

journal of global buddhism

ད་ག་པ་

Research Article

Journal of Global Buddhism 2 (2001): 44-58

Teaching Buddhism in the West:
(Mostly) North American Universities and Colleges.

By Mavis Fenn



Copyright Notice

Digital copies of this work may be made and distributed provided no charge is made and no alteration is made to the content. Reproduction in any other format with the exception of a single copy for private study requires the written permission of the author.

All enquiries to jgb-general@jgb.la.psu.edu.

<http://jgb.la.psu.edu>

Teaching Buddhism in the West: (Mostly) North American Universities and Colleges

By

Mavis Fenn

Assistant Professor

St. Paul's College, University of Waterloo

mfenn@uwaterloo.ca

INTRODUCTION

This article presents the results of my preliminary research on the teaching of Buddhism in the West and lays the foundation for future research in this area. Although much has been written on the early history of Buddhist Studies¹ and some on the evolution of the modern American university², little has been written on the teaching of Buddhism in North America. We have little information on the degree of specialization possible for undergraduates and graduates, their access to language study, current trends in research, and so on. Further, the increasing use of technology in education provokes reflection on the nature of the field itself: where have we been, where are we now, and what direction will teaching take in the future?

In an attempt to compile some data that would assist my reflection on these questions, I posted a questionnaire on *Budschol* in August 2000.³ *Budschol* is an online list (budschol@egroups.com), the members of whom must be either Buddhist scholars or graduate students in Buddhism. At the time of the posting, there were 304 members on the list. Of those 304 members, thirty-nine were listed at Asian universities, two were listed as retired, and ninety-three were duplicates (having more than one member from the same university). Of the remainder, there were eleven members who were clearly identifiable as “other” (institutes and research centers, for example). It was not possible to clearly affiliate all members of the list, as some are independent scholars. In addition, the survey was sent to six scholars not found on the list. The sample basis, then, I have taken as 165.

Of a possible 165 responses, I received thirty-three. Two of the responses were from the same university, and one was rejected as no complete courses on Buddhism were given at the institution.⁴ Thus my final response sample is thirty-one, or a 18.78 percent response rate. Although this percentage appears low, two factors must be taken into consideration: the sample base includes some non-affiliated scholars, and response rates

to Internet questionnaires are generally low.⁵ The countries from which responses were received were as follows: Australia (1), New Zealand (1) United Kingdom (1), Canada (8, with one duplicate), Germany (1) and the United States (20).⁶ The predominance of responses from the United States can be explained by reference to its dominance in the sample group.

RESULTS

Although responses from the United States predominate, Table 1 indicates that the distribution by overall university enrollment presents a broad range, from those under 5,000 students to those with about 50,000 students.⁷

Table 1.

RESPONDENT NO.	ENROLLMENT	RESPONDENT NO.	ENROLLMENT
1	1,400	17	15,000
2	1,831	18	17,900
3	1,858	19	18,660
4	1,991	20	20,000
5	2,200	21	21,000
6	4,000	22	21,000
7	4,800	23	28,711
8	5,600	24	30,000
9	6,147	25	33,327
10	8,250	26	35,100
11	9,870	27	40,000
12	10,000	28	40,000
13	11,000	29	40,700
14	11,300	30	49,700
15	13,000	31	50,000
16	14,084		

The study of Buddhism generally finds its home within departments of Religious Studies. Twenty-four of the thirty-one (77.41 percent) respondents listed Religious Studies as the faculty, department, or program where Buddhism was taught. Three were located in a department of Religious Studies where there was a program in Buddhist Studies, and one listed Asian Studies as the main component with Religious Studies as the secondary component. In the “other” category, Buddhist Studies found its home in philosophy and history departments. In two cases, interdisciplinary categories were cited: History/Art and Anthropology, and History of Art. In only one case was Buddhist Studies listed as the primary identifier. Buddhist Studies, then, administratively is generally considered to be a subset of Religious Studies rather than a primary field per se. This notion is reinforced when we look at the department size category. The most common response was “Greater than ten” (fourteen responses for 45.14 percent), the next “Five to ten” (29.03 percent), and eight departments (25.8 percent) listed “Less than 5.” In one case, the respondent noted that the department had fifty-one members, but that he was the sole instructor in Buddhist Studies.⁸

Specialization in Buddhist Studies was available at fifteen institutions (48.38 percent). Thirteen offered some specialization at the graduate level (86.6 percent), including one Art History, and nine offered specialization at the undergraduate level (60 percent). Of the universities or colleges that allowed specialization, three had been offering degrees in which Buddhist Studies was an important component for thirty to forty years, three had offered them for twenty to thirty years, three for ten to twenty years, three for five to ten years, three for less than five years, and two did not respond to the question.⁹ Regarding universities and colleges that did not offer specialization, one had been offering Buddhist Studies courses for over forty years, three had been offering them for thirty to forty years, seven for twenty to thirty years, three for ten to twenty years, two for five to ten years, and one for under five years.¹⁰ Taken at face value, these figures appear to indicate a measure of stability in the field, and even some small measure of growth, given that one institution has added specialization in Buddhism as a degree component within the last five years, three have offered it for five to ten years, and two have offered courses for five to ten years. However, without a detailed comparison of this current information with material gleaned from either earlier studies (and I am not aware of any such studies) or research on the department history of each of the respondent institutions, one must be cautious in commenting on the significance of these figures.

The supposition that the field has remained somewhat stable increases when we

examine the responses regarding enrollment. Respondents were asked to identify the period of time in which enrollment in Buddhist courses was highest. I expected that most would refer to an earlier period of time, especially the 1970s. However, twenty-three listed “Current” as their highest period of enrollment (74.19 percent).¹¹ Of the remainder, one commented that enrollment had been stable from the 1970s to the present, one commented that enrollment had been high when Buddhist Studies had been part of a Far Eastern Studies department (now inoperative) and had begun to rise again in the 1990s in a Religious Studies department, and one “guessed” that it had been highest in the 1970s. Two listed “Unknown,” and one did not answer the question.¹² Further, the most common response to the query regarding the number of students taking courses on Buddhism was “More than twenty” (80.64 percent).¹³

As a primary focus, “Historical” appeared in every answer (100 percent), but in only three cases was it listed as the sole focus (9.67 percent).¹⁴ It was found in combination most often with “Textual” (nineteen for 61.2 percent) and “Anthropological” (thirteen for 41.9 percent). “Contemporary” appeared eleven times (35.48 percent) and linguistic seven times (22.58 percent). “Art” appeared twice (6.45 percent). When asked if their program had changed focus over the years, fourteen indicated that it had (45.16 percent). Of these fourteen, seven (50 percent) reported a move toward a more contemporary focus frequently combined with social scientific method.¹⁵ We see the manifestation of this shift in the fact that eighteen (58.06 percent) of the colleges and universities offer courses in Western Buddhism, American Buddhism, Engaged Buddhism, or Buddhist Ethics.¹⁶ Western Buddhism was the most frequently noted (eight for 25.8 percent), with respondents adding that topics in American Buddhism, Engaged Buddhism and Buddhist Ethics were covered within that context. Buddhist Ethics was also listed separately four times (12.9 percent), and respondents in two cases noted that Engaged Buddhism was covered under this course title as well. One respondent noted that a course on Western Buddhism was proposed for offering in his department next year, and one noted that courses on these subjects are made available to students in the summer session. Reasons given for the shift varied. Although retirement of faculty was listed as the sole reason in one case, it was most often combined with faculty and student interest.

Although contemporary studies appear to be growing, the teaching of languages continues to be important. Only six institutions (19.35 percent) did not offer language study as a teachable subject.¹⁷ Many institutions were able to provide a wide range of languages, although some languages were provided outside the immediate department

and others were offered only by special request. The most frequent offerings were in Chinese (24) and Japanese (23), followed by Sanskrit (14), Tibetan (11), and Pali (7). Also offered were Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, a variety of Prakrits, Thai, Laotian, Korean, Sinhala, and Hindi.¹⁸

The question concerning the schools or traditions in which one could take courses turned out to be somewhat problematic. The question was too vaguely worded, and thus responses were difficult to quantify in a manner that would be helpful. Because many offered survey courses, they responded with “all.” Some responded with a regional response such as Chinese and Japanese traditions, and some were far more specific, listing Madhyamaka, Abhidharma, or Zen. And many, likely due to confusion, left the question blank.

Although the question concerning course offerings did ask about total numbers of courses, it too could have been more precise. It failed to ask whether courses were “total” by instructor, term, year, or by the number of courses available in the course calendar.¹⁹ At the graduate level, it similarly failed to indicate whether seminars were to be considered classes, and it provided no space to include individual professor-student readings. Despite these limitations, we still get a good general picture. At the graduate level, two responded that course offerings “vary” and are “unlimited.” One simply listed ten, while another listed five or six per semester, adding that there were thirty to forty courses listed “on [the] books.” One respondent listed five “set” courses and added that independent study was separate. One listed four, but indicated that the figure varied. The balance indicated either one or two. At the undergraduate level, the largest number of course offerings was listed as ten, followed by eight. One listed five or six courses per year, and another listed five or six, adding that not all of these were offered annually. Three listed five courses, four listed four, four listed three, nine listed two, and three listed one course.²⁰

Whether one teaches one course per semester or three, it is always a challenge to balance teaching and research. The modern department generally appears to consider both important. Nineteen (61.29 percent) stated that their department focus was fairly equally divided between concern for research and teaching.²¹ Five (16.12 percent) placed teaching as the primary focus of their department, two (6.45 percent) felt that teaching predominated, and the same percentage listed research as predominant. Two listed a ratio of 60 percent to 40 percent in favor of research. One respondent stated that, in theory, the ratio was supposed to be 75 percent teaching and 25 percent research, but that promotions were based upon research.

The final set of questions had to do with the use of technology. It provided an interesting range of responses and elicited the most comments.²² Twenty-eight (90.32 percent) respondent institutions did not have a web course on Buddhism. Of those twenty-eight, two had proposals for a course. There were two who had web courses, and one had part of the introductory course online. The second part of the question asked if they thought a web course would be good or bad and for any comments they might wish to make on the subject. Although fourteen (45.16 percent) responded that a web course would be good, four of those qualified their response. Some of the concerns were practical, regarding the time and resources necessary to prepare a web course and concern that a web course done elsewhere might eliminate their survey course. Others expressed concern for the loss of “face to face” teaching. This pattern of qualification extended to the “No” responses. Eight (25.8 percent) felt that a web course would be bad, and four of those qualified their answer. Concerns expressed were similar to those in the qualified “yes” group, but also included political and pedagogical concerns as well. Problems concerning intellectual ownership, the “downloading” of responsibility onto sessional instructors or teaching assistants were noted, and one respondent noted that the increased time web course instructors spend at their computers increased the risk of injuries. Three respondents were uncertain about how they felt (9.6 percent). One respondent noted that he had “not thought this issue through very well.” Two responded to the question by indicating that whether or not they felt a web course was “good” or “bad” would depend entirely on the quality of that course (6.45 percent). The balance of the responses listed “no interest,” “no opinion,” or “no strong opinion,” and one did not respond to the question.

CONCLUSIONS

As noted above, one must be cautious when commenting on the meaning to be derived from these survey results. The size of the sample is small, the return rate somewhat low, and we do not have surveys from some institutions where Buddhist Studies has traditionally been important. Having said that, however, all the respondents are Buddhist scholars, and the return rate would have been statistically higher had clear identification of graduate students been possible.²³ Further, the size of the institutions provides a nice range, and although the presence of non-North American institutions is small, the range of those from the United States and Canada is geographically representative. Some careful speculation may be made.

The inclusion of courses on Buddhism in the West by over 50 percent of colleges and universities is significant. Although some research has been done on both immigrant and conversion Buddhism in the West, the presentation of this material has usually been seen as an addendum to a general survey of Buddhism rather than as the basis for a course offering. The study of Buddhism as it is currently evolving—that is, “living communities”—has been seen previously to be the legitimate purview of social scientists, not Buddhist Studies scholars. The notion of what constitutes Buddhist Studies has expanded. I use the term “expanded” rather than “changed” because the survey results clearly indicate that more traditional teaching foci have remained relatively consistent. There is still a concern for proper grounding in language and the study of texts.²⁴

The fact that this shift represents a confluence of both faculty and student interest is also significant. Faculty interest indicates an acceptance of Western Buddhism, American Buddhism, Engaged Buddhism and Buddhist Ethics as fields of study within Buddhist Studies. Student interest is indicative of several factors: an increased awareness of Buddhism as part of the “mainstream” (read an article, heard a talk, went to a concert, heard about Buddhism from a friend’s teacher or from neighbors, and so on), sufficient desire to ask for information or courses, and sufficient attendance at such classes to justify their continued existence. Whatever else one makes of this, it is clear that the study of Buddhism in the West has become a legitimate teaching subject in its own right.

Student interest provokes further reflection. I noted above that, from the surveys submitted, there appears to be a measure of stability to the area, if not some small growth. We need to put these figures in some perspective, particularly when they seem to be at odds with what is generally held to be the case, that the field is under threat and that student enrollment was highest in the 1970s.²⁵ It is possible that few of those who responded to the survey have been at their institution since this period.²⁶ The response that enrollments are currently the highest, then, might mean that a department is recovering after a period of decline and administrative reorganization. The respondent comment that enrollment had been high when Buddhist Studies was part of a Far East Studies program, had declined when that program was eliminated, but now was increasing in the Buddhist Studies section of a department of Religious Studies lends some credence to this view, as does the experience at the University of Alberta. A further matter complicating this issue has to do with the possibility of specialization. Although almost 50 percent of the participant institutions can offer specialization in Buddhism, and 60 percent of those can offer specialization at the undergraduate level—a figure that seems reasonable to me—how many were able to

do so ten years ago, fifteen years ago, and so on? The same respondent noted above also stated that when Buddhist Studies was part of the Far East Studies program, it was possible to specialize in Buddhism, and now it is not. Perhaps the stability, or recovery, of the field includes a move from specialization towards generalization. Further research is required in this area before any firm conclusions can be made.

The responses to questions concerning the use of technology in teaching were of particular interest to me. I have just completed an introductory web course on Buddhism for use in distance education and am intimately familiar with the problems involved. As I have written in detail about the problems with, and benefits of, web courses elsewhere, I will simply note some of the issues.²⁷ Development is time-consuming, and the time involved does not lessen as there is a great deal of interaction between students and professor via e-mail. Further, this time commitment is rarely rewarded with credit towards promotion, leave time, or financial incentive.²⁸ There is also a real potential that web courses can be used to cut financial corners by administrators who want to avoid replacing retiring faculty. Once developed, they can be monitored by teaching assistants or sessionals at less cost.²⁹ Several respondents noted their preference for “face-to-face” teaching. The belief that good pedagogy requires face-to-face interaction with students lies at the heart of professorial resistance to the use of technology in education and, for some, serves as an argument against distance education itself. Having been involved in distance education and having read studies of its effectiveness, I believe that this notion is misdirected.³⁰ To say that face-to-face instruction is the ideal should not be interpreted as meaning that education is not possible without it. A web course designed to promote interaction between professor and students and among students can go a long way to providing distance education students with the same experience as their on campus colleagues. So, too, the Internet now has a wide variety of good resources for Buddhist Studies that can be harnessed for research papers and additional reading.³¹ A variety of factors, only a few of which have been noted above, will contribute to the increased use of web courses in the teaching of Buddhism. It is incumbent upon instructors to learn about the issues involved in the use of technology in education so that they can make sound decisions concerning its use.

The results of this survey provide a benchmark for further research. There is need to build upon Thomas Tweed’s *The American Encounter with Buddhism 1844-1912* and Laurence R. Veysey’s *The Emergence of the American University* if we are to produce a comprehensive history of the teaching of Buddhism in the West. From Veysey’s work,

we learn that many of the issues that confronted American educators in the late nineteenth century are still with us at the beginning of the twenty-first. Continuing research on the current situation may enable us to predict, and thus prepare for, the future.

APPENDIX 1

Survey: Teaching Buddhism in the West [edited slightly for publication]

Please answer all questions that you feel are applicable to your institution. If a question is not applicable, please indicate "n/a." You may make additional comments, if you wish. The form will take about fifteen to twenty minutes to fill out. Thank you for your help.

Name of your institution _____

1. Is Buddhist studies at your institution part of an:

Asian Studies Program _____ Buddhist Studies Program _____ Department
or Faculty of Religious Studies _____ Institute _____ Other _____

2. Is it possible to specialize in Buddhist Studies at your institution?

Yes or No _____

If "Yes", at what level?

Graduate _____ Undergraduate _____

3. If you answered "Yes" to question two, then how long has your institution had a degree program in which specialization in Buddhism is a component?

More than forty years _____ Thirty to forty years _____ Twenty to thirty
years _____ Ten to twenty years _____ Five to ten years _____

Less than five years _____

4. If you answered "No" to question two, then how long has your institution offered courses in Buddhism?

More than forty years _____ Thirty to forty years _____ Twenty to thirty
years _____ Ten to twenty years _____ Five to ten years _____

Less than five years _____

5. What would you say are the main foci of the Buddhist studies element of your program

(or non-program courses offered)? (You may check more than one category.)

Linguistic _____ Historical _____ Textual _____

Anthropological _____ Contemporary _____ Other _____

6. What is the focus of your department/program/faculty?

Research _____ Teaching _____ Both (relative equality) _____

7. What size is your department/program/faculty?

More than ten _____ Five to ten _____ Fewer than five _____

8. How many courses on Buddhism do you offer in total?

Graduate _____ Undergraduate _____

9. Which of the following are offered at your institution?

Sanskrit _____ Pali _____ Tibetan _____ Chinese _____

Japanese _____ Other _____

10. Please list the Buddhist traditions/schools in which one may take courses at your institution.

11. Does your institution offer courses on the following topics?

Western Buddhism _____ American Buddhism _____ Engaged
Buddhism _____ Buddhist Ethics _____

12. How many students are currently enrolled in your graduate program with Buddhism as their specialization?

More than twenty _____ Fifteen to twenty _____ Ten to fifteen _____
Five to ten _____ Fewer than five _____

13. How many undergraduates are enrolled in your undergraduate program with Buddhism as their main focus?

More than twenty _____ Fifteen to twenty _____ Ten to fifteen _____
Five to ten _____

54 *Research Article*

14. How many students for whom Buddhist Studies is *not* a main focus do you estimate are taking courses in Buddhism?

More than twenty _____ Fifteen to twenty _____ Ten to fifteen _____
Five to ten _____

15. What period of time represented your largest enrollment in Buddhist Studies or courses on Buddhism?

Currently _____ 1990s _____ 1980s _____ 1970s _____
1960s _____ 1950s _____ Pre-1950 _____

16. Has there been a shift in your program's focus since its inception? If so, please state from what to what (for example, from historical and linguistic to contemporary and social scientific).

17. What was the reason for that shift?

Faculty interest _____ Student interest _____ Retirements _____
Other _____

18. Does your institution offer a web course on Buddhism?

Yes _____ No _____

19. (a) Do you feel a web course on Buddhism would be a positive thing?

Yes or No _____

(b) Do you feel a web course on Buddhism would be a bad thing?

Yes or No _____

(c) Please add any additional comments you might have regarding the use of technology in teaching Buddhism.

If you have any additional comments regarding teaching Buddhism, please feel free to add them here.

APPENDIX 2: PARTICIPATING UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

1. Australian National University (Australia)
2. Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand)
3. University of London, Goldsmiths College, (United Kingdom)
4. University of Hannover (Germany)
5. University of Alberta (Canada)
6. University of Calgary (Canada)
7. University of Manitoba (Canada)
8. McMaster University (Canada)
9. McGill University (2) (Canada)
10. University of Saskatchewan (Canada)
11. University of Waterloo (Canada)
12. Arizona State University (United States of America)
13. Canisius College (United States of America)
14. Carleton College (United States of America)
15. The Catholic University of America (United States of America)
16. Colorado College (United States of America)
17. Emory University (United States of America)
18. Franklin and Marshall College (United States of America)
19. Fairfield University (United States of America)
20. Florida State University (United States of America)
21. Middlebury College (United States of America)
22. The Ohio State University (United States of America)
23. Pennsylvania State University (United States of America)
24. Stanford University (United States of America)
25. Swarthmore College (United States of America)
26. University of Alaska, Fairbanks (United States of America)
27. University of California, Santa Cruz (United States of America)
28. University of South Carolina (United States of America)
29. University of Virginia (United States of America)
30. Wake Forest University (United States of America)
31. University of Wisconsin (United States of America)

NOTES

1. The most commonly cited work is J.W. de Jong, *A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America* (Tokyo: Kosei Publishing Co., 1997). This volume is a reprint of articles originally published in the *Eastern Buddhist*. Also valuable in this regard is Thomas Tweed, *The American Encounter with Buddhism 1844-1912* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992) and his "'Opening the Tomb of the Buddha': Buddhism and the Early Years of the American Oriental Society" in *Newsletter of the American Oriental Society* 21 (May 1996), available at <http://www.umich.edu/~aos/news21.htm#OPENING>. A few other volumes containing reference to Buddhist Studies are *How the Swans Came to the Lake: A Narrative History of Buddhism in America* by Rick Fields (Boulder: Shambala, 1981); *The Oriental Religions and American Thought: Nineteenth-Century Explorations* by Carl T. Jackson, Contributions in American Studies, Number 55 (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1981); *The Buddhist Nirvana and Its Western Interpreters* by Guy Welbon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968). For a look at Buddhist Studies within a colonial context, see *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism Under Colonialism*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).
2. The fascinating classic here is Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1965.
3. See Appendix 1 for the full questionnaire.
4. The California State University survey was the one rejected.
5. Lorne Dawson, professor of Sociology, University of Waterloo (personal communication).
6. A list of the responding universities is found in Appendix 2. Unfortunately, surveys from several major universities, such as the University of Michigan, Harvard Divinity School, and the University of Chicago, were not submitted. The potential consequences of this are discussed below.
7. Enrollment generally refers to both undergraduate and graduate, primarily on the "main campus" of the university. This is due to the fact that some universities have multiple campuses. The Pennsylvania State University, for example, has more than two dozen campuses. Had all been considered, enrollment would have been about 80,000. Thus, the 40,000 main campus (University Park) figure was chosen.
8. In another, department size was given as twenty-two full-time faculty with one professor of Buddhist Studies.
9. Although respondents had the option of not answering questions or indicating "not applicable," in this case a non-response may safely be taken to indicate "unknown."
10. There were also thirteen respondents who did not answer the question or who answered "not applicable." Respondents had been asked to answer either question three (number of degree years) or question four (number of years that courses have been offered). In retrospect, they should have been asked to answer both, as the number of degree years and course offering years could have differed.

11. Given that we are just into the twenty-first century, I decided to collapse the categories “current” and “1990s.”
12. The unanswered response may be taken for an “unknown,” as the respondent was relatively new to the department.
13. Indeed, several added responses like “over a hundred,” “hundreds,” and “between 200-300.” One respondent commented on the high undergraduate interest in courses on Buddhism, and another stated that, if one included all the courses offered with Buddhist content at their university, the number of students involved would be close to a thousand.
14. Respondents were allowed to choose more than one in this category.
15. One noted a change from a focus on American Religions to a World Religions focus. Another stated that there had not been a shift in his department as such, but that courses in contemporary Buddhism had been added.
16. Forty percent do not offer such courses, and one respondent did not answer the question (3.3%). There has been a spate of books in this area in the last few years. See Charles S. Prebish, *Luminous Passage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Charles S. Prebish and Kenneth K. Tanaka (eds.), *The Faces of Buddhism in America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Christopher S. Queen and Sallie B. King (eds.), *Engaged Buddhism: Buddhist Liberation Movements in Asia* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996); Christopher S. Queen (ed.), *Engaged Buddhism in the West* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2000); Duncan Ryūken Williams and Christopher S. Queen (eds.), *American Buddhism: Methods and Findings in Recent Scholarship* (Surrey, UK: Curzon Press, 1999); Richard Hughes Seager, *Buddhism in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Thomas A. Tweed and Stephen Prothero (eds.), *Asian Religions in America: A Documentary History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). The most comprehensive bibliography on Buddhism in the West of which I am aware is that of Martin Baumann. It is available in the *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* (<http://jbe.la.psu.edu>) in the “Scholarly Resources” section.
17. This figure should not be interpreted to mean either that language study was totally unavailable to students at these institutions nor that the instructors themselves had no language capability. For example, in one case, Buddhist Studies was listed as part of a department of history. In this case, language study might be available through other departments. In three cases, the respondents had language qualifications, but were members of institutions that did not offer specialization.
18. The emphasis on Chinese and Japanese is a departure from the earlier period where the emphasis was on Sanskrit and the study of Indian religions. See Jackson, *Oriental Religions*, 190.
19. A few respondents clarified their responses quite specifically. In one case, courses (both graduate and undergraduate) were listed by degree of Buddhist content. In another case, the respondent gave a breakdown of the courses by level.
20. One did not respond to the question.
21. This figure includes one who did not respond to the question.
22. Although this may be accounted for in part by the explicit invitation of comments concerning the use of technology in education, it is clear from the responses that many had been giving sustained thought to the issue.

23. One of the respondents did identify himself/herself as a graduate student. The others were all professors.
24. There is decline in philological interest from that evidenced in the nineteenth century. According to de Jong, the main emphasis in the early period of Buddhist Studies was philological. See de Jong, (*A Brief History*, 10). Jackson (*Oriental Religions*, 189) indicates that a shift away from philological focus begins with the work of Edward Washburn Hopkins. I should also note that it is not clear whether or not those students doing contemporary work with social scientific method also have the traditional languages or vernacular languages or must rely on interpreters. In short, we must not assume that each student in a department is trained in all its offerings.
25. For example, in Canada in the last ten years, two departments of Religious Studies have closed (University of Windsor and University of Lethbridge), and one was temporarily merged into an interdisciplinary department (University of Alberta). The University of Alberta now has a department of East Asian Studies.
26. In one case, one respondent who has been at his institution for thirty years listed enrollment as "stable."
27. See my "Teaching Buddhism by Distance Education: Traditional and Web-based Approaches" in *Teaching Buddhism in the West: From the Wheel to the Web*, ed. Victor Sogen Hori, Richard P. Hayes, and James Mark Shields (Surrey, UK: Curzon Press, forthcoming).
28. Don Olcott, "Destination 2000: Strategies for Managing Distance Education Programs," *Journal of Distance Education* 1, no. 2 (1996), 103-115.
29. David Noble recounts the case of York University, where untenured faculty were required to put their courses on the web and then re-hired to teach them at a lesser rate. This led to a faculty strike for a contract that prevented such non-voluntary use of technology. See David Noble, "Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education" at <http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue3.1/noble/index.html>. Discussion of this and other cases and a select bibliography are found in my "Teaching Buddhism," noted above.
30. There is no evidence that distance education is less effective than on-campus instruction. So, too, there is no evidence that the use of technology in education is less effective than traditional lecture-style learning. See David Annand and Margaret Haughey, "Instructor's Orientations Towards Computer-Mediated Learning Environments," *Journal of Distance Education* 12, nos. 1-2 (1997), 127-152; Steven Gilbert, "Making the Most of a Slow Revolution," *Change* 28 (March/April 1996), 10-23; Gary Poole, "Back to the Future: What Can We Learn From Current Debates on Educational Technology," *Journal of Distance Education* 12, nos. 1-2 (1997), 9-14; Thomas L. Russell, *No Significant Difference* (North Carolina State University, 1999); Herbert Wideman, "Using Computer Conferencing as a Medium for Pedagogical Innovation: Two Case Studies," *The Centre for the Study of Computers in Education*, York University, Technical Report 96-1 (December 1996), 1-12.
31. For example, the *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* (<http://jbe.la.psu.edu>) and the series of sites accessible at <http://www.human.toyogakuen-u.ac.jp>.