

Trends and Challenges in Post-Secondary Language Classrooms: A National Survey

Christina Huhn, *Indiana University of Pennsylvania, (PA)*

Teresa R. Bell, *Brigham Young University (UT)*

Krista Chambless, *University of Alabama at Birmingham (AL)*

Kelly M. Moser, *Mississippi State University (MS)*

Abstract

Post-secondary world language departments face ongoing challenges related to shifting student demographics, declining enrollments, and limited budgets. Findings from a nationwide survey provide insight into current instructional practices among language educators and reveal variation across languages, levels, and content areas. Many participants reported constraints in implementing proficiency-driven instruction and in applying the *World-Readiness Standards for Language Learning (W-RSLL)*. This study examines the teaching practices of post-secondary language educators through survey data that included both quantitative ratings and qualitative descriptions related to the *W-RSLL*. Descriptive statistics and thematic analysis were used to analyze responses. Participants represented instructors of 14 different languages working in both large and small institutions. Their teaching experience ranged from one to more than 30 years, and their courses spanned multiple levels and content areas (e.g., literature, linguistics, cultural history, and languages for specific purposes). The data also reflected varied instructional approaches.

Keywords: *post-secondary world language teaching, World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages, post-secondary traditions*

Introduction

Post-secondary world language (WL) departments face ongoing challenges related to shifting student demographics, declining enrollments, and limited budgets that affect program viability. The Modern Language Association's (MLA) call for transformation in post-secondary WL contexts (MLA, 2007) has received sustained attention in published literature (Lomicka & Lord, 2018; Redden, 2017), yet a broad reimagining of the curriculum has not been fully realized. For WLs, the Modern Language Association report (MLA, 2007) did not extend to what constitutes *good* teaching. In the current climate of WL higher education marked by declining

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons CC BY Attribution Non Commercial No Derivatives 4.0 International License

NECTFL Review, Number 96, March 2026, pp. 13-43. © 2026 by NECTFL.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17613/c47m6-8nj36>

NECTFL Review Number 96

enrollments and financial pressures, the need for transformation is more visible than ever (Butrymowicz & D’Amato, 2020). At the same time, as Generation Z students enter college, educators are challenged to adapt instruction in ways that address their needs and prepare them to engage in a globalized, 21st-century world (Dimock, 2019).

Within this context, post-secondary WL programs continue to face challenges linked to shifting student demographics, constrained budgets, and enrollment declines. To better understand instructional practices in this environment, the current study draws on a nationwide survey of post-secondary language educators. The survey combined quantitative ratings with qualitative responses to examine how faculty integrate the *World-Readiness Standards for Language Learning (W-RSLL)* into their teaching. Initial findings reveal variation across languages, levels, and content areas, as well as constraints that limit consistent implementation of proficiency-driven instruction. Participants represented instructors of 14 languages across large and small institutions, with teaching experience ranging from one to more than 30 years, and their courses spanned diverse areas such as literature, linguistics, cultural history, and languages for specific purposes. This study aims to provide a deeper understanding of how post-secondary language educators approach instruction and provides a foundation for examining current practices within a changing higher education landscape.

Considering the current crisis, WL programs must reflect on what they do, how, and why. Colleges lost 651 language programs between 2013 and 2016 and experienced a notable decrease in advanced-level courses (Looney & Lusin, 2018). D’Amico (2023) and Murphy and Martin (2023) highlight the role of strong pedagogy and classroom experiences in influencing students’ decisions to continue language study at higher levels. Thus, understanding the role of teaching in post-secondary WL classrooms takes on renewed importance. However, limited research provides a detailed description of post-secondary WL teaching. The following section reviews prior scholarship on instructional practices and standards-based approaches to situate this study within the broader field. Research does not provide in-depth studies that document the reality of WL teaching in a post-secondary context, nor does research identify a consensus regarding what factors need to be addressed to improve what happens in post-secondary classrooms. This survey study focused on how post-secondary WL teachers interpret and apply the *World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (W-RSLL)* in practice.

Review of literature

Changing educational landscape

While enrollment trends in higher education in general were troubling before the COVID-19 pandemic, the health crisis escalated concerns about the value of a post-secondary education (NCES, 2024). The National Center for Education Statistics (Irwin et al., 2023) reported a 15% decline in enrolled college students between 2010 and 2021, and numbers continue to sit below pre-pandemic levels. Further, colleges and universities are bracing for a “looming enrollment cliff” (Kingson, 2024), anticipating fewer high school graduates after 2025. This reality has contributed to a renewed focus on student retention.

The most critical variable affecting student enrollment and retention is effective instructional practices (Morgan & Thompson, 2023). To this end, the American Council on Education made effective teaching a top priority. In their position paper with the Association of College and University Educators

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

(ACUE), they argued that “higher education leaders must focus their efforts on improving the quality of instruction in college classrooms” (Gyurko et al., 2016, p. 5) and “can no longer ignore the positive impact and untapped potential of good teaching” (p. 6). Nearly two decades ago, their report called for a radical transformation of post-secondary WL programs, thereby diversifying the curriculum and making it more relevant and attractive to students. Since that time, there has been some progress, albeit slow (Lomicka & Lord, 2018).

Before our profession can address WL student retention through quality teaching, we must first establish a clearer understanding of the teaching practices of post-secondary WL educators. Although recommended approaches to WL teaching have been identified (e.g., high-leverage teaching practices and proficiency-driven instruction), much of that research has been situated within K-12 school contexts, and the application of those practices in post-secondary contexts is not fully known. This survey study sought to address this paucity of post-secondary research.

Factors affecting university WL programs

Numerous factors affect WL higher education programs, which in combination complicate the work of university WL educators. First, current research suggests that accurate placement in language courses is essential (Spino, et al., 2023). Morgan and Thompson (2023) found that there were several potential institutional hurdles associated with language study in the university setting, including first-course placement, among their study participants. Spanish group respondents (approximately 70%) were the most likely of the languages to be inaccurately placed in the lowest possible introductory course in Spanish and were the least likely to continue with a minor or major beyond the course requirements. If a lower-level course does not engage students by building proficiency, the likelihood of a student continuing their studies will decrease, creating an undesirable ripple effect. Additionally, conflicting academic and credit hour limitations attached to financial aid restrictions are major culprits of language study recruitment (Morgan & Thompson, 2023). One key to managing this issue lies in the way the courses are taught. Students perceive proficiency as more relevant than grammar-driven instruction (Hancock et al., 2023) which may increase student motivation to continue their language study.

One mechanism that has led to making WL study more attractive to students is the Global Seal of Bilingualism at the university level, an internationally recognized credential that uses a third-party exam to assess proficiency. Students receive a certificate as well as a digital credential certifying their proficiency at one of three levels: Functional Fluency, Working Fluency, or Professional Fluency. Many institutions have already implemented a pathway for students to earn the Global Seal of Bilingualism, positively affecting enrollment trends in their schools (Eckerson & Jacobs, 2025; Monto, 2025). However, WL students will not easily achieve a Global Seal without proficiency-driven language instruction in WL higher education programs.

While many faculty may be superficially aware of proficiency-based instruction, Hancock et al., 2023, found that when compared with a traditional, grammar-based program, a proficiency-based program leads to greater student oral proficiency. Further, the results suggest that the shift away from a grammar-based approach toward one reflecting a proficiency-based philosophy may lead to other benefits, such as perceived greater instructional relevance, enhanced student motivation, and increased student

confidence.

Several scholars have identified systemic challenges to implementing the W-RSLL in higher education. Troyan (2012) emphasized a persistent curricular divide that limits meaningful integration, while Paesani and Allen (2012) observed that the standards receive little attention in advanced-level courses and questioned their overall applicability in post-secondary contexts. Brooks and Darhower (2014) and Huhn (2012) further noted the emergence of a “culture of proficiency” that, although promising, tends to remain concentrated in pre-service teacher education programs rather than being adopted across entire departments. Together, these findings highlight structural and cultural barriers that restrict the standards’ transformative potential in higher education and help explain, in part, their uneven and often limited implementation. To fully address this disparity, it is necessary to move beyond the national standards themselves and consider broader frameworks and perspectives that can inform curricular innovation and reform.

Traditions of post-secondary education: Textbook-driven curriculum

Allen (2002) and Huhn (2021, 2022) noted that many university curricula have long relied on a textbook-driven “coverage model” (Chaffee, 1992) and/or closely coordinated curriculum, coupled with long-standing traditions that stem from the history and practices attached to the study of literature and culture at the university level. In more recent research, Martel (2017) observed that our traditions are evidenced in classroom observations and commonly used textbooks. A predominance of textbook content that drives curriculum (Al Masa’eed, 2014; Boubaya, 2020; Cubillos, 2014; Huhn, 2018; Martel, 2013, 2016; Padilla 2019) has proven limiting to a broader expansion of the National Standards and other measures in driving post-secondary curriculum. Martel (2016) adds that there remains a significant emphasis on Present -> Practice -> Perform grammar instruction model in textbooks, and Al Masa’eed (2014) found through faculty focus groups that “instructors feel enormous pressure to engage in explicit grammar instruction in order to prepare students for exams that place a rigorous focus on de-contextualized exercises covering a wide range of grammar points (p.141).” Huhn (2021) found that the textbook focus was clearly visible in observations of an experienced university educator, as just one example. Few, if any textbooks support the implementation of the national standards of proficiency-driven teaching as curricular models in the post-secondary environment, which can undermine proficiency-driven instruction (Huhn, 2018, 2021).

In their examination of German textbooks, Rothe et al. (2023) urged language teachers to consider how curricular materials can make “our classrooms and programs uninviting” (p. 58). In fact, in their literature review of the topic, Zhang et al. (2024) examined 62 relevant articles to investigate cultural representation in textbooks. They found that more than half of the studies “cater[ed] to textbook writers, encouraging them to enhance the representation of local cultures, cultures beyond the inner circle countries, ethnic diversity, gender equity, and citizenship issues” (p. 8).

Furthermore, textbooks have been commonly criticized for relying on isolated grammar instruction, which is contrary to best practices in WL teaching (Cubillos, 2014; Fernández, 2011; Huhn, 2018). A quick glance at many textbooks reveals a traditional approach to language learning—chapters organized by theme, presenting vocabulary first, grammar next, and asides of culture. Despite this critique, Vold (2020) reported that changes in how

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

publishers introduce grammatical structures to students have begun to emerge in newer editions of French textbooks, for example. Still, she encouraged educators to use the textbook as a tool rather than as the sole resource for instruction. Similarly, Martel (2016) refers to “exploding the textbook” using it as a “point of departure” (p. 175).

Historical Context of the W-RSLL in Higher Education

The W-RSLL (2015), commonly known as the 5Cs, have the potential to serve as a robust framework for transforming university language programs. A fuller appreciation of this limited integration emerges when the standards are examined considering the historical contexts and broader trends that have shaped language education in the United States. Initial efforts to assess the impact of the W-RSLL in higher education began with the ACTFL 2011 Standards Impact Survey, which identified 96 published articles referencing the standards in post-secondary contexts (ACTFL, 2011). While the survey did not analyze the content of these articles, it did establish a baseline record of scholarly engagement with the standards and provided evidence of their growing visibility within the field. However, because the survey did not examine how the standards were being discussed, interpreted, or applied, it offered limited insight into the depth or quality of their integration into higher education practices.

This early assessment reflects a broader historical trend in U.S. language education, in which major frameworks and policy initiatives—such as the 1996 Standards for Foreign Language Learning and subsequent state-level adaptations—often achieved visibility more quickly than curricular transformation (Glisan & Donato, 2017; ACTFL, 2011). Federal and state accountability measures, fluctuating enrollment patterns, and recurring concerns about national language capacity further shaped the ways in which standards were interpreted and prioritized across institutions. Collectively, these dynamics suggest that the uneven uptake of the W-RSLL in higher education is not an isolated case but part of a longer trajectory in which ambitious reforms encounter varied levels of institutional adoption.

Against this backdrop, subsequent research sought to move beyond documenting visibility and toward analyzing how the standards were being engaged in practice. A decade after the Standards Impact Survey, Huhn (2022) conducted a thematic review and found a growing professional dialogue and increased research focused on the W-RSLL goal areas. Still, only about half of the studies were classroom-based (Huhn, 2022), and the standards appear to still be underutilized in literature addressing post-secondary teaching methods. In addition to the W-RSLL goal areas, several other publications provide support for proficiency-driven post-secondary world instruction:

- NCSSFL/ACTFL Can-Do Statements (2017): Define what learners can do within each goal area
- ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (2024): Describe how well learners can communicate
- ACTFL Performance Descriptors (2015): Provide benchmarks for performance across proficiency levels
- High-Leverage Teaching Practices (HLTPs), (Glisan & Donato, 2017)

Drawing inspiration from mathematics education, language educators have also identified ten high-leverage teaching practices (Glisan & Donato, 2017; Hlas & Hlas, 2012; Kissau et al., 2019) that reinforce the importance of purposeful assessment, cultural exploration, and consistent feedback—core principles embedded in the W-RSLL. While these are appropriate for pre-

service teachers, the concepts in these resources have great potential to also influence what happens in post-secondary classrooms.

Research on effective teaching in post-secondary WL teaching

Among the sparse work that has been done on effective teaching for post-secondary WL educators, Bell (2005, 2015) and Brown (2009) also established a consensus on specific attitudes and behaviors of WL teachers. Among their salient findings, there are notable differences between the viewpoints of WL teachers and their students, which can have a negative effect on the classroom. WL teaching is the only subject where effective instruction requires the teacher to use a medium (i.e., the language of instruction) that the students may not yet or fully understand, and Swanson and Moore (2006) emphasized the benefits of correcting the inaccurate perceptions of students studying a second language. Language teachers teach communication, not facts (Borg, 2006), with the interaction with others being essential to learning.

The research of these authors represents one of the limited efforts to define effective WL teaching at the post-secondary level (Chambless, 2012). Expanding on this work through the lens of self-study, Huhn (2021) considered published research in WL teaching and found that while considerable valuable resources exist, there is a visible lack of consensus and commonly available resources that support advancing post-secondary WL education. Although a university faculty member may wish to expand and evaluate their teaching, there is no easily accessible common definition or set of criteria, especially when looking specifically at the post-secondary context.

As a result of her study, Huhn (2021) developed a crosswalk between the various sets of standards informing the profession that in turn has the potential to inform post-secondary WL classroom instruction. This crosswalk includes the national W-RSLL, high-leverage teaching practices (HLTPs) (Glisan & Donato, 2017), the Teaching Effectiveness for Language Learning (TELL, now housed at the National Foreign Language Resource Center), and the ACTFL position statements. This research, however, will benefit from a broader application to post-secondary WL classrooms and through triangulation with other post-secondary faculty engaging in similar research (Huhn, 2021).

It should be noted, however, that the role of grammar in modern WL classrooms is a topic that has been contested for decades. Over thirty years ago, Schulz (1996) reported that 80% of her students believed that formal grammar instruction was a critical component of language learning. Students' preference for grammar instruction (over proficiency-driven instruction) has been repeatedly highlighted since that time (see, for example, Bell, 2015; Brown, 2009; Plonsky & Mills, 2006). Additionally, Vyn et al. (2019) explored teachers' practices and their impact on students' proficiency. The findings of their work underscored that when teachers relied on consistent comprehensible language instruction, students made significant progress on proficiency assessments. On the contrary, explicit grammar instruction produced negative results in the beginning levels of instruction. Despite these more recent explorations, there remains a lack of consensus on effective WL teaching at the post-secondary level (Chambless 2012).

To investigate the issues identified above, research that provides a rich description of the realities of post-secondary WL education has the potential to drive change in post-secondary WL instruction. This project investigated the factors that play a role in how languages are taught at the university level. Standards-driven proficiency-based instruction is a vast topic beyond the

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

scope of a single study and this project sought to identify specific elements that are key to providing instruction to Generation Z learners that guides them towards functional proficiency: implementation of the *W-RSLL*, modes of communication, cultures (products, practices and perspectives), grammar-driven versus proficiency-driven instruction, textbook use, and professional development.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How familiar are post-secondary WL educators with the *W-RSLL* and related resources?
2. What are the factors influencing language classroom teaching practices (teacher education, background, teaching experience)?

Methods

In response to anecdotal conversations on this critical issue and their deep knowledge of WL in higher education, the researchers developed a survey to gather information on the current practices of post-secondary language educators. Survey research was deemed appropriate because we aimed to gather data about WL post-secondary educators' "characteristics, opinions, attitudes, and experiences" (Bell, 2005; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 183). Additionally, survey methodology was beneficial because we sought to reach a large and broad population of individuals, and it allowed the researchers to gather information via multiple professional listservs and social media sites.

The survey was piloted with a small group of language educators and approved by the Institutional Review Board of the lead institution. To reach a broad audience both within and beyond the national organizations for language teachers, the researchers contacted the Modern Language Association, ACTFL Communities, the American Association of University Supervisors (AAUSC), state language organizations, and other language teaching associations with the request to invite their members to respond to the qualitative questionnaire designed for this study. In response, 2,196 post-secondary language educators fully completed the questionnaire. These educators responded to questions about their experiences teaching languages, their institutional environment, professional development activities, courses in pedagogy they completed, the use of the *W-RSLL* in their curricula, participation in professional conferences, and TL use in teaching. Some participants did not complete all questions, and thus, totals for individual questions may vary.

Participants

The survey first collected demographic information on the professional roles of respondents. This information reveals a diverse range of expertise in language education and administration among respondents (Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3, next pages).

NECTFL Review Number 96

Table 1

Professional Roles of Survey Respondents

Role	N	%
Foreign Language Professors	1063	31.24
Education Professors	480	14.11
Methods Professors	389	11.43
College Administrators	322	9.46
K-12 Language Teachers	138	4.06
K-12 Administrators with University Roles	134	3.94
K-12 Language Student Teacher Mentors	138	4.06
Officers in Language Associations	286	8.37
State Supervisors	262	7.70
Master's Students	125	3.67
PhD/EdD Candidates	112	3.29
Other	42	1.23

Table 2

Languages Taught by Respondents

Language	%
French	17.97
Chinese	16.51
Spanish	15.47
German	11.09

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Table 3

Course Levels Taught and Instructor Types Assigned

Course Level	n	%	Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty (%)	Graduate Students (%)	Instructors/Adjuncts (%)
Beginning	702	32.0	43.4	46.2	37.8
Intermediate	836	38.1	49.3	37.2	38.5

In terms of professional affiliations, 16% of respondents are members of the Modern Language Association (MLA), while only 12.07% are members of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), suggesting that this survey may have captured perspectives from a non-ACTFL population. In terms of national language-specific organizations, respondents are members of AATSP (7.63%), AATF (7.19%), AATG (6.93%), ACL (6.67%), AATK (5.92%), ACTR (5.77%), and CLTA (3.7%), AATJ (0.8%), and AATI (0.6%). (Table 4)

Table 4

Professional Organization Membership

Organization	%
MLA	16.00
ACTFL	12.07
AATSP	7.63
AATF	7.19
AATG	6.93
ACL	6.67
AATK	5.92
ACTR	5.77
CLTA	3.70
AATJ	0.80
AATI	0.60

Nearly one-third of the respondents have been teaching in a higher education setting between one and five years (30.57%), and 28.6% have been teaching between six and ten years. Educators who have taught between 11 and 15 years make up 12.73% of respondents; 9.95% have taught between 16-20 years, 4.52% for 30 years or longer, and 3.24% are in their first year of teaching. Additionally, 74% (n=1528) (Table 5)

NECTFL Review Number 96

Table 5

Years of Teaching Experience in Higher Education

Years Teaching	%
1 year	3.24
1–5 years	30.57
6–10 years	28.60
11–15 years	12.73
16–20 years	9.95
30+ years	4.52

Slightly more than one-third of participants reported teaching beginning (n = 702, 32.0%) or intermediate (n = 836, 38.1%) language courses. At the beginning and intermediate levels, institutions expected tenured/tenure-track faculty (43.4% for beginning, 49.3% for intermediate), graduate students (46.2% for beginning, 37.2% for intermediate), and instructors/adjuncts (37.8% for beginning, 38.5% for intermediate) to teach those courses. These findings suggest that responsibility for lower-level language instruction is widely distributed across faculty ranks and employment categories, which has implications for workload distribution, the preparation and mentoring of graduate student instructors, and the consistency of instructional quality across programs. (Table 6) With respect to the levels and types of courses taught, 20% of respondents reported teaching intermediate language courses, 18% advanced courses, and 17% beginning courses. Additionally, 13% taught literature and culture, 11% linguistics, and 8% language for the professions. Twenty respondents selected the “Other” category, specifying courses such as heritage Spanish, translation, conversation, and history.

Table 6

Types of Courses Taught

Course Type	%
Intermediate Language	20
Advanced Language	18
Beginning Language	17
Literature and Culture	13
Linguistics	11
Language for the Professions	8

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

This demographic information reflects the broad cross-section of university educators who participated in the survey. Moreover, the findings highlight the importance of engaging a wide range of faculty across professional organizations and ensuring access to professional development opportunities. To address the study's guiding research questions, the survey also collected data on multiple aspects of language teaching practices among respondents.

Survey Instrument

The survey included both multiple-choice and open-ended questions. Items addressed teachers' professional roles within their postsecondary institutions (e.g., languages and levels taught, professional title, institution type, and years of teaching experience), professional development (e.g., memberships, activities, prior training, and mentoring influences), and their familiarity with and integration of the ACTFL W-RSLL in teaching. The final section of the survey consisted of open-ended questions that invited participants to reflect on their experiences with curricular development, and the evaluation systems in place at their institutions. (Appendix A)

Results

The survey results provide insight into the realities of post-secondary WL education with regard to the role of the national standards and their broader implementation into the post-secondary WL landscape.

Familiarity with W-RSLL

Our initial research question was intended to determine whether post-secondary language teachers are familiar with the W-RSLL.

Three-quarters of participants (75%) reported that they are either very familiar (33%) or familiar (42%) with implementing the modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, presentational) in language teaching. Also, almost three-quarters of participants (73%) reported familiarity with the Cultures goal (which includes cultural products, practices, and perspectives) from the W-RSLL. Similarly, 72% report familiarity with the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines, and 69.58% with the ACTFL Performance Descriptors. Almost the same number of respondents (69% and 69.07%) reported familiarity with the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Statements and the W-RSLL respectively. Fewer (61%), though still most respondents, reported familiarity with the approach of using Backward Design to plan units and lessons in language teaching.

Most respondents (74%) stated that their department adheres to the ACTFL W-RSLL document, which emphasizes proficiency-oriented teaching and learning. However, a more in-depth review of the qualitative comments highlights a strong textbook and grammatical focus within the post-secondary curriculum.

Respondents who indicated they were familiar or very familiar with the elements of the national standards varied widely in what they reported they actually do in their classroom. Among these respondents, approximately 71% indicate they always or frequently use the interpretive, presentational or interpersonal mode of communication in their instruction, with only closer to 67% indicating they assess these modes.

Additionally, these data revealed that participants reported familiarity (familiar or very familiar) with the Proficiency Guidelines (63.8%, $n = 1,401$), Performance Descriptors (61.6%, $n = 1,352$), and Can-Do Statements (61.1%, $n = 1,342$). Approximately 68.0% ($n = 1,494$) of the participants asserted that their department uses the W-RSLL in curricular development.

W-RSLL: Communication

With respect to communication, the survey focused solely on the mode of interpersonal communication as it has the strongest connection to proficiency-driven instruction. Nearly half of the participants indicated that they did not encourage students to use the language beyond the classroom (n = 940, 49.0%). In addition, only a small proportion (n = 226, 11.8%) reported reaching the 90%+ recommendation of target language use, and if the teacher does not use the language of instruction, students are even less likely to use the language themselves. Furthermore, nearly one-third of respondents stated that their students used the language for less than half of class time. Overall, these findings highlight the limited extent to which the language is used consistently within and beyond the classroom.

Incorporation of culture

Regarding the Cultures Goal area, respondents offered many superficial references to culture. In particular, the comments on the introduction of culture in language instruction suggest that it is often treated superficially or driven by textbook content, lacking deeper cultural analysis. Connections to other disciplines are similarly limited, as many respondents did not provide answers or offered vague references to culture. While some unique ideas were shared, overall, the integration of culture remains minimal.

Additionally, participants either reported that they embedded culture throughout lessons with items such as videos, newspapers, and guest speakers, or it was treated as a “sidebar” using a textbook or online materials. For example, one participant described, “In most cases, culture is presented as an aside to a vocabulary lesson or grammar lesson because we have so little time. I barely have time to cover the material in each chapter, so culture is touched upon only briefly.” Those who supplemented (or supplanted) textbooks discussed the importance of “intercultural competence” and using “authentic texts,” “current events,” and “pop culture.”

While the survey did not specifically ask about the Comparisons goal area, the participants’ responses consistently linked it to Cultures. For example, one educator shared “It’s impossible to teach a language and not teach its culture(s), both big C and little c. [We make] regular comparisons between student lives and peers in other countries.” Another commented, “We make comparisons between their own culture and (the stereotypes) of the T[arget] C[ultures].” Graduate students produced the least examples in line with best practices (15 of 27, 55.5%) for teaching Cultures; however, the overall percentage of these examples was higher than those of full-time (52 of 94, 55.3%) and part-time instructors (91 of 190, 47.8%). Tenured/tenure-track faculty produced the most examples grounded in best practices for integrating culture (147 of 223, 65.9%); however, they frequently referred to advanced classes rather than beginning/intermediate language classes. Many examples from the respondents provided evidence that they planned strategically to connect culture to the topic of study. One participant explained, “I usually include culture that would go with vocabulary themes that we are learning at the time... if the theme is clothing, we visit websites of language specific well-known stores and check out today’s trends, etc.”

Connections

The Connections Standard states that learners connect with other disciplines and acquire information and diverse perspectives to use the language to function in academic and career-related situations. Among our qualitative responses, participants described various methods for implementing this standard in their teaching. Examples included web-based math activities, such as conversions for

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

recipes and dimensions for architectural projects, as well as using geographical and historical maps in civilization courses. They cited specific interdisciplinary themes like biodiversity while studying island ecosystems in the Pacific or exploring anthropology through archaeological digs in French-speaking regions. Teachers also incorporate fields like history, geography, politics, art history, and literature to enrich students' understanding. Additional academic disciplines integrated into language learning include research relevant to students' majors, linguistics, philosophy, religion, forensics, and Deaf studies, demonstrating how language can intersect with a broad range of academic and professional fields.

Communities Standard

To support the Communities Standard that states that learners communicate with cultural competence to participate in multilingual communities locally and globally, teachers reported that they use a variety of strategies to connect students with TL communities. One approach mentioned was organizing field trips to local events, like Christmas markets and festivals, where students can experience traditions and language in authentic settings. Teachers also referenced hosting community events that welcome native speakers, encouraging direct interaction with students. Internships, study abroad, and virtual exchanges with TL university students provide immersive or interactive language practice, while guest speakers and native speakers in the classroom expose students to diverse perspectives. In some cases, students conducted ethnographic studies in neighborhoods where the TL is spoken to observe cultural practices in real-life contexts. Partnerships with local businesses allow students to apply language skills in professional settings, while apps like Talk Abroad and Conversifi foster global connections online. Many institutions further support community engagement through international buddy programs, service-learning projects, student language resident housing, and, where possible, work with refugees. These initiatives offer a range of opportunities for language acquisition and cultural connection, even when a specific language community may not be present nearby.

Additionally, faculty and graduate students who did indeed encourage students to seek opportunities outside of the classroom nearly always appeared to be linked to extra credit or voluntary options. Their comments fell into several categories including: study abroad, language clubs, conversation exchanges with native speakers, integrating community events, connecting with local communities, and technology (e.g., films, music, videos, readings online). Faculty who identified as being tenured/tenure-track provided examples linked most strongly with the W-RSLL (150 of the 193, 77.7%) included comments that were aligned with potential best practices. Comments that were excluded from best practice categorization were either vague (e.g., “homework”; “assign a topic”; “improve grammar”) or failed to answer the question fully (e.g. “It helps them speak perfect [sic]”; “I encourage them”; “I use too many to list here”). The researchers argue that while some of these responses could be in line with high-leverage practices (e.g., homework might include authentic materials; students might improve grammar but focus on meaning in real-world contexts), the lack of detail makes it impossible to know for certain. We used this approach for the remaining goal areas of the W-RSLL presented below.

Connections and Communities

The Connections and Communities goal areas produced the highest percentage of examples aligned with best practices. Beginning with Connections (447 of 512, 87.3%) tenured/tenure-track faculty shared the most examples (199 of 217, 92%), of potential best practices. Responses fell into two categories: (1) what they do as educators and (2) what students do through assignments.

NECTFL Review Number 96

Educators most connected WL to other disciplines such as history, art, and mathematics, and some provided additional detail (e.g., “I teach Spanish for the Professions which includes Engineering and Agriculture;” “Our program offers a dual degree with STEM.”) To accomplish this goal, they referred to “bring[ing] in guest speakers,” “collaborating,” “interdisciplinary meetings,” “team-teaching with other disciplines,” “cross-listing courses with other departments,” or using “textbook materials.”

Nearly all teachers reported needing to find resources such as readings and videos to supplement their textbook. Other answers included details about creative student work (“Students review documents in the specific careers they plan to enter;” “Students learn about urban planning and design an ideal neighborhood;” “Students create baroque-style portraits;” “We talk about the solar system, and students design lessons for children.”) For those who did not make connections to other disciplines, their reasons for doing so were due to certain constraints such as the level of the class (e.g., “I don’t do a great job here. I only teach beginning language classes, but I wish there were more resources easily available on this integration.” “In general, I connect language with history, although I do this mostly in advanced classes.”) or institutional traditions (e.g., “Another instructor makes the course slides.” “I invite students to do so but university professors are terribly territorial, and with so many departments on campus, collaboration is not feasible.”)

Regarding Communities (459 of 511, 90%), graduate students provided the least examples in line with best practices (22 of 33, 66.7%), and tenured/tenure-track faculty offered the most (203 of 214, 94.9%); however, like other goal areas, their responses were most frequently tied to advanced classes. For example, one educator described how students, “conduct research and oral interviews about the growing population locally; assess issues like coverage in the press, growth of small businesses; access to and status of ESL in schools; interview local business, educational, religious and other professionals; interview cultural agents; interview human services personnel.” Another explained how students work with the local consulate to create “campus tour videos and COVID-19 posters at the start of the pandemic that were distributed by the Mexican consulate, [and] an interactive timeline of Jewish immigration to Argentina, which the Argentine consulate posted on their website.” Regarding the beginning/intermediate language classes, most responses were linked to advertising local events in the community, encouraging study abroad or club participation, inviting guest speakers to class, or creating internship experiences for students. Most of these examples were added as encouraged opportunities rather than embedded throughout the course. However, one teacher described an integrated approach:

At the C[ommunity] C[ollege] where I teach, we have developed a “cultural encounters” project where students find ways to engage with Spanish-speakers in their communities, providing a list of ideas and encouraging them to come up with their own activities. These activities were reported as visiting and exploring Latino markets, attending community events, attending quinceañeras, weddings and/or church services, interviewing a Spanish-speaking family or community member (with guidelines to prevent unwanted discussion of topics like immigration status), and many more ideas.

Influences on WL Teaching Practices

Regarding their teaching practices, most survey respondents reported that their instructional decisions were shaped by prior teachers, students, and professional training. Three-quarters cited former teachers as critical influences, and over half indicated they teach the way they were taught. Coursework and

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

pedagogy degrees also informed their approaches, though many noted departmental traditions and textbook expectations as limiting factors.

Among participants' responses, regarding textbook use and curricular control, instructors sometimes or frequently chose their own texts, supplemented with materials, and used authentic resources. Yet, about half reported pressure to cover specific grammar points or follow pre-developed assessments, reflecting restricted autonomy.

TL use and grammar instruction highlighted persistent gaps in proficiency-driven practices. Only one-fifth reported using the TL at least 90% of the time, while the largest group fell between 50% and 74%. Similarly, most continued to rely on the presentation–practice–produce (PPP) model, despite widespread acknowledgment of the value of communicative, contextualized instruction.

Overall, the findings point to and suggest a continued dominance of grammar-driven instruction in university classrooms, limiting opportunities for sustained TL use, and meaningful engagement. This pattern diverges from established professional standards, such as ACTFL's (2017) recommendation of 90% TL use and Ellis's (2006) and Lyster's (2007) calls for contextualized grammar instruction.

Barriers to broader implementation of the W-RSLL

Respondents identified several university-level constraints on teaching. Nearly 80% reported that promotion and tenure standards at their institutions de-emphasize classroom practice, and 84% noted reliance on standardized student evaluations, though 78% questioned their effectiveness for language pedagogy. In addition, respondents pointed to a lack of discipline-specific evaluation measures that capture the complexity of language teaching, including communicative, cultural, and proficiency-oriented goals. Several also noted limited institutional recognition for pedagogical innovation and the time-intensive nature of high-quality language instruction, suggesting a broader misalignment between institutional reward structures and the realities of effective language teaching. These trends suggest that teaching remains undervalued in academic advancement, as evidenced by limited reference to classroom observations. Data also revealed that participants found that teaching methods were strongly shaped by prior experiences: 75% attributed their teaching to former professors or teachers, with roughly two-thirds reporting they teach as they were taught. This reliance on prior models suggests the enduring influence of apprenticeship of observation, in which instructional practices are often internalized and reproduced over time. At the same time, respondents indicated that these inherited approaches were not always critically examined or aligned with current research in language pedagogy, highlighting the need for sustained, reflective teacher education that supports the adaptation and refinement of instructional practices. Qualitative comments further underscored the influence of personal academic and teaching histories. As an example, one participant commented that the “teachers I've had and mentors I've learned from and still consult” and another commented “my teaching is not so much of a ‘what’ is it a ‘who;’ ...taught me how to teach Spanish while I was a graduate student... Her methods upended everything I had previously learned about teaching.”

Discussion and Implications

Current Trends

This survey offers an initial perspective on trends among post-secondary language teachers' familiarity with and integration of the W-RSLL and related resources. Findings from the survey point to several trends among our

NECTFL Review Number 96

participants. First, although respondents reported familiarity with the W-RSLL the responses to more specific questions indicate a contradiction with the reality of their practice, and a continued reliance on grammar-driven instruction and relatively little class time appears to be devoted to target language tasks. Self-reported practices varied widely and tended to emphasize grammar-driven rather than proficiency-driven instruction, shaped in part by departmental course coordination. About half of respondents noted being required, or feeling pressured, to cover specific textbook grammar points, and qualitative responses frequently highlighted grammar practice as a central focus.

Post-secondary educators reported familiarity with and departmental adherence to the standards; however, closer examination of their classroom responses suggests inconsistent implementation of the modes of communication. The Cultures, Connections, and Communities standards appeared to receive only superficial attention.

Persistent Challenges

The survey also highlighted systemic and structural challenges that shape instruction in post-secondary environments. Many responses indicated that they felt pressure to focus on what counts for promotion and tenure, an over-reliance on student evaluations and departmental expectations to remain faithful to traditional grammar-driven and textbook driven curricula.

Implications for Practice

The findings of this national study emphasized the need for attention to how WL are taught in post-secondary environments. Departments and individuals may benefit from revisiting their curricula as a whole and ensuring that grammar and textbook coverage do not overshadow communicative goals. Professional development specifically designed for post-secondary WL educators (and made easily accessible given the constraints of the university environment) may help shift these trends. Finally, universities may need to re-consider the current evaluation systems, including student evaluations of teaching that may be negatively influencing innovation and implementation of more proficiency-based instruction.

Directions for future research

This study raises several questions that merit additional investigation. To begin, this study relied on self-reported responses. Observational research, focus group discussions or studies of artifacts such as syllabi or course materials would contribute to a deeper understanding of what influences academic choice in post-secondary classrooms. Future studies might also explore the effects of the Seal of Biliteracy on incoming college freshmen. Expanding on these areas of research will help strengthen the relevance of the W-RSLL in post-secondary WL programs and practices.

Limitations of the Study

While this study included a broad range of participants, survey research cannot fully capture the complexity of individual classrooms and curricula. As a result, it offered only a limited account of post-secondary teaching practices. Respondents may also have interpreted the W-RSLL differently, leading to varied understandings and implementation practices in university/post-secondary classrooms. In addition, the survey's length may have contributed to fatigue, constraining the depth of some responses.

Conclusion and Future Research

Post-secondary WL programs face an enrollment crisis, requiring transformational teaching to attract and retain students. While faculty demonstrated familiarity with the W-RSLL and offered examples of classroom use, consistent implementation—particularly of sustained TL use—as suggested by the results remains limited. Growing numbers of students entering college with the Seal of Biliteracy present institutions with an opportunity to leverage prior experiences and establish pathways toward the Global Seal. At the same time, systemic pressures such as promotion and tenure expectations and departmental constraints continue to hinder the adoption of standards-based, proficiency-driven instruction. Addressing these challenges is vital for WL programs to remain sustainable and responsive to students' needs.

References

- ACTFL. (2011). *A decade of foreign language standards: Impact, influence, and future directions* (Survey report). Alexandria, VA: ACTFL. <https://www.actfl.org/uploads/files/general/NationalStandards2011.pdf>
- ACTFL. (2015). *ACTFL performance descriptors for language learners*. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. <https://www.actfl.org/resources/performance-descriptors>
- ACTFL. (2024). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2024*. https://www.actfl.org/uploads/files/general/Resources-Publications/ACTFL_Proficiency_Guidelines_2024.pdf
- ACTFL & NCSSFL. (2017). *NCSSFL–ACTFL can-do statements*. <https://www.actfl.org/resources/ncssfl-actfl-can-do-statements>
- ACTFL/CAEP. (2013). *ACTFL/CAEP program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers* (modified 2015). ACTFL. https://www.actfl.org/uploads/files/general/Documents/ACTFLCAEPStandards2013_v2015.pdf
- Bell, T. R. (2005). Behaviors and attitudes of effective foreign language teachers: Results of a questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02490.x>
- Bell, T. R. (2015). Matching student and teacher perceptions for the retention of university German students. In R. J. Halverson & C. A. Costabile-Heming (Eds.), *Taking Stock of German Studies in the United States: The New Millennium* (pp. 200-225). Boydell & Brewer. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781782045878-013>
- Borg, S. (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 3–31. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806LR1820A>
- Brooks, F. B., & Darhower, M. A. (2014). *It takes a department! A study of the culture of proficiency in three successful foreign language teacher education programs*. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47(4), 592-613. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12118>
- Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827.x>
- Butrymowicz, S., & D'Amato, P. (2020, August 4). *A crisis is looming for U.S. colleges — and not just because of the pandemic*. NBC News. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/education/crisis-looming-u-s-colleges-not-just-because->

[pandemic-n1235338](#)

- Chaffee, J. (1992). Teaching critical thinking across the curriculum. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 77, 25-35. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ443439>
- Chambless, K. S. (2012). Teachers' oral proficiency in the target language: Research on its role in language teaching and learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(S1), S141–S162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01183.x>
- D'Amico, M. L. S. (2023). Understanding student (a)motivation towards learning a language: Students' perspectives on continued language study. In E. Heidrich Uebel, F. A. Kronenberg, & S. Sterling (Eds.), *Language program vitality in the United States* (Educational Linguistics, Vol. 63, pp. 115–135). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43654-3_7
- Dimock, M. (2019, January 17). *Defining generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z begins*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>
- Eckerson, J., & Jacobs, C. (2024). The Seal of Bilingualism as a recruitment tool in postsecondary language study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 57(3), 654–674. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12769>
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
- Glisan, E. W., & Donato, R. (2017). *Enacting the work of language instruction: High-leverage teaching practices*. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. ISBN 978-1-942544-54-8
- Gyurko, J., MacCormack, P., Bless, M., & Jodl, J. (2016). *Why colleges and universities need to invest in quality teaching more than ever* [White paper]. Association of College and University Educators. <https://acue.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/ACUE-White-Paper1.pdf>
- Hancock, C. R., Adams, M. J., & Kissau, S. (2023). The relationship between proficiency-based instruction and student oral proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 56(2), 280–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12698>
- Hlas, A. C., & Hlas, C. S. (2012). A review of high-leverage teaching practices: Making connections between mathematics and foreign languages. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(S1), S76-S97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01180.x>
- Huhn, C. (2018). Integration of the national foreign language standards in post-secondary beginning Spanish textbooks. *The TFLIA Journal*, 7(1), 1–21. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343547076_Integration_of_the_National_Foreign_Language_Standards_in_Post-Secondary_Beginning_Spanish_Textbooks
- Huhn, C. (2021). Reframing my practices: Reconsidering post-secondary world language education. *Teacher Development*, 25(5), 687-705. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2021.1970000>
- Huhn, C. (2022). *Two decades of the standards: Post-secondary impact*. In the 2022 Report of the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (pp. 151-184). ERIC. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED623038.pdf>
- Irwin, V., Wang, K., Tezil, T., Zhang, J., Filbey, A., Jung, J., Bullock Mann, F., Dilig, R., & Parker, S. (2023). *Report on the Condition of Education 2023* (NCES 2023-144). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2023/2023144.pdf>

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

- Kingson, J. (2024, July 3). *Schools are bracing for the looming “enrollment cliff.”* Axios. <https://www.axios.com/2024/07/03/education-enrollment-cliff-schools>
- Lomicka, L., & Lord, G. (2018). Ten years after the MLA report: What has changed in foreign language departments? *ADFL Bulletin*, 44(2), 116-120. <https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.44.2.116>
- Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2018). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016: Final report*. Modern Language Association. <https://www.mla.org/content/download/83540/2197676/2016-Enrollments-Final-Report.pdf>
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Martel, J. (2013). Saying our final goodbyes to the grammatical syllabus: A curricular imperative. *The French Review* 86(6), 1122-1133. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/tfr.2013.0106>.
- Martel, J. (2016). Tapping the National Standards for thought-provoking CBI instruction in K–16 foreign language programs. In L. Cammarata (Ed.), *Content-based foreign language teaching: Curriculum and pedagogy for developing advanced thinking and literacy skills*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Martel, J. (2017). Is the Field of Foreign Language Education Disposed to Change? *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(2), 431–433. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44980989>
- Modern Language Association. (2007). *Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world*. MLA. <http://www.mla.org/flreport>
- Monto, C. (2022). The Seal of Biliteracy as a recruitment tool in postsecondary language study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 55(4), 654–674. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12769>
- Morgan, W. J., & Thompson, A. S. (2023). “My friend Travis says...”: A look at enrollment trends in language classes in the United States. *Foreign Language Annals*, 56(2), 259–279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12697>
- Murphy, D., & Martin, J. (2023). Amplifying student voices: U.S. undergraduate student perspectives on expanding access and increasing the relevance of courses in languages other than English. In E. Heidrich Uebel, F. A. Kronenberg, & S. Sterling (Eds.), *Language program vitality in the United States: From surviving to thriving in higher education* (pp. 59–75). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43654-3_4
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2024, May 30). *NCES’s “Condition of education” sheds light on enrollment trends, from early childhood to K–12 and postsecondary education*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/whatsnew/press_releases/5_30_2024.asp
- National Foreign Language Center. (n.d.). *TELL project*. University of Maryland. <https://nflc.umd.edu/projects/tell>
- National Standards Collaborative Board. (2015). *World-readiness standards for learning languages* (4th ed.). ACTFL. <https://www.actfl.org/uploads/files/general/World-ReadinessStandardsforLearningLanguages.pdf>
- Redden, E. (2017, January 6). Call to action on languages, 10 years later. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/06/survey-looks-foreign-language-programs-response-decade-old-call-transform-teaching>

NECTFL Review Number 96

- Rothe, L., Tsui, C. K., García, P. A., & McCloskey, M. B. (2023). Creating safe spaces: Diverse instructional materials for world language learners. *NECTFL Review*, 90, 57–79. <https://www.nectfl.org/download/4897>
- Spino, L., Echevarría, M. M., & Wu, Y. (2022). Assisted self-assessment to optimize the OPIc test experience. *Foreign Language Annals*, 55(3), 853–876. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12645>
- Swanson, P. B., & Moore, A. D. (2006). Changing student misperceptions about foreign language teaching: A research-based approach to improving recruitment practices. *NECTFL Review*, 59, 6-27. <https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/bitstreams/6b40609a-3f83-49fc-99f4-8eddc7e3f371/download>
- Zhang, H., Li, R., Chen, X., & Yan, F. (2024). Cultural representation in foreign language textbooks: A scoping review from 2012 to 2022. *Linguistics and Education*, 83, 101331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101331>

Appendix A Survey Instrument

Do you currently teach a world language in a two-year or four-year university environment?

- Yes
- If no, thank you so much for considering our survey.

First a little about you and your **professional roles and activities**:

Gender:

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say
- Other _____

My professional role (s). (Select all that apply.)

- Foreign Language Professor
- Education Professor
- Methods Professor
- College Administrator
- State Supervisor/Coordinator
- Language Association Officer
- K-12 Language Teacher (in addition to a university role)
- K-12 Language Student Teacher Mentor/Cooperating Teacher (in addition a university role)
- Language/Language Education Graduate Student MA or MS
- Language/Language Education Graduate Student PhD or EdD
- K-12 Administrator (with a university role)
- Other _____
- _____

I am a member of the following professional organizations: (select all that apply)

- Modern Language Association (MLA)
- ACTFL
- A state foreign language association

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

- A regional foreign/world language association (NECTFL, SCOLT, CSCTFL, SWCOLT, PNCFL)
- American Association of Teachers of German (AATG)
- American Association of Teachers of French (AATF)
- American Association of Teachers of Korean (AATK)
- American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP)
- American Classical League (ACL)
- American Council on the Teaching of Russian (ACTR)
- Chinese Language Teachers Association (CLTA)
- Other _____

I have been teaching (or taught) for:

- < 1 year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21-30 years
- 30+
- Retired
- Other _____

My teaching position is:

- Graduate Student
- Lecturer/Instructor--Full-time
- Lecturer/Instructor--Part-time
- Tenured/Tenure-Track Professor
- Post-secondary/Undergraduate
- Other _____

I teach/taught:

- Arabic
- Chinese
- French
- German
- Italian
- Japanese
- Korean
- Portuguese
- Russian
- Spanish
- Other _____

Click the level of classes you most commonly teach: (select all that apply)

- Beginning language classes
- Intermediate language classes
- Advanced language classes
- Literature, film and culture classes
- Linguistics classes
- Language for the professions
- Other _____

NECTFL Review Number 96

How much support do you receive for professional development from your department, college, or university?

- 100%
- 50-99%
- 10-49%
- Below 10%

How likely are you to remain in academia?

- Very likely. (This is my chosen profession.)
- Somewhat likely, but I do have some uncertainty.
- Not likely. (I don't see myself staying in academic very long.)

Education/Pedagogy

Do you have a background in teaching K-12 or certification to teach K-12?

- Yes (Which subject areas and for how long?)

• No _____

Have you completed education courses?

- Yes (which ones?)

• No _____

Have you ever completed pedagogy courses?

- Yes (which ones?)

• No _____

Do you have a degree or degrees in education?

- Yes (if so, what is the degree?)

• No _____

Have you taught anywhere outside of the university environment? Please explain.

- Yes (if so when and where?)

• No _____

Your Institution:

Does your institution have a foreign language requirement?

- Yes (if so, please describe what requirement)

• No _____

- Not sure

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

At your institution, who teaches the beginning language classes? (select all that apply)

- Faculty
- TAs or student instructors
- Instructors or adjuncts

At your institution, who teaches the intermediate language classes? (select all that apply)

- Faculty
- TAs or student instructors
- Instructors or adjuncts

Who determines what courses you teach?

- College dean
- Department chair
- Section head
- College dean with input from me
- Department chair with input from me
- Section head with input from me
- I do

My department uses the ACTFL World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages in our curriculum.

- Yes
 - No
 - Not Sure/Other
-

Conference Attendance

Do you regularly attend professional conferences **specific to teaching languages**?

- 10+ conferences per year
- 5-9 conferences per year
- 2-4 conferences per year
- One conference per year
- One conference every two years
- Fewer than one conference every two years

Which conferences? Please list.

When you attend conferences, do you regularly attend sessions on classroom pedagogy?

- Yes
- No

NECTFL Review Number 96

How much support do you receive for professional development from your department, college, or university?

- 100%
- 50-99%
- 10-49%
- Below 10%

How likely are you to remain in academia?

- Very likely. (This is my chosen profession.)
- Somewhat likely, but I do have some uncertainty.
- Not likely. (I don't see myself staying in academic very long.)

Education/Pedagogy

- Do you have a background in teaching K-12 or certification to teach K-12?
- Yes (Which subject areas and for how long?)

• _____
No

Have you completed education courses?

- Yes (which ones?)

• _____
No

Have you ever completed pedagogy courses?

- Yes (which ones?)

• _____
No

Do you have a degree or degrees in education?

- Yes (if so, what is the degree?)

• _____
No

Have you taught anywhere outside of the university environment? Please explain.

- Yes (if so when and where?)

• _____
No
•

Your Institution:

Does your institution have a foreign language requirement?

- Yes (if so, please describe what requirement)

• _____
No

- Not sure

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

At your institution, who teaches the beginning language classes? (select all that apply)

- Faculty
- TAs or student instructors
- Instructors or adjuncts

At your institution, who teaches the intermediate language classes? (select all that apply)

- Faculty
- TAs or student instructors
- Instructors or adjuncts

Who determines what courses you teach?

- College dean
- Department chair
- Section head
- College dean with input from me
- Department chair with input from me
- Section head with input from me
- I do

My department uses the ACTFL World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages in our curriculum.

- Yes
 - No
 - Not Sure/Other
-

Conference Attendance

Do you regularly attend professional conferences **specific to teaching languages**?

- 10+ conferences per year
- 5-9 conferences per year
- 2-4 conferences per year
- One conference per year

Which conferences? Please list.

When you attend conferences, do you regularly attend sessions on classroom pedagogy?

- Yes
- No
-

NECTFL Review Number 96

Teaching Resources

Please indicate your familiarity with each of the resources below.

	very familiar	familiar	not very familiar	not familiar at all
Modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, presentational)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Culture (products, practices, perspectives)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ACTFL Performance Descriptors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ACTFL/NCSSFL Can-Do Statements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages (aka 5 Cs or Goal Areas)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Backwards Design (Wiggins & McTighe)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Your classroom

Do you encourage opportunities to use the language outside of class?

- Yes (if so, please be specific and provide examples)

• No

How do you integrate culture into your courses? (Please be specific and provide examples.)

How do you connect your courses with other disciplines? (Please be specific and provide examples.)

How do you connect your students to the target language communities? (Please be specific and provide examples.)

Do you use the Backwards Design model (Wiggins & McTighe)?

- Yes (if so, please be specific and provide examples)

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Influencing Factors

Please indicate which statements below influence the way you teach.

	Yes	No
My previous professors and teachers have influenced my teaching.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach my language classes the way I learned languages as a student.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach my language classes the way I was taught as a student.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate which of these professional development activities you engage

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
I engage in professional development on teaching in general.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I engage in professional development on language teaching specifically.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I read professional journal articles on teaching techniques.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I read professional journal articles on research in language teaching.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

With regard to your curriculum:

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
I choose the textbook(s) I use for the courses I teach.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Someone in my department or college chooses the textbook(s) use for the courses I teach.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use a textbook as my curricular guide.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach using the textbook sequentially.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use a textbook and supplement my own materials.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use authentic resources (materials created by native speakers for native speakers) in my teaching.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

NECTFL Review Number 96

With regard to your curriculum:

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
I choose the textbook(s) I use for the courses I teach.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Someone in my department or college chooses the textbook(s) use for the courses I teach.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use a textbook as my curricular guide.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach using the textbook sequentially.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use a textbook and supplement my own materials.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use authentic resources (materials created by native speakers for native speakers) in my teaching.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

With regard to your curriculum:

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
I feel pressure to cover the required textbook chapters in my courses.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am required to teach specific grammar points in my courses.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use textbook/publisher developed quizzes and tests.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use textbook workbook/lab manuals (online or paper).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

With regard to your teaching:

±)

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
I use reading, listening, and viewing (interpretive communication) activities in the language classes I teach.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I assess the interpersonal communication mode (partner speaking or writing).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use the interpretive communication mode (reading and listening and viewing).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I assess the presentational communication mode (speaking or writing).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use departmentally developed rubric or criterion-based grading in my assessment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use my own rubric or criterion-based grading in my assessment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I provide point-based feedback.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I provide comments and proficiency feedback.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

NECTFL Review Number 96

With regard to grammar instruction:

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Never
I teach grammar through the presentation-practice-produce model.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach grammar as a concept, in context.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach grammar in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I teach grammar in the target language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In Closing

What is the biggest influence on your language teaching?

Do your university's promotion and tenure standards and practices place emphasis upon classroom practices and teaching?

- Yes (if so, how?) _____
- No _____

Does your institution use standardized student evaluations?

- Yes
- No

Are there items on the evaluations that are discipline-specific?

- Yes
- No

Would you be interested in participating in a follow-up survey or focus group? If so, please include your email. Your email will not be connected with your responses.

- Yes _____
- No _____

Please leave your name and email address below if you'd like your name to be included in a drawing for one of 10 \$50 Visa gift cards. Your email will not be connected with your responses. If selected, you will be notified by email.

- Yes _____
- No _____

TRENDS & CHALLENGES IN POST-SECONDARY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Dr. Christina Huhn is a Professor in the Department of Foreign Languages, Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Her research and publications focus on Teaching Methods, Teacher Education, and Language Education, as well as program evaluation, World Language Standards in the post-secondary classroom, and post-secondary educator effectiveness.

Dr. Teresa R. Bell is a Professor of German at Brigham Young University. Her research and publications focus on language teacher development, proficiency maintenance, and world language pedagogy.

Dr. Krista Chambless is a Professor of French and Spanish at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. Her research focuses on the teaching of world languages, specifically the use of the target language in the classroom and world language teacher preparation.

Dr. Kelly M. Moser is an Associate Professor of Spanish and World Language Teaching in the Department of Classical & Modern Languages and Literatures. Her research explores World language teacher development, teacher cognition and practice, world language teacher shortages and rural world language teacher preparation.

