Development and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages

Joel C. Walz
Editor

THOMSON
HEINLE

ERIC

AAUSC

Development and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages

Edited by Joel C. Waltz

Copyright © 2000 Heinle, a division of Thomson Learning, Inc.
Thomson Learning ™ is a trademark used herein under license.

Printed in the United States of America
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 06 05 04 03 02

For more information contact Heinle, 25 Thomson Place, Boston, MA 02210 USA.
or you can visit our Internet site at http://www.heinle.com

All rights reserved. No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, Web distribution or information storage and retrieval systems—without the written permission of the publisher.

For permission to use material from this text or product contact us:
Tel 1-800-730-2214
Fax 1-800-730-2215
Web www.thomsonrights.com

ISBN: 0-8384-5124-1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Seamless Web: Developing Teaching Assistants as Professionals

Marva A. Barnett and Robert Francis Cook
University of Virginia

The seamless web of our title is a metaphor for an academic life whose parts all fit together in ways that can be made visible, as good cloth is visibly warp and weft at once. The color of the cloth is, at first glance, the color of neither warp nor weft; but reflection and practice can make it possible, first, to see the cloth as a whole, and then to recognize how its appearance derives from how it was made. In the same way, what we call teaching and research, study and writing, thinking, arguing, and guiding group work are parts of a single enterprise, whether the practitioner be an undergraduate beginner, a graduate assistant, or a chaired professor.

Anything that teachers do well can be traced back to an intellectual principle; decisions about teaching are intellectual decisions. At the core, scholarly and teaching activities are very much the same, and we have something to gain by emphasizing that truth in our training programs. At first glance, it may seem paradoxical or sensationalistic to insist that teaching and research are not fundamentally different acts, but the alternative is to continue conceiving of our profession as a conventional yet arbitrary yoking of opposites. No one who thinks the link between teaching and research is arbitrary can present them in any fashion that has to do with the liberal arts,

with critical analysis and independent thought, with any of the activities that departments and faculties hope to train students at all levels to do.

Our graduate students will experience their careers all at once: myths aside, we know they will be expected to "teach" and to "do research" simultaneously and to do both extremely well. They need not be frustrated by these expectations if they understand the very good reason why they are expected to live such a strenuous professional life. Our lives as scholars exemplify and manifest globally the activity often called "critical thought" for short, with its concomitant writing and self-criticism. Critical thinking is usually connected with courses of study, as a kind of "outcome"; but students can learn it only through teachers who embody it. Preparing for the profession means above all else preparing to embody the virtues of the active mind, and, in that largest frame, both "teaching" and "research" go without saying.

Scholarship as Teaching *and* Research

Arguments against the perception of teaching and research as separate are now becoming, in fact, rather numerous. Ernest Boyer (1990, p. 16), president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, has recently summarized the link: "Surely scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one's investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one's knowledge effectively to students." Our basic premise is that teaching is genuinely a professional activity, one governed by the same rules of critical thought, intellectual honesty, and rigorously obtained knowledge as any other profession. The lower prestige of the teaching profession is an accident of fairly recent history; teaching has come to be associated, for some segments of the public and even for many educators, with details of practice rather than with principles based on that rigorously obtained knowledge. That association has not been good for teachers. Obviously, every profession has an essential body of practice, but the practice is justifiable *only* in terms of intellectual principles. Teachers cannot know what they are doing unless they know *why* in the broad sense that applies to all professions (cf. Azevedo, 1990).

It must be recognized that the view of scholarship as exclusively a research activity and of publishing as a pen-and-paper endeavor — and the concomitant acceptance of a dichotomy between research and teaching —

ERIC

remain common throughout academia despite the best persuasive efforts of Booth (1981), Boyer (1990), and Jarvis (1988; 1991), among others. Most people can more easily maintain such a traditional view than ponder the sometimes subtle relationships between gaining and disseminating knowledge in very different contexts. In a day-to-day setting, rare are the associate or full professors willing to rock the professional boat that keeps them afloat; even rarer are assistant professors with the time to consider the broader implications of the work they do, implications that would carry them beyond the realities of the tenure-track, publish-or-perish bind they find themselves in. But graduate students, despite their familiarity with this dominant ethos, remember for a while their undergraduate experience and their interactions with stimulating professors. Early in their graduate careers they are still able to consider teaching, research, and scholarship from a fresh perspective.

Yet graduate teaching assistants (TAs) are in a divided position: at once students and teachers, intellectuals and low-paid hirelings. In departments where graduate students work as TAs, relatively familiar comments denote an inevitable tension. Some are framed as explicit criticisms:

- In a conversation with parents: "I certainly don't want my son to attend *that* university, where he'll be taught by TAs."
- In a student council meeting: "We're paying a lot to attend this university, and we shouldn't be taught by TAs."
- In the graduate student lounge: "The supervisor expects too much; she doesn't realize all the other work we have to do."
- In a conference between a graduate faculty member and a group of TAs: "Don't let those 202 exam committee meetings get in the way of your own work."
- In a graduate admissions committee meeting: "We can't be *too* selective in our admissions policy; after all, we do have to staff our required language courses."

We also hear more heartening comments:

- From deans of students: "The TAs in the Department of Any Language do a fine job of keeping us posted about students who are having problems."

- From undergraduate students: "I didn't plan to take any more French/German/Italian/Spanish, but my TA was really great and got me interested."
- From TAs: "It's the teaching that keeps me going in graduate school. It makes a lot of sense."

For the sake of the undergraduates whom TAs teach and for the health of our TAs, graduate students, and programs, we must deal with the contradictions inherent in these disparate views of the same people doing the same job.

First, let us acknowledge that a staff whose members are simultaneously students and teachers presents multiple dichotomies when its functions are conceived narrowly. Departments with graduate language programs need students in mutually supportive and dissimilar ways, both to keep alive graduate programs and to teach basic language courses. Graduate faculty frequently see these people primarily as budding scholars; moreover, some faculty members were never TAs themselves, having pursued graduate study in the halcyon, vanished days of generous fellowships. At the same time, some administrators speak of TAs as though they were nothing but functionaries who teach required or large undergraduate courses at a bargain price. TAs themselves have relatively little power and often feel completely powerless. Concurrently pursuing both solitary research and active communication with students, they face the standard academic dilemma, but rarely realize how normal it is. They consider this conflict difficult (as indeed it is), abnormal (which it is not in an academic setting), and temporary (little realizing that it changes only slightly after the degree is in hand).

Now that we have acknowledged these conflicts, let us confront them. As educators of graduate students, we must show them where they are going and how they can succeed professionally and ethically in their chosen careers. Most graduate students in our discipline complete degrees and become educators themselves, whether as public or private high school teachers, as members of college or university faculties, or as deans or other administrators. Simply giving our graduate students the tools of the discipline with little indication about how to use them collegially and responsibly means that we are doing only half the job, as the extramural colleagues who hire our doctoral products know: "The beginning assistant professor of German must often learn pragmatism on the job because many PhD-graduate departments eschew it" (Van Cleve, 1987, p. 18). Or, as in Roger Soder's graphic comment (cited in Mooney, 1990, p. A16): "In graduate school,

you'll hear, 'Don't let teaching get in the way of your dissertation.' What, then, has our budding young professor learned after seven years in the wilderness?" How can we best train graduate students for both their current and future roles?

A Required Professional Development Course

One solution has proven effective in our department: "Theories and Methods of Scholarship: Research and Teaching" (FREN 701). This professional development course is the mainstay of the TA training program in French at the University of Virginia, which also includes a week of hands-on practice teaching and orientation, follow-up workshops on specific topics, a year of careful supervision, peer observation (Barnett, 1983), videotaping of classes for self-analysis, and administrative opportunities for graduate students (see also TA program suggestions by Di Donato, 1983; Lee, 1987; Rivers, 1983; Waldinger, 1990). Theories and Methods of Scholarship combines two former one-hour practicum courses in teaching and bibliographic methods and is team taught by the specialists in second language acquisition and in medieval literature. Our departmental colleagues agreed that the one-hour practica too often impressed students as being afterthoughts, and they supported our experimental project of combining the two into a full-fledged course. (The team teaching, incidentally, causes no difficulties as to teaching load, since each year it counts as a full three-hour course for one of us.)

Thus, Theories and Methods of Scholarship began as an amalgamation of practicalities and immediately grew into a unique professional development course, neither a language-teaching methods course, nor a second language acquisition course, nor a bibliographic methods course, but rather a required course integrating all these aspects of the profession with ethics and with the broadest view of scholarship. We aim to prepare generalists in French studies. The course description notes the theoretical base for professional practicalities:

FREN 701: THEORIES AND METHODS OF SCHOLARSHIP:
TEACHING AND RESEARCH

Offered yearly in the Fall semester. *Prerequisite:* Graduate standing. Required of all graduate students.

> An introduction to the conceptual basis for research, writing, and teaching in French language, literature, and civilization. Exploration of the various disciplines pursued under the rubric of "French." Use of reference sources and the library; presentation of papers and articles in accepted style; the organization and presentation of French courses, especially the French language. Assignments include reference and bibliography exercises; readings and exercises on the teaching of language and literature; peer observations and analysis; and a final essay examination.

We present scholarship globally, as research and teaching together, with attention to theory and practice, general and particular, principles and goals, just as any other set of intellectual notions and their applications are properly taught. To offer the "language teaching practicum" and the "bibliography and research methods course" as one indissoluble whole is not merely to move toward banishing the trivial from these traditionally mechanical topics; it is to reveal their true nature as symbiotic components of the major intellectual enterprises we all work to further.

A three-credit-hour, graded course, Theories and Methods of Scholarship is required of all graduate students during their first or second year, normally during a semester in which they teach, regardless of their previous teaching experience. Exceptions are made only when a student has had a comparable initiation into all aspects of the course. The few graduate students who take the course before becoming TAs gain early insights that they can incorporate when they do teach, usually the following year. Requiring such a course is the first step toward developing graduate TAs as professional academicians, ethical scholars who make their ideas and analyses public both in the classroom and in writing.

By integrating ethics, research, and teaching, Theories and Methods of Scholarship explores truths of academic life, treats graduate students as the future professors they usually are, and makes some sense of the potentially divided nature of their position as both graduate students and TAs. Students in the course encounter and discuss each week their dual scholarly roles of researcher and teacher in the fuller professional, academic context. Their training is not only utilitarian — that is, a practicum in teaching and research methodologies — but also theoretical, including readings and discussions about such issues as ethical professional behavior, the interaction of research and teaching, and the role of the humanities in American education. (See Appendix A for details).

Objectives and Structure of Theories and Methods of Scholarship

How does this combining of practical and philosophical challenges translate into a course structure? We mix some joint presentations with very broad perspectives with classes that resemble what either of us might have done in a separate course. Matters sometimes left to the chances of conversation or "osmosis" are explicitly included. Problems in ethics and strategies for job seeking (and job keeping) are treated as part of the profession. Juxtaposing matters more commonly opposed stimulates and challenges both instructors and students. Fortunately, we are telling students their chosen profession is coherent, and they also entertain readily the course's guiding ethical notion: that we are not only at the service of ideas but at the service of people, students and the society that sends them to the university (Booth, 1981).

Theories and Methods of Scholarship introduces TAs to the profession of scholarly research and teaching in French language, literature, and civilization through a tripartite format: theory, practice, and ethics. Theoretical aspects of the course revolve not only around professional issues such as those cited above, but also around theories of second language acquisition and literary criticism. The former are taught for their intellectual value as well as for their importance in underpinning various methodologies; future professionals must know why the teaching techniques or methods they use are effective and must be prepared to progress as knowledge of the discipline advances (see Azevedo, 1990, p. 25). Theories of literary criticism are not so much taught (the responsibility of a separate course) as used for the purpose of illustration.

For example, during Week Ten of the course, when reading strategies are the topic of the day, we touch upon their relationships with general hermeneutic theory, with the interplay of expectation and recognition. The members of the class are reminded that sometimes as teachers they may be called upon to teach hermeneutics itself, as a topic, while other times they will teach elements of the reading process, depending on the moment; at no time, we suggest, can they afford to ignore what is known about the reading process. They can find out what is known by using the journals and reference works presented in other lessons, but not forgotten during Week Ten. In another context, we link teaching about culture to considerations of literature as an expression of culture that is simultaneously a case study in cultural understanding. Such discussion helps explain and justify the

importance and prestige granted literary topics in the graduate curriculum. Discussion of the writing process, as it surfaces in elementary French courses, leads to the reminder that writing papers, briefs, reports, and essays is part of virtually all the jobs educated people do. If writing process theory is valid (the students are, after all, learning to judge such theories for themselves), the process is not confined to elementary teaching; it is the same process TAs themselves follow when they write required seminar papers and theses and the same process we follow (and they will follow) in communicating with colleagues in our disciplines through publication. This process is also either like, or related to, the processes by which literary works are created.

Even the arbitrary rules of MLA style, so often taught by rote as purely mechanical adjuncts to the scholar's real work, are brought before the class as examples of communicative convention. The students must learn the code sooner or later; but as they learn it, they also examine how it illustrates the intimate link many linguists postulate between arbitrariness and sharing (Saussure, 1922, pp. 104–08). Our syllabus, then, lists the topics of the day under familiar names, but the presentation of these topics regularly invites new associations.

The practical aspects of Theories and Methods of Scholarship are fairly standard: how to teach the four language skills and culture, as well as introductory literature; how to write and grade tests; how to correct students' errors; how to improve one's teaching; how to use standard bibliographies and journals of literature, language teaching, and linguistics; how to use the *MLA Style Manual;* how to write professionally, including abstracts; how to submit a paper for a conference or for publication (see the syllabus in Appendix A).[1] The practical aspects are also sometimes professional: an introduction to the *AATF Syllabus of Competence* (Murphy & Goepper, 1989) and discussion of its implications; case studies of teaching situations we use to elicit analyses of ethical dilemmas (see Appendix B); explanation of job searches, whether at the secondary or postsecondary level. Our mix of lecture and discussion works well, we think, to supply students with necessary information and to provoke them to think for themselves. We further encourage them to specify and test their own ideas through dialogue.

We have argued (following Booth, 1981) that the ethical aspects of the profession intertwine with theoretical and practical considerations. We have found that we must discuss ethics in a formal setting because, although we would like to believe that ethical behavior is transferred from professor to

student automatically, we do not see evidence that such transfer happens regularly. In class, case studies have proven to be a forceful tool for promoting discussion of ethical issues (see Appendix B). So far, we have kept our case studies simple, asking students to state the problem(s) represented and to propose solutions. The ensuing debate often makes manifest the students' own value systems and allows them to consider, in a relatively safe atmosphere, controversial or intricate cases of cheating, sexual harassment, and other professional dilemmas they might eventually encounter in person. After discussing individual cases, students write a brief analysis of a preferred case, then rewrite the analysis in response to our comments. We are thus able to confirm their awareness of the issues involved, evaluate the breadth of their solutions, and inform their writing.

The integrated course format parallels our view of the profession: a back-and-forth movement in the topics treated and frequent contributions from both instructors on all subjects. For instance, as the syllabus shows, a class session focusing on writing leads to a session about the presentation of scholarly research and writing, which is followed by a hands-on session about evaluating students' compositions, which is succeeded by a class on the "hows" and "whens" of publishing and reading papers at professional meetings. Just as our professional lives put us at once on the creating and receiving ends of the writing process, this juxtaposition of teaching and doing scholarly writing gives our graduate students insights they might otherwise not gain until reaching assistant professor status. Because of this natural interaction, we find ourselves regularly returning to points made in a session ostensibly devoted to teaching when discussing research — and vice versa. We both contribute to all class sessions, despite the fact that most of the time one or the other of us officially assumes responsibility for teaching a particular topic. Because we both teach the first two sessions and then immediately alternate "official" control of each session, the students quickly adjust to our individual styles. They also profit from seeing that we do not always take the same position on issues and that frank debate is enlightening. In addition, evaluation of students' work is potentially more equitable when two instructors who have seen the same piece of work discuss its merits.[2]

The view that scholarship includes both teaching and research and that a scholar publishes in many ways is at the heart of our course, as the final exam essay section shows. In this largest part of the take-home exam, we always ask students to comment on a quotation within the context of Theories and Methods of Scholarship. For example:

Analyze the implications of the following remarks for the intertwined concepts of research and teaching. You may, of course, choose to agree with the author, to disagree, or both; you may also wish to point out areas for further exploration. Do not neglect either practice, principle, or ethics.

"My various societies thus allocate their resources and boost or hinder me in my scholarly endeavors. They support research about Chaucer or *Tristram Shandy* or Alcanter de Brahm because they have become somehow convinced, as we are convinced, that preservation of our literary culture is a good thing, that somehow literary culture graces or enhances their lives.

"It is obvious that they will do this allocating well only if we have managed to teach them how to do it. We scholars have taught, after all, in our role as teachers, every member of our society who carries much weight in society's allocations. And we continue to teach and thus to make our society, by the nature and quality of what we do; they learn from us whether or not to take our work seriously." (Booth, 1981, pp. 125–26.)

or

"The work of the professor becomes consequential only as it is understood by others. Yet, today, teaching is often viewed as a routine function, tacked on, something almost anyone can do. When defined as *scholarship*, however, teaching both educates and entices future scholars. Indeed, as Aristotle said, 'Teaching is the highest form of understanding.'" (Boyer, 1990, p. 23.)

Why would an expert, when asked to describe what professors do, describe teaching and scholarship in this way? In your essay, refer to any FREN 701 information that supports your answer.

Thus, we show regularly in specifics what the course's theme suggests: that research and teaching are not done by different people with different gifts, habits, and purposes, and that the topic of the moment is isolated from general principle only temporarily. Once one begins to think in this way, the possibilities of linking and comparison become almost too numerous, and it often requires discipline to avoid bringing up too many connections at once and thus throwing the class off track. Yet all of our presentations and remarks of this type have a single purpose: to make explicit the ordinary operations of the professional teacher's mind. These operations, and the

training that permits them, are most effectively presented not as monads but as part of a seamless web of experience and action.

Is Such a Professional Course Really Necessary?

In contemplating the introduction of a course like Theories and Methods of Scholarship at another institution, one may anticipate specific criticisms that can be easily parried if colleagues are reminded of something they probably already know: that the traditional clichés do not really limit our disciplines to one or two activities. The main protest may be a reaction to the course's content: that this is a "vocational" course and therefore, by definition, not substantive enough, for it does not teach French or Spanish or German literature or culture per se. We object to such a definition of what is substantive and note the high intellectual level of *The MLA Introduction to Scholarship* (Gibaldi, 1992) and *The Academic's Handbook* (DeNeef, Goodwin & McCrate, 1988). This is an age of reflection and self-reflection, after all, and academics who accept the metahistorical and metacritical dimensions of scholarly discourse may well wish to reflect before they exclude the larger dimensions of professional life from the graduate curriculum.

That is all very well, some of our colleagues might say, but what has the intellect to do with elementary language teaching? Even if we break down the prejudice that separates scholars into "learner" halves and "teacher" halves, what can the teacher-learner do to prepare French 101 if not learn a set pattern — "methods," classroom management, "the book," *trucs et moyens?* That reaction implies, first, that second language learning is a static profession, and, second, that second language study has no intellectual content. We do not have to argue, for the readers of this collection, that the notion of a static "method" is hopelessly inaccurate. We do not have a small group of "methods" waiting to be mastered (and rejected, all but one); what we do have is only a type of inquiry: information to be gathered, investigations to be carried out, and endless decisions to be made. Every detail of the French 101 syllabus must be chosen deliberately, professionally, with all decisions under control, or else the syllabus is an accident.

It is a little harder to see how studying adjectival agreement and the names of cheese and bread at age 16 or 18 is an intellectual activity, and yet by nature it is. Even more than that, it is an adventure cognate with the adventure of diving into an unknown literature or an alien past. It means

discovering language in a way no monolingual can, because it means discovering that one's native language, a fundamental constituent of personality, is not immanent. Rules of communication are neither inevitable nor absolute; they have a context and can be seen in a perspective. Many students discover this powerful reality more or less independently, but cannot necessarily name it. From our point of view, this discovery is only one form of contact with the foreign, and we do not have to talk about berets and baguettes to get across just how foreign another language is (Cook, 1977).

The intellectual challenge of accepting and finally manipulating something so very foreign becomes obvious to novice teachers once the nature of the challenge is made clear to them. After all, elementary sentences, like elementary chemical formulae or basic physics experiments, are not brought into the curriculum for their own sake, nor are they merely stepping-stones to real advanced study. They exemplify challenging mental problems: choices, pathways, the effect of prior knowledge and habits. That fact is written implicitly into every fill-in-the-blank exercise and should be explicitly present in the scholar-teacher's mind all the time. Only trained minds can manage to link why and what, principle and practice, while also managing the classroom. And so we openly invite our students in French 701 (and why not in French 101?) to avoid leaving the intellect at the door just because the topics of elementary-language-student discourse include such mundane matters as buying stamps. Buying stamps is not the only subject at hand; the subject is also the power and inevitability of language.

Another response to the antiprofessional stance is pragmatic and shifts the battleground a bit. Given the current assaults on higher education, and inquiries into its values and responsibilities (e.g., Bennett, 1984; Bloom, 1987; Sykes, 1988; Cheney, 1990; D'Souza, 1991), we know that the young scholars who complete our graduate programs cannot assume that academic practices will be accepted without reflection by outsiders. A course that deals in part with professionalism is not, therefore, superfluous any more than it is second rate; it is essential to our students' future professional health. Colleagues who realize that the reputations of departments and universities rest partly on the quality of their graduates recognize that sending well-rounded Ph.D.'s into the marketplace and hence into other institutions can only enhance our standing in the discipline. Departments granting doctorates need to respond to the demands of the marketplace. The views of state college and university chairs who attended a 1984 ADFL summer seminar are clear; they recommended that newly prepared Ph.D.'s have the following

characteristics: versatility and a more generalist than specialist stance, near-native speaking ability, training in foreign language pedagogy, basic knowledge of linguistics and culture, the ability to teach a second language or area of concentration, training in professional ethics and protocol, preparation for the job market, and a comprehensive knowledge of English, including writing ability (Showalter, 1984).

Some colleagues may accept the idea that a course like Theories and Methods of Scholarship is both substantive and useful, but argue that teaching techniques and research methods are learned indirectly, without need of analysis, in the usual graduate literature, civilization, and linguistics courses. Those of us who train and supervise TAs and foster improved teaching know, rather, that instructors gain most through analyzing their own teaching practices with attention to experts' insights. Too often the learning about teaching that supposedly happens by osmosis when one takes a master teacher's course is vague, if not imaginary. Serious graduate students are conditioned to pay the greatest attention to subject matter and much less to teaching techniques or style — except when they find the latter annoying. Unreflective imitation, even of the best teachers, is not an adequate way to equip students to establish and maintain effective teaching practice. In any case, it may not always be the best teachers who are imitated.

With respect to research, graduate students are most likely to take their responsibilities as writers seriously if their departments give these matters serious — that is, explicit — attention. Although many members of graduate faculties may be uneasy with the situation, exposure to research protocols has for some time been the business of graduate schools. But a few faculty members still seem to expect students to leap into graduate school fully cognizant of the standard reference works in the discipline and capable of consulting them resourcefully. They request that students submit papers using the MLA's increasingly complex rules of documentation and assume that their request means something to neophytes. In fact, the level of bibliographic research required for graduate study is not that of undergraduate language and literature programs.

But the essence of why a course like Theories and Methods of Scholarship needs to exist and, in fact, to be required, grows from the larger questions that we have said graduate students and academics must consciously answer: What is the nature of scholarship? How must we act to be ethical researchers and teachers? In maintaining that teaching and research are inextricably linked to each other, what do we mean? In sum, what are

the larger principles behind our practices as researchers and teachers? Perhaps, in the days of smaller graduate departments, questions like these were confronted, pondered, and answered over coffee or tea shared by a faculty mentor and a student protégé. Such a scenario (if it ever matched reality) has surely become rare today, but the quandaries remain. In a professional course, graduate students and their teachers must face these issues, sharing ideas, and reach at least temporary conclusions, expressed in their final essays.

Conclusion

In the light of four years' experience, we believe that Theories and Methods of Scholarship succeeds for both students and instructors. On the final anonymous evaluations, students have commented positively: "We're really lucky; as far as I know, we're the only department that has a course like this." Two second-year graduate students who had taught in high school before attending graduate school and who took French 701 before becoming TAs noted, "Last year we wondered how 701 could teach us anything new, but now we find it right on target." As the course has evolved, we, as instructors, have developed our own understanding of the true integration of the research and teaching aspects of our profession. Because both instructors attend all class meetings and discussion flows back and forth between "research" and "teaching," we see more connections and make them for and with the graduate students. By team teaching, we envision — and are tempted to tackle — teaching techniques different from those we have found comfortable. We tend to do our best in teaching this course: after all, our audience consists of graduate students, many of whom will soon become professors *and* valued faculty colleagues. We gain new insights into our own work from the different perspectives that a colleague with a different specialization brings to it. The integrated team teaching approach we take in this course leads to the type of scholarly discussions colleagues are supposed to have in the hallowed halls, but infrequently do. For a language program director who also happens to be a junior faculty member, having the opportunity to teach with a more advanced colleague whose specialty is literature or civilization can be a door to a greater mutual understanding between departmental colleagues. Experiences such as ours can help repair the "split community" many of us deplore (Rivers, 1983, p. 28).

ERIC

Recent articles (Azevedo, 1990; Waldinger, 1990) show clearly that the language profession has made great strides toward taking elementary language teaching seriously, and there is good evidence that most departments are now paying more attention than ever to the training of future teachers, who in fact are actively teaching foreign languages even now. The next step is to put an end to the ghettoization implied in our profession's persistent tendency to treat language teaching as an isolated specialty (Dvorak, 1986). For most college teachers it is not a specialty; it is a regular and recurring responsibility. Those in more complex departments, who may not teach elementary language regularly, are every bit as responsible for what happens during the acquisition process as are the people who foster it; and they are, besides, dependent on the outcome when they teach "higher" courses in literature or civilization. The path to understanding that interdependent relationship is, in our view, a high road of theory rather than a low road of practice. Second language teaching uses particular materials and terms, but it is intellectually like all other teaching; it requires similar habits and similar mental equipment. Professors and administrators must know the language disciplines every bit as well as they know literary theory: that is, well enough to conceive the students' leap into the unknown as the leap it is. And where practice is concerned, we must not only recognize that language teaching is a form of applied linguistics, but agree that we have every reason to communicate that fact to graduate instructors.

We have a chance, early in graduate students' education, before they have engraved their opinions in stone, to help them integrate what may falsely appear to be very different axes of their current and future scholarly lives: that is, the introspective, sometimes necessarily narrow research that leads to new insights and the participatory, outward-looking sharing of the resultant knowledge that is teaching and writing at its best. A course like Theories and Methods of Scholarship can lead both departmental colleagues and graduate students to understand better the healthy interaction of research and teaching that is the mark of a true scholar and to realize that in the academic profession we expect competence and have need of inspiration in teaching and administration, as well as in publishing. Those of us who would design courses such as Theories and Methods of Scholarship can play a vital role in professionalizing the future professoriate, and we must make the most of it.

Notes

1. Clearly, Theories and Methods of Scholarship is not a standard language-teaching methods course; it accomplishes both more and less. Our inclusion of research and reference techniques and consideration of the ethics of publication, for instance, preclude our spending as much class time discussing teaching techniques and methods as one can in a three-hour methods course. With this trade-off, however, we lose nothing: the synthesis of teaching and research enhances both in the eyes of our students; we have more time for all aspects of the course than we had with our separate one-hour practica; ongoing workshops expand upon topics introduced in FREN 701; and finally, we also offer FREN 703, Methods of Teaching College French, upon students' request (see Lalande, 1991, for support of a similar course).

2. Shared evaluation, like shared teaching, has benefits beyond the scope of this chapter. Suffice it to say that arguing for the grade one wants to give, with reference to the text of the student's paper or exam, calls upon and makes explicit for us the scholarly virtues of accuracy, logic, and attentiveness.

Works Cited

Azevedo, Milton M. "Professional Development of Teaching Assistants: Training versus Education." *ADFL Bulletin* 22, 1 (1990): 24–28.

Barnett, Marva A. "Peer Observation and Analysis: Improving Teaching and Training TAs." *ADFL Bulletin* 15, 1 (1983): 30–33.

Bennett, William J. *To Reclaim a Legacy: Report on the Humanities in Higher Education.* Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984.

Bloom, Allan. *The Closing of the American Mind.* New York: Simon & Schuster/Touchstone, 1987.

Booth, Wayne. "The Scholar in Society." *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures.* Ed. Joseph Gibaldi. New York: Modern Language Association, 1981: 116–43.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Cheney, Lynne. *Tyrannical Machines: A Report on Educational Practices Gone Wrong and Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Right.* Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1990.

Cook, Robert Francis. "Foreign Language Study and Intellectual Power." *ADFL Bulletin* 8, 4 (1977): 6–9.

ERIC

DeNeef, A. Leigh, Craufurd D. Goodwin & Ellen Stern McCrate (Ed.). *The Academic's Handbook.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1988.

Di Donato, Robert. "TA Training and Supervision: A Checklist for an Effective Program." *ADFL Bulletin* 15, 1 (1983): 34–36.

D'Souza, Dinesh. *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus.* New York: Free Press, 1991.

Dvorak, Trisha R. "The Ivory Ghetto: The Place of the Language Program Coordinator in a Research Institution." *Hispania* 69 (1986): 217–22.

Gibaldi, Joseph (Ed.). *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures.* 2nd ed. New York: MLA, 1992.

Jarvis, Donald K. *Junior Faculty Development.* New York: MLA, 1991.

_____. "Junior Faculty Development and Language Department Quality." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, 3 (1988): 32–37.

Lalande, John F., II. "Advancing the Case for an Advanced Methods Course." *Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs.* Ed. Sally Sieloff Magnan. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction 1990. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1991: 151–66.

Lee, James F. "Toward a Professional Model of Language Program Direction." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, 1 (1987): 22–25.

Mooney, Carolyn J. "Higher–Education Conferees Applaud Carnegie Plan to Broaden the Definition of Faculty Scholarship." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 11 April 1990, pp. A1, A16.

Murphy, Joseph & Jane Black Goepper (Ed.). *The Teaching of French: A Syllabus of Competence.* The Report of the Commission on Professional Standards, the American Association of Teachers of French. *AATF National Bulletin* 14 (October 1989). (Special issue.)

Rivers, Wilga M. "Preparing College and University Instructors for a Lifetime of Teaching: A Luxury or a Necessity?" *ADFL Bulletin* 15, 2 (1983): 23–29.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Cours de linguistique générale.* 2nd ed. Paris: Payot, 1922.

Showalter, English. "What Departments Look for in New PhD's." *MLA Newsletter* 16, 3 (1984): 3–4.

Sykes, Charles J. *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education.* Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1988.

Van Cleve, John. "Graduate Study and Professional Responsibilities: Bridging the Gap." *ADFL Bulletin* 18, 2 (1987): 18–19.

Waldinger, Renée. "Training PhD Students to Teach in College." *ADFL Bulletin* 22, 1 (1990): 20–23.

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

Appendix A

Syllabus for Theories and Methods of Scholarship

FREN 701: THEORIES AND METHODS OF SCHOLARSHIP: RESEARCH AND TEACHING

(Required; 3 credit hours; meeting 2½ hours per week. Fall 1991: Mondays/Wednesdays, 1:00–2:15. One topic each meeting.)

[NOTE: Brackets indicate information not on students' copies.]

WEEK ONE (September 2, 4)

Joint Introduction to All Aspects of the Course: Learning and Teaching. [What the course is and why it is needed.] (Joint presentation.)

READ: *Academic's Handbook*, preface and section 1 ("The Academy and the Academic").

The Concept of Proficiency as a Model.

READ: Omaggio, ch. 1–2; also, pp. 337–41 ("The Structure of the ACTFL/ETS Oral Proficiency Interview").

WEEK TWO (September 9, 11)

Examine Reference Sources in Print Form. Major bibliographies, encyclopedias, and manuals in French studies: form and content.

The AATF Competencies: What does language teaching entail?

DUE: Be prepared to discuss the AATF competencies. How well do the undergraduate programs you know help student to reach the basic level of competence?

WEEK THREE (September 16, 18)

Electronic Reference and Bibliographical Sources.

Ethics of the Profession, 1. (Joint presentation.)

READ: *MLA Newsletter* list of ethical concerns in colleges.

READ: Case studies, to be discussed in class.

RECOMMENDED READING: *Saints and Scamps*, ch. 5.

Week Four (September 23, 25)

The Preparation of Scholarly Research and Writing, 1: Bibliographical access to sources in language, literature, and civilization: general considerations. (Using the reference handlist [over 30 pages long].)

Due: First (brief) reference exercise.

Testing (Written and Oral); Giving Feedback.

Read: Omaggio, ch. 8; be able to define the terms in #1, p. 354; prepare #7, p. 355, for discussion.

Due: Case study analysis (2 pages): Rough Draft.

Week Five (September 30, October 2)

The Preparation of Scholarly Research and Writing, 2: Reference and verification. [Why the scholar's habits are both useful and important.]

Teaching Writing.

Read: Omaggio, ch. 6; prepare #3, p. 269, for discussion.

Due: A quiz you might use in class.

Week Six (October 7, 9)

The Presentation of Scholarly Research and Writing, 1: Thesis and dissertation writing, publication, and paper-giving: Why?

Read: *Academic's Handbook*, section 5 ("Publishing Research"), with special attention to the sections by Budd and by Rowson.

Due: Second (brief) reference exercise.

Due: Final text of case study analysis.

Evaluating Compositions. Peer Observation.

Due: Composition assignment; graded compositions; discussion of criteria.

[Here is the assignment as distributed:]

Explain in writing the way in which you will assign a future contextualized composition topic to your FREN 101, 102, 201, or 202 students. (If you are not currently teaching, imagine that you are working with students at one of these levels. Take a look at the appropriate textbook.) Give as many details as necessary for us to understand how the presentation/assignment will work

ERIC

in class. Include any handouts you will use. Be sure to consider and include the following also:

- Prewriting activity: brainstorming for vocabulary and/or topic and or organization; providing a model; providing a context.
- Logical, realistic framework for the composition.
- Will you give the students a choice of topic?
- How will you advise them to revise their first draft *before* handing the composition in?
- What will you tell them about how the composition will be evaluated?

Along with this lesson plan and assignment, give us the details of how you will evaluate this composition: percentages or relative weight of different aspects of the composition.

READ: Explanation of the peer observation system.

WEEK SEVEN (October 14 [Fall Break], 16)

The Presentation of Scholarly Research and Writing, 2: Publication and paper-giving: HOW? WHEN?

WEEK EIGHT (October 21, 23)

Journal Reviews: How can journals on second language acquisition and language teaching help you in your present and future academic career?

DUE: Be prepared to present one language teaching/linguistics/literature journal to the class, answering the questions previously distributed. Hand in your written review of another journal.

[Here is the assignment as distributed:]

To become familiar with journals in the field of second language acquisition, teaching of literature, language pedagogy and methodology, and applied linguistics, study two of the journals in the list you received [a list of nine journals in second language acquisition, foreign language teaching, and applied linguistics]. Decide how useful you think the journals will be to you as you continue your career and why. Consider the questions below for each of the journals you choose, and integrate answers to them into a professionally written summary. Think beyond your years as a graduate student.

How frequently does the journal appear?

What kinds of articles or items are included?

What is the general focus of the journal?

For whom are they written?

What percentage of them would be of use or interest to you now *and* during your future professional life? Why?

Is the journal published by an association? Is this an advantage? Should you join the association? Why or why not?

Does the journal carry advertising? How much?

Will the advertising be useful to you? Why or why not?

For one journal, type your summary as an essay to be handed in (1–2 pages). Be prepared to present both journals to your classmates on October 21. That day we will discuss as many different journals as possible.

MLA Style, Hands-on Session. Discussion of the MLA Introduction to Scholarship: Lehmann on linguistics, Tanselle on textual criticism.

EXAMINE: The *MLA Style Manual.*

DUE: A note of peer observation groups and first meeting date.

WEEK NINE (October 28, 30)

Discussion of the MLA Introduction to Scholarship: Lewalski on historical scholarship, Lipking on criticism.

Error Correction.

READ: Omaggio, ch. 7; be able to define the terms in #1, pp. 304–5, and prepare #5, p. 305, for discussion.

WEEK TEN (November 4, 6)

Teaching Reading. Reading Process Theory.

READ: Omaggio, ch. 3; prepare #1, pp. 117–18, for discussion.

MLA Style, Hands-on Session.

EXAMINE: *MLA Style Manual.*

WEEK ELEVEN (November 11, 13)

Listening Comprehension; Using Videotapes; Conversation Classes.

READ: Omaggio, ch. 4.

DUE: Reading comprehension activity (Omaggio, p. 173, #5)

Details of MLA Style.

DUE: Error correction assignment.

Receive: Take-home final exam (due December 11 at 5:00 P.M. in Mr. Cook's mailbox in Cabell 329).

WEEK TWELVE (November 18, 20)

Culture and Civilization in the Language Course; Ethical Implications of Teaching Culture.

READ: Omaggio, ch. 9; prepare #3 and #4, pp. 403–4, for discussion.

REREAD: Culture section of AATF Syllabus of Competence.

DUE: Listening Comprehension Activity (Omaggio, p. 173, no. 4).

Discussion of the MLA Introduction to Scholarship: Hernadi on literary theory.

DUE: Peer observation reaction forms.

WEEK THIRTEEN (November 25, 27)

Ethics of the Profession, 2. (Joint presentation.)

READ: Booth on the scholar in society.

READ: *Academic's Handbook*, section 3, "Teaching and Advising."

RECOMMENDED READING: *Saints and Scamps*, ch. 2 and 3.

Current Second Language Acquisition Theory and Research. Reading and understanding research articles; integrating theory and method into your own teaching.

DUE: Two journal article abstracts; be prepared to present a three-minute summary of each in class.

[Here is the assignment as distributed:]

Write summaries of and reactions to one article from each of two different professional journals (see sample abstract [one student's excellent work from a previous semester]). One of the articles you choose must report

ERIC

an experiment on some aspect of second language acquisition/learning; the other may be classroom-oriented, theoretical, or also research-based. Each summary/reaction must be limited to one 8½ × 11″ sheet of paper and typed.

Both written abstracts are due on *November 27*. Be prepared to present at that time a three-minute oral summary of each article and your reactions to them.

DUE: A cultural activity you can use in the future. See Omaggio, #5, p. 404.

READ: Omaggio, ch. 5. Prepare #2, p. 217, for discussion.

WEEK FOURTEEN (DECEMBER 2, 4)

Getting a job — MLA *Career Guide*, MLA job list, *Chronicle*, departmental files, CV, conferences, letters of application, interviews. (Joint presentation.)

READ: *Academic's Handbook*, section 2.

DUE: MLA Style exercise (December 2).

READING LIST

Required:

Achtert, Walter S. & Joseph Gibaldi. *The MLA Style Manual*. New York: MLA, 1985.

DeNeef, A. Leigh, Craufurd Goodwin & Ellen Stern McCrate (Ed.). *The Academic's Handbook*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1988.

Gibaldi, Joseph (Ed.). *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*. New York: MLA, 1981. [Replaced by the 1992 edition.]

Omaggio, Alice C. *Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency-Oriented Instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1986.

Recommended:

Cahn, Steven M. *Saints and Scamps: Ethics in Academia*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman, 1986. (On reserve in Clemons Library.)

Cook, Claire K. *Line by Line: How to Edit Your Own Writing*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985. (Sometimes cited as "The MLA's Line by Line.")

Williams, Joseph C. *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace*. New York: Scott Foresman, 1989.

WORK LOAD AND GRADE COMPONENTS:

- Participation in discussions (15%)
- Short written assignments (15%)
- Journal article abstracts and analysis (10%)
- Two or three reference library-use exercises (20%)
- An MLA Style exercise (10%)
- The final exam (30%)

The FINAL EXAM is to be taken home. It will include:

1) Identification questions (with an emphasis on concepts in language teaching).
2) An exercise in the application of the rules of MLA Style (writing entries for previously unseen books and articles.) The *Manual* may NOT be consulted during this exercise.
3) A question requiring the description of a strategy for solving a research problem.
4) An essay on the general topics of the course: teaching and learning, principles and practice; their relationships within our profession.

Appendix B

Case Studies: Introduction and Samples

The case study method educates, in principle, by presenting imaginary situations that are more important to talk about than to solve. Indeed, that is the way the cases proposed reflect reality: they are usually complex, presenting dilemmas, not calling forth formulas. The problems raised may never appear in your futures in the form they take here, but the principles will return.

It will be helpful to organize your thoughts about the cases around a few basic questions. You may, of course, reorder or replace the ones we propose here. We suggest these questions as valuable for each of the following cases. You will use them to organize your analysis of the case you choose to write about, and we will use them to organize our discussion.

1) What is the nature of the problem? Define the issues raised and locate the horns of the dilemma.
2) What additional information might the characters ideally wish to have before acting?
3) What are the ethical and professional responses you would recommend for the principal character?
4) What are the limits of possible action the character faces in the search for a solution?

1.

Mara Wisniewski cannot at first believe her ears. Yet the words come again. In the third week of the course, the theoretical introduction is over, and the professor is speaking of the nature of the learning process in general. She hears him say, "It is, of course, well known that not all population groups have the same learning characteristics. I will take as an example Polish people. They are slow learners and poorly equipped to grasp certain tasks. The classic examples are changing a light bulb and popping popcorn; these will be familiar to all of you."

Mara is barely aware of the sentences on the cognitive aspects of light-bulb changing that follow. Only the conclusion strikes her with renewed force: "We must keep in mind, therefore," the professor states, "that Poles as a group score low on standardized measures of intelligence and achievement for the reasons just given."

What does Mara write in her notebook? What does she do at the end of the class? The next day? In short: how does she approach the intellectual and ethical problem of thinking about what she has heard?

2.

Jack Straw, super TA, leaps into action on the first day of class, reading the roll with gusto, associating names and faces, making even this routine act a form of relationship with his new group of FREN 201 students. Near the middle of the roll, he reads out a name of familiar aspect: Thomas Levéreux. "Here's one I won't have to use my fake French accent on," he thinks; "no more 'Couques' or 'Barresnettes'; this one's a piece of cake."

"/to mA lə ve rø/," intones Straw. There is no response (although every student called to that point has replied at once). "/lə ve rø/," he repeats patiently.

There is a stirring at the back of the room. A young man frowns. "Monsieur Levéreux?" asks Jack. This time the response is immediate.

"*Lever*oh. I don't know what you said, but my name's *Lever*oh, *that's* how you pronounce my name." The frown remains; how does Jack reply?

3.

Harry Friendly looks up from the 101 papers he is grading to see Jennifer Lerner standing in his doorway. He is glad she has come to him for advice again; it makes him think that what he told her about her course selection must have been useful. Only she is pale, and her eyes are rimmed with pink.

"Can I talk to you about something?" she asks.

"Come in, Jennifer," he says; "I haven't seen you since you finished my 101 last semester. How is 102 going?"

"Not good at all," she replies at once.

"Tell me what's up."

"Well, you know I wanted to be a French major. But I just don't understand what is going on in 102. I just got back a D on the third quiz. It's the TA, Stanley. He seems so snappish, and if we make a mistake, he just sneers at us, and I study for hours and never recall anything, and all my friends feel the same way, and I used to love French and always get As, and I can't be a French major if I don't do well in 102." (You may supply further comments.)

There is a good chance Harry has never heard anything of the sort about Stanley before. He has perhaps 10 or 15 seconds to give a correct and meaningful reply without appearing stumped or evasive. What are some of the things he might say or ask?

4.

In the convention hotel, Luke S. Walker sits down to dinner with a feeling of satisfaction. His paper on prethinking strategies in the foreign language classroom went well; the drive down with his supervisor, Helen Troy, was enlivened by discussion of everything from the weather to new language lab equipment. Now, as Helen Troy sits down across from him, he anticipates a valuable discussion of the day's events.

Yet Troy's remarks on the reception given Walker's paper are perfunctory. She seems distracted, eye contact is difficult; she speaks again and again

of frustration, then of loneliness. Her gestures and the tilt of her shoulders seem unfamiliar.

Then dinner is nearing its end, and, to his surprise, she places her hand on Luke's, saying, "Why don't we go up to my room and talk about these things over a drink, in a place where we can be more private?"

Do we need to set a question on this one?

ERIC