs to adopt whatever insights gleaned from these workshops into their own teaching and material development efforts.

2.3.6 Creation of the National African Language Resource Center. The funding and establishment of the National African Language Resource Center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in September 1999 constitutes ALTA's highest achievement to-date. The creation of this HEA Title VI language center, was made possible thanks to the vision and leadership of its first director, Professor Folarin-Schleicher, who drew on the expertise of ALTA members to write a winning proposal. NALRC is the first

center of its kind that focuses on African languages and only one of nine national foreign language resources centers in the nation.

The overall aim of NALRC is to facilitate the promotion of African language teaching and learning in the U.S. through the sponsorship of various key projects and programs. In the words of Director Folarin-Schleicher (Ulimi 2000: 1)[5]:

> The primary mission of the NALRC is to improve the accessibility of African languages in the United States by strengthening the field as a profession and by developing resources for teaching, learning and research of [sic] African languages. …[more specifically,] the NALRC has as its purpose and primary agenda the development of the field of African language teaching in this country using the full expertise of the African language pedagogists [sic] throughout the nation, rather than at a single institution.

During the first three-year cycle this mission will be carried out under five major project areas: (1) national African language program coordination, (2) African language materials development and dissemination, (3) professional development for African language educators, (4) research in African language pedagogy, and (5) African language program development and evaluation (*Ulimi*, Fall 2000). NALRC programming is directed by three national Boards that advise the director and thus provide informed input from the entire field.

Last spring and summer NALRC sponsored two major sets of activities in the pursuit of goals (3) and (5) above. In April it provided mini-travel grants to African language Teaching Assistants to attend the 2000 ALTA conference at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia (April 13-15); it also sponsored the Competency-based Language Teaching, Testing, and the Use of Technology workshop conducted by Professor Sally Magnan of the Department of French, University of Wisconsin-Madison. During the summer of 2000 (June 19-July 7) NALRC organized and hosted at UW-M the very first series of institutes involving the training of future administrators and teachers of PALs[6]. The three-week intensive

[5] In "Letter from the Director," *Ulimi: Bulletin of the National African Language Resource Center* (NALRC) 1, 1: (Fall 2000), page 1.

[6] The institute was taught by Professor Eyamba G. Bokamba (Linguistics and African languages, University of Illinois/Urbana-Champaign), David Dwyer (Anthropology, Linguistics & African Languages,

institute, attended by thirteen nationally selected fellows, focused on three key aspects of PAL programming: (1) African language program development, coordination and evaluation, (2) African language curriculum development and evaluation, and (3) African language material development and evaluation. The overall objective of this institute was to train future administrators and teachers of African languages in order to prepare them to function competently in this emerging field. This was the first time that such training has ever been conducted. To mark the significance of this development and attest to the knowledge acquired, the participants were awarded "a certificate of completion of study" in the three areas mentioned above at the end of the institute. The ceremony was attended by the Dean of the College of Humanities and interested faculty members from the Department of African Languages and Literature, and other African studies units.

2.4 Summary. The evolution of the field of African languages in the United States is truly a by-product of the Cold War and intellectual pursuits to which other developments were juxtaposed. This chapter has attempted to document, albeit in a summary fashion, the complex ways in which the U.S. federal government-based and private foundation-supported initiatives in foreign language and international studies in tertiary education have shaped and contributed to this evolution. It has been shown here that the NDEA constituted the first force that impelled the establishment of PALs in the U.S. as part of language and international programs that were developed to serve the U.S. national defense objectives at the onset of the Cold War in Asia. The initial wave of decolonization of African nations from the late 1950s through the 1960s expanded the U. S.' zone of influence to Africa, and thus its languages and cultures.

Taking in part advantage of this development, the Black Power movement, which was propelled by the Civil Rights movement and multiculturalism, redirected the objectives of the

---

Michigan State University), Antonia Folarin-Schleicher (African Language and Literature, NALRC, University of Wisconsin-Madison), Charles James (German, University o Wisconsin-Madison), and John Mugane (Linguistics & African Languages, Ohio University, Athens).

African area and language programs by expanding and incorporating them into the then newly-established and non-NDEA funded Afro-American/Black studies programs. This appears to have been the first instance of the (re-) appropriation of PALs. The second case involved the establishment of non-Title VI programs in African studies based on local demands at a number of institutions (see Appendix A). Perhaps influenced in part by these developments, the revised NDEA (HEA 1965), while maintaining implicitly the national defense interest, focuses more on building the intellectual capacities of American citizens and permanent residents for scholarship. The expansion of the scope of HEA Title VI following the 1979 President's Commission on Languages and International Studies spurred further the growth in PALs. This growth in the field as in other area studies concretized the pre-eminence of the intellectual forces for foreign languages and international studies. The increased integration of the study of African languages as an explicit or implicit requirement for graduate programs in academic fields such as African languages and literature, African studies, anthropology, Black studies, comparative literature, history, linguistics, and musicology is a testimony to this natural development.

It has also been seen here that the growing field of African languages has greatly benefited from the infrastructure developed by ALTA, HEA Title VI NRCs, the Association of African Study Programs (AASP), ACAL, the African Studies Association (ASA), and close collaboration with other NCOLCTL members. The establishment of *JALTA*, the ALTA annual international conference, the NALRC and its newsletter (*Ulimi*), provide not only a solid foundation for the continuation of this professionalization, but also the necessary conditions for its growth and future sustainability.

Given these facts and the potential that exists for expanding PALs across many more of the 3,500 colleges and universities in the U.S., especially historically black colleges and universities (HBCU), the fundamental questions that arise at this juncture are: How does one initiate, build, and maintain a viable PAL? We turn to these issues in the next chapter.

APPENDICES

A: Programs in African Languages at Selected U.S. Colleges & Universities

Institution	*Languages & scope*
1. Samford University; Birmingham, AL (Critical Languages Program)	*Arabic* (nlspecified), *Swahili* (nlspecified)
2. Univ. of Alabama-Birmingham (Unit: African American Studies)	*Swahili* (nlspecified)
3. Univ. of Alabama-Tuscaloosa (Critical Languages Center)	*Swahili 1-2, Arabic 1-2 (self-instructional)*
4. Univ. of California at Berkeley (Linguistics & Center for African Studies)	*Afrikaans* (Dutch Studies; nlspecified), *Arabic* (nlspecified), *Swahili 1-2, Zulu* (nlspecified)
5. Univ. of California at Los Angeles (Linguistics & African Studies)	*Afrikaans*, *Amharic 1-3, Bambara 1-3, Hausa 1-3,Swahili 1-3, Wolof 1-2, Yoruba 1-3, Zulu 1-2*
6. Univ. of California at San Diego (African & African-American Studies Research Project)	*Afrikaans, Akan, Hausa, Igbo, Swahili, Kituba, Twi, Yoruba* (nlspecified)
7. California State Univ., Chico, CA (African Studies Area Program)	*Swahili* (nlspecified)
8. California State Univ., Los Angeles, CA (Dept. of Pan-African Studies)	*Arabic, Igbo, Swahili* (nlspecified)
9. San Francisco State Univ.; San Francisco, CA (African & African-American Studies)	*Ancient Egyptian* (nlspecified)
10. Stanford Univ.; Stanford, CA (Center for African Studies)	*Arabic 1-3, Swahili 1-3*
11. Univ. of Denver; Denver, CO (African Area Studies)	*Swahili, Yoruba* (nlspecified)
12. Univ. of Connecticut; Storrs, CT	*Amharic, Arabic 1-4, Hausa,*

(Ctr. for Contemporary African Studies) *Igbo, Swahili, Wolof* (nlspecified)

13. Yale Univ.; New Haven, CT
    (Council on African Studies) *Swahili 1-3, Yoruba 1-3, Zulu 1-3*

14. Catholic Univ. of America; Washington, D.C.
    (Semitic Languages & Literature) *Arabic* (nlspecified)

15. Johns Hopkins Univ./SAIS; Washington, D.C. *Arabic 1-3, Swahili 1-2*
    (Program of African Studies)

16. Univ. of Florida; Gainesville, FL
    (Dept. of African and Asian Languages & Literatures) *Akan 1-2, Arabic 1-3, Swahili 1-4, Yoruba 1-2*

17. Univ. of Georgia at Athens
    (Department of Comparative Literature) *Swahili 1-3, Yoruba 1-3, Zulu 1-3*

18. Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
    (Linguistics & Center for African studies) *Arabic 1-5, Bambara/Bamana 1-2,Lingala 1-4, Swahili 1*-5, *Wolof 1-4, Zulu 1-2*

19. Northwestern Univ.; Evanston, IL
    (Program of African & Asian Languages) *Arabic 1-3, Swahili 1-3* (advanced Twi & Xhosa, on demand)

20. Indiana Univ./Bloomington
    (Linguistics; African Studies Program) *Arabic 1-3, Hausa 1-3, Swahili 1-3, Twi 1-2, Xhosa* (nlspecified), *Zulu* (nlspecified); *Chichewa and Wolof* (tutorial basis); *Oku* (field methods course)

21. Indiana Univ.; Indianapolis
    (Afro-American Studies) *Arabic* (nlspecified)

22. Univ. of Iowa; Iowa City
    (African-American World Studies; Linguistics) *Swahili 1-2, Yoruba 1-2*

23. Wartburg College; Waverly, IA
    (Intercultural Certification) *Swahili* (nlspecified)

24. University of Kansas; Lawrence
    (African & African American Studies) *Arabic 1-2, Hausa 1-3, Swahili 1-2, Wolof* (tutorial basis)

Institution	Languages
25. Boston Univ.; Boston, MA (African Studies Center)	Bambara/Bamana 1-2, *Hausa 1-2*, *Setswana/Sesotho 1-2*, *Swahili 1-3*, *Yoruba 1-2*, *Zulu 1-2; Fulfulde, Igbo, Kikuyu, Kriolu, Twi* (on demand)
26. Michigan State Univ.; East Lansing, MI (Dept. of Linguistics and Germanic, Slavic, Asian and African Languages)	*Arabic 1-2, Swahili 1-2;* 29 other languages offered as tutorials, on demand
27. Wayne State Univ.; Detroit, MI (Dept. of Africana Studies)	*Swahili 1-2* (?)
28. Univ. of Minnesota; Minneapolis, MN (Dept. of Afro-American & African Studies)	*Arabic 1-3, Swahili 1-2*
29. Saint Cloud State Univ.; Saint Cloud, MN (African Studies)	*Arabic 1-2* (?)
30. Washington Univ.; Saint Louis, MO (African & Afro-American Studies)	*Swahili 1-3*
31. Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln (African Studies Program)	*Swahili* (nlspecified)
32. Dartmouth College; Hanover, NH (Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Languages and Literature)	*Arabic 1-3*
33. New England College (not specified)	*Hausa*, *Arabic* (nlspecified)
34. Rutgers Univ.; Piscatawa, NJ (Dept. of Africana Studies)	*Arabic* 1-3, *Hausa 1-3, Swahili 1-3*
35. Univ. of New Mexico; Albuquerque, NM (African American Studies)	*Arabic 1-2, Swahili 1-2*
36. Columbia Univ.; New York, NY (Institute of African Studies)	*Hausa 1-2, Swahili 1-3, Wolof 1-3, Zulu 1-2*
37. City Univ. of NY-Queens College; Flushing, NY (Africana Studies Program)	*Arabic 1-2* (?)

38. Hobart and William Smith Colleges; Geneva, NY (Africana and Latino Studies)	*Swahili 1-2* (?)
39. Saint Lawrence Univ.; Canton, NY (African Studies Minor/History dept.)	*Swahili 1-2*
40. State Univ. of NY College at Buffalo (African & African-American Studies Interdisciplinary Unit)	*Swahili 1-2* (?)
41. Duke University; Durham, NC (Asian & African Languages & Literature)	*Arabic 1-3, Swahili 1-2*
42. North Carolina State Univ.; Raleigh, NC (African-American Studies)	*Swahili 1-2* (?)
43. Univ. of Cincinnati; Cincinnati, OH (African Studies)	*Swahili 1-2* (?)
44. Kent State Univ.; Kent, OH (African Studies Program)	*Swahili 1-2 (?)*
45. Ohio State Univ.; Columbus, OH (Department of African-American and African Studies)	*Arabic* (nlspecified), *Shona 1-2, Swahili 1-2*, *Twi 1-2*, *Zulu 1-2*
46. Ohio University; Athens, OH (Linguistics Department)	*Swahili 1-3*
47. Lincoln University; Lincoln University, PA (Dept. of Languages & Linguistics)	*Arabic 1-3, Yoruba 1-2*
48. Pennsylvania State Univ.; Univ. Park, PA (African/African-American Studies Department)	*Arabic* (nlspecified), *Swahili 1-2* (?)
49. Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA (African Studies Center)	*Amharic 1-2*, *Egyptian 1-Old Egyptian, Swahili 1-3*, *Yoruba 1-3* (regularly offered); *Hausa, Luo, Shona, Twi, Wolof and Zulu* (tutorial basis); *Bambara/Bamana, Chitonga, Fon, Kikuyu, Mende, Oshivambo, Setswana, Temne* (on demand)

Institution	Languages
50. Temple Univ.; Philadelphia, PA (Dept. of African & African-American Studies)	*Swahili 1-2(?)*
51. Rhode Island College; Providence, RI (African & Afro-American Studies)	*Arabic* 1-2 (?)
52. Univ. of South Carolina; Columbia, SC (African Studies Program)	*Arabic* 1-2, *Swahili* 1-2
53. Baylor University; Waco, TX (Modern Foreign Languages Dept.)	*Arabic 1-3, Swahili* (nlspecified)
54. School for International Training; Brattleboro, VT (College Semester Abroad-Africa)	*Moroccan Arabic, Setswana, Shona, Swahili, Twi, Zulu* (nlspecified)
55. Univ. of Washington; Seattle, WA (Afro-American Studies Program)	*Swahili* 1-2 (?)
56. West Virginia Univ.; Morgantown, WV (African & African-American Studies)	*Hausa* 1-2 (?), *Swahili* 1-2 (?)
57. Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison; Madison, WI (Dept. of African Languages & Literature	*Arabic* 1-3, *Hausa* 1-3, *Swahili* 1-3, *Yoruba* 1-3
58. Univ. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; WI (Dept. of Afro-American Studies)	*Swahili* 1-2 (?)
59. Univ. of Richmond; Richmond, VA (Dept. of Modern Languages & Literatures)	Swahili Self-Paced Program
60. Williams College; Williamstown, MA (Center for Foreign Languages, Literatures, & Cultures)	*Swahili* (self-instructional, on demand)

B: Key Responsibilities for PAL administrators
(Based on Bokamba 1989)

1. Program Supervision

a. Class visitations
b. Consultations with instructors
c. Consultations with and advising Center for African Studies(CAS) director regarding program (if applicable)
d. Consultations with and advising departmental chair regarding program (if applicable)
e. Convening of staff meetings
f. Handling of student grievances
g. Participation in CAS advisory committee (if applicable)
h. Participation in a LCTLs language committee (if applicable) or
i. Responding to internal (i.e., campus inquiries)
j. Scheduling of classes
k. Student advising regarding African language courses
l. Writing/endorsing letters of recommendation for PAL enrollees and instructors
m. Miscellanea (including advising and administration of discipline to uncooperative or incompetent instructors, procurement of substitute instructors, writing and publication of advertisements for PAL courses, etc.)

2. Curriculum Development

a. Selection of African language(s) to be offered
b. Writing of course description for instructors and university course catalog
c. Preparation and administration of proficiency examinations

3. Staff Recruitment & Development

a. Identification and recruitment of instructors from other universities in the USA and Africa
b. Biennial staff orientation
c. In-service training of staff on teaching, preparation of supplementary pedagogical materials, and on administration of ACTFL-based oral proficiency interviews

4. Development of Pedagogical Materials

a. Identification and ordering of teaching materials
b. Writing of grant proposals for external funding of pedagogical materials in African languages
c. Writing of textbooks for languages for which no adequate or appropriate texts exist
d. Preparation of audio-visual materials

5. Cultivation & Maintenance of External Linkages

a. Participation in Title VI centers' coordinators meetings at the African Studies Association (ASA) Annual Convention
b. Participation in African Languages Teachers Association (ALTA) workshops
c. Development and maintenance of linkages with African universities for various programmatic purposes (e.g., recruitment of TAs, advice on teaching materials, and the establishment of cooperative, intensive summer language programs in Africa)
d. Miscellanea (including responding to external inquiries about PAL, textbooks, occasional participation in the Title VI center directors meeting in Washington, DC (if applicable) and other aspects of public relations)

REFERENCES

Baker, Philip, comp. (1994). *International Directory of African Studies Research/Répertoire International des Etudes Africanes.* International African Institute, London: Hans Zell Publishers.

Bokamba, Eyamba G. (1979). African Languages and Linguistics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: First Decennial Report (1969-79) and Future plan of Action. Unpublished manuscript submitted to the Department of Linguistics and the Center for African studies. Urbana

Bokamba, Eyamba G. (1979). African Languages and Linguistics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: 2nd Decennial Report (1979-89) and Future plan of Action. Unpublished manuscript submitted to the Department of Linguistics and the Center for African Studies. Urbana.

Bokamba, Eyamba G. (Forthcoming). The Evolution of the Program in African Languages and Linguistics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: 3rd Report (1989-2001). Unpublished manuscript to be submitted to the Department of Linguistics and the Center for African Studies. Urbana.

_____ and John P. Hutchison (1991). A brief history of the African Language Teachers Association. *Lugha*, vol 1, 1: 1-4. Urbana, IL: department of Linguistics.

Boyer, P. (1998). Birth of the atomic age, 1940-1949. In *National Geographic Eyewitness to the 20th Century*, pp. 163-97.

Brecht, Richard D. and A. Ronald Walton (1994 a). National strategic planning in the less commonly taught languages. In Richard D. Lambert, ed., *Foreign Language Policy: An Agenda for Change*. Special issue of *The Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 532:190-212. Reprinted from *NFLC Occasional Papers*, December 1993. Washington, D. C.: The National Foreign Language Center at the Johns Hopkins University.

______ (1994 b). Policy issues in foreign language and study abroad. In R. D. Lambert, ed., *Foreign Language Policy: An Agenda for Change*. Special issue of *The Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 532: 213-26.

Burn, Barbara B. and James A. Perkins (1980). International education in a troubled world. In R. D. Lambert, ed., pp. 17-30.

Carson, C. (1991). King, Martin Luther, Jr. In Foner and Garraty, Des., pp. 618-19.

Christy, Annemarie, comp. (1993). *Directory of African and African-American Studies in the United States. Eighth Edition. Atlanta, Georgia: African Studies Association Press, Emory University*.

Clements, G.N. (1989). African linguistics and its contributions to linguistic theory. In Eyamba G. Bokamba, Rick Treece, and Dorothy E. Evans, Des., *The Contribution of African Linguistics to Linguistic Theory: Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Vol.1. Special issue of Studies in the Linguistic Sciences,* 19, 2: 3-42. Urbana, IL: Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois.

David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991, Signed by the President December 4, 1991. P.L. 102-183, as Amended. Title VIII-National Security scholarships, fellowships, and grants. Handout.

Dougherty, James V. (1993). *A History of Federal Policy Concerning College or University-based Foreign Language and Area Studies Centers, 1941-1980 (Army Specialized Program, National Defense Education Act)*. Ph.D. thesis: University of Maryland-College Park.

Dwyer, D. (1987). *A Resource Handbook for African Languages*. East Lansing: African Studies Center, Michigan State university.

_____ (2000). Issues in African academic language programming in the U.S. Unpublished paper, Department of Anthropology; Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Dwyer, David and Lioba Moshi (1996). Academic African language programming in the United States. Unpublished paper. Washington, D.C: NFLC.

Foner, E. and J. A. Garraty, Des. (1991). *The Reader's Companion to American History*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

García, Orfelia and Ricardo Otheguy (1994). The value of speaking a LOTE in U.S. business. In Richard D. Lambert, ed., *Foreign Language Policy: An Agenda for Change*. Special issue of *The Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 532: 99-122.

Hare, Donna L. (1999). *Sputnik and United States K-12 Science Education*. Ph.D. thesis: University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Hayden, Rose Lee (1980). Foreign languages, international studies, and business (a dubious savior). In R. D. Lambert, ed., pp. 141-50.

Kuntz, Patricia S. (1996). *University Students' Beliefs About Foreign Language Learning, with a Focus on Arabic and Swahili at the United States Title VI African Studies Centers (National Defense Education Act)*. Ph.D. thesis: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Kurtt, Sharon B. (1999). *A Study of an Agenda-Setting Model as Applied to the Passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958*. Ph.D. thesis: The University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Lambert, Richard D. (1973). *Language and Area Studies Review*. Monograph 17 of the American Academy of Political and Social science. Philadelphia: American Association of Political and Social Science.

_____. (1980). International studies: an overview and agenda. In R. D. Lambert, ed. New Directions in International Education. Special issue of *The Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 449: 151-64.

_____. (1984). *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and area Studies*. Washington, D.C: Association of American Universities.

_____. (1994 a). Problems and processes in U.S. foreign language planning. In R. D. Lambert, ed., *Foreign Language Policy: An Agenda for Change*. Special issue of *The Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 532: 47-58.

______ (1994 b). Some issues in language policy for higher education. In R. D. Lambert, ed. *Foreign Language Policy: An Agenda for Change*. Special issue of *The Annals of the American Association of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 532: 123-37.

_____, Elinor G. Barber, Margaret B. Merrill, Eleanor Jorden, and Leon Twarog. (1984). *Beyond Growth: The Next stage in Language and Area Studies*. Washington, D.C: Association of American Universities.

National Geographic Society (1998). *National Geographic Eyewitness to the 20th Century*. Washington, D.C.

National Security Education Program: Annual Report, 1997-1998. Arlington, VA: National Defense University.

National Security Education Program: Annual Report, 1999. Arlington, VA: National Defense University.

NSEP News: National Security Education Program, Vol. 1, Issue 1 (July 1999). Arlington, VA: National Defense University

NSEP News: National Security Education Program, Vol. 2, Issue 1 (March 2000). Arlington, VA: National Defense University

NSEP News: National Security Education Program, Vol. 2, Issue 2 (October 2000). Arlington, VA: National Defense University

Oshinsky, David (1998). The cold war and McCarthyism, 1950-1959. In *National Geographic Eyewitness to the 20th Century*

Rana, H.M. and J.A. Distefano (1987). *Directory of African and Afro-American Studies in the United States*. Seventh Edition. Los Angeles: African Studies Association, UCLA.

Rotberg, Robert I. (1991). Africa-U.S. relations. In Foner and Garraty, eds., pp. 17-19.

Ruhlen, Merritt (1991). *A Guide to the World's Languages*. Volume 1; Classification. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ruther, Nancy L. (1994). *The Role of Federal Programs in Internationalizing the United States Higher Education System from 1958-1988*. Ph.D. thesis: University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Simon, Paul (1980). The U.S. crisis in foreign language. In R.D. Lambert. Ed., pp.31-44.

Sims, M. and A. Kagan (1976). *American and Canadian Doctoral Dissertations and Master's Theses on Africa*. Watham, Massachusetts: African Studies Association, Brandeis University.

Stuckey, S. (1991). Black nationalism. In Foner and Garraty, Des., pp. 116-17.

_____ (1991). Black power. In Foner and Garraty, Des., pp. 117-18.

Stutzman, M. and D.J. Harmon (1979). *Doctoral Dissertations and Master's Theses on Africa: University of California at Los Angeles, 1940-1978. Occasional Paper No. 18*. Los Angeles, CA: African Studies Center, University of California.

Swenson, Steven Robert (1999). *International Education and the National Interest: The National Defense Education Act of 1958, the International Education Act of 1966, and the National Security Education Act of 1991*. Ph.D. thesis: University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Thompson, Richard T. (1980). New directions in foreign language study. In R. D. Lambert, ed., pp. 45-55.

Wiley, D. and D. Dwyer, comps. (1980). *African Language Instruction in the United States: Directions and Priorities for the 1980s.* East Lansing; African Studies Center, Michigan State University.

---

[1] Demographically Arabic, which is classified in Greenberg (1963) as a member of the Afro-Asiatic family, is spoken by an estimated 100 millions people, with two thirds of them living in Africa (Ruhlen 1991). At many U.S. universities where there is no center for Eastern studies, Arabic is included in PALs in an

Africana center. The ASA directory, perhaps in recognition of these facts, treats it as an African language. We follow this practice in this book.

[5] For example, Lambert (1973: 156) reports that in "…1958, there were only 7 students in African, 14 in South Asian, and 14 in Southeast Asian languages. Aside from Spanish, Hebrew, and Russian, which already had a substantial clientele, only Portuguese, Polish, Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese had registrations in the hundreds. In contrast, by 1965, seven years later, Lambert points out that "all of the enrollments in 20 of the 24 new languages added to the instructional roster of higher education were at NDEA centers." By 1966-67 the number of languages increased dramatically to 129, of which 92 were modern and 37 ancient languages. Equally noteworthy was the finding by Lambert (1973) that 40% of the enrollments in the fall of 1965 were from NDEA centers.

[i] The less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) are the vast majority of the world languages (ca. 98%) that are infrequently taught in U.S. school system and tertiary education. They include all the languages except French, German, and Spanish--the so-called commonly taught languages (CTLs).

[ii] The expansionary movement in the creation of language and area studies lost momentum for over a decade between the late 1960s and 1970s a drastic reduction in funding from both the federal government and the private foundations. In 1967 the Ford Foundation terminated its funding of the International Training and Research Program. While two years earlier the U.S. Congress had re-authorized the NDEA as Higher Education Act (HEA 1965) Title VI, and in 1966 it enacted the International Education Act (IEA), there was less funding. Support for the HEA Title VI was substantially cut, and none was provided for the IEA (Lambert 1984, Dougherty 1993, Swenson 1999). As a result, the rapid growth spurred by the NDEA Title VI was stopped, and the number of existing programs declined substantially in spite of efforts by universities to sustain them (Thompson 1980, Lambert 1994). Lambert (1984) reports that by 1973 the number of language and area centers that were supported by HEA Title VI was drastically reduced from 107 to 46, and remained around that throughout the 1970s.