

# ***Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs***

***Sally Sieloff Magnan  
Editor***



Published by  
Heinle & Heinle Publishers  
A Division of Wadsworth, Inc. Boston, MA 02116

© Copyright 1991 by Heinle & Heinle Publishers. No parts of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Manufactured in the United States of America.

Heinle & Heinle Publishers is a division of Wadsworth, Inc.

ISBN 0-8384-2548-8

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

# Team Teaching French with Teaching Assistants

*Theodore E. D. Braun and Bonnie A. Robb  
University of Delaware*

## **Introduction**

One of the major challenges confronting foreign-language programs in American universities has been the widespread use of teaching assistants (TAs) and relatively inexperienced part-time instructors in the elementary and intermediate courses. This challenge, already decades old, is unlikely to disappear in the 1990s, and in fact—if projections for a greater need for high school and college foreign-language teachers are accurate—it is likely to become even more acute as more and more TAs and part-timers are appointed. Ways must be found to assimilate these inexperienced people into elementary and intermediate programs more effectively, in order that the quality of instruction in these courses be as high and as consistent as possible. In this article, we report on an experience with team teaching at the University of Delaware which has proven helpful in meeting this challenge.

## **A Departmental Decision to Team Teach in a New Course Structure**

Team teaching was instituted by the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures in new three-course elementary/intermediate sequences in French, Spanish, and German in fall 1987. Among the motivations for initiating team teaching in our programs were the desire to provide a variety of accents and voices for the students and the hope that this variety as well as different personality and classroom management

styles would enhance student interest. The system adopted by the department called for each course in the sequence to meet five times weekly, with one instructor (usually an experienced veteran) teaching on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and the other (usually a TA or a part-timer) on Tuesday and Thursday. Within the overall framework of this scheduling pattern, the faculty teaching each language was given the freedom to work out the details of implementing team teaching in its program.

One of the objectives of instituting the three-course sequence was to permit students beginning the language to complete the required sequence in one year: for instance, French students could take FR 105 in the fall, FR 106 in the winter (either on campus or in our new winter session program in Caen), and FR 107 in the spring; those entering at the 106 or 107 levels could take the next level of courses either on campus or in Caen. Another objective was to provide better overall instruction than had been possible in our traditional three-hours-per-week program by providing students with a more intensive, five-hours-per-week classroom experience. An apparent result of this program has been a slight increase in the number of minors and majors (in the order of 20%-30% or 8-10 new students in each category), and—especially among students who have spent the winter session in Caen—a considerable increase in enrollment in our postrequirement and upper-level courses. The German and Spanish faculties have had similar results.

### **The French Connection: Teams of Equal Partners**

The French faculty, in a preliminary survey of the literature on the use of teaching teams in the foreign language classroom, found very little on the subject: there were reports on the Rassias method and an article by Magnan (1987) describing a team-teaching experiment at the University of Wisconsin which had just appeared in the *French Review*.<sup>1</sup> The modes described by Magnan and by Rassias,<sup>2</sup> as well as other cases known to us anecdotally, all called for an experienced teacher to present concepts and a TA or part-timer to lead practice sessions. While mindful that these approaches had yielded good results, we were unable to follow them closely: on the one hand, we were obliged to keep each section of the courses intact for both teachers, in contrast to the large class/small practice sections framework used by others; and on the other hand, we did not want to run the risk of having the students view the inexperienced teachers' class hours as being less important than those of the more experienced teachers.<sup>3</sup>

Therefore, we determined that the two teachers of our team would each share in all teaching responsibilities. The novice as well as the

veteran would introduce creative activities and new curricular materials on their days in the classroom, thereby integrating inexperienced teachers fully and immediately into the program. Although for scheduling and other administrative purposes, the University of Delaware requires the use of the designations “primary” and “secondary,” the two teachers were to be perceived by their students as equally important and as sharing the same work.<sup>4</sup> We hoped to mitigate or avert entirely the problem of difference in rank and degree of authority which Magnan noted the TAs in her program felt (p. 462).

We foresaw that this arrangement would be a challenging one, since such sharing would necessitate daily communication between the teammates. Like many instructors in multisection courses, we were accustomed to comparing notes and sharing ideas; but we saw from the start that team-teaching promised to give a new meaning to communication between colleagues and between faculty and TAs or part-timers.

## The Curriculum

At the time the decision to institute team teaching was made, the French faculty was in the process of designing a syllabus-driven curriculum to clarify and codify the goals of each course in our elementary/intermediate program and to improve the articulation between courses. While the development of the new program syllabus was undertaken independently of the plans for team teaching, the coincidental implementation of the two innovations in the fall of 1987 was opportune. Since the close collaboration between two teachers sharing the instruction of a course necessitates a mutual understanding of course goals, the explicit formulation of these goals in the program syllabus is extremely useful for orienting the teams in their planning; furthermore, since students are also in possession of the syllabus, they can see how all activities of both instructors are aimed at achieving the stated goals.

The syllabus (see Appendix) consists of a statement of the overall program objectives, followed by a separate presentation of the goals for each individual course. The overall statement outlines the main topics or notions we want students to master, the skills needed to perform meaningfully in French, the vocabulary essential for accomplishing these tasks,<sup>5</sup> and the basic grammatical points without which the students cannot perform adequately. More detail is provided in the individual course descriptions, which list the proficiency goals, accuracy goals, topics, and cultural items specific to each course. The proficiency goals set for the three courses, which were defined in terms of the 1986 *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*, are Novice High, Intermediate Low, and Intermediate Mid, respectively.<sup>6</sup>

The accuracy goals consist of the basic grammatical and orthographical material taught at each level, with, however, a timetable that allows students to experiment with the new grammatical items before they are graded<sup>7</sup>—a practice which eases tensions in the classroom, as students are generally in command of new structures before they are graded on their use of them, and are therefore far less likely to overmonitor their speech production.<sup>8</sup> The main topics/notions and the cultural items are recycled throughout the three semesters' work, and are accompanied by progressively more complex and nuanced skills requirements.

In addition to the syllabus, students receive a day-by-day course schedule. Written tests occur at approximately 15-hour intervals, or about four per semester. There are two oral tests, the first occurring at about mid-point in the course, the other near the end. The fourth hour test and the final oral test are general in nature, and replace the standard final exam. In addition, students have quizzes and homework assignments; in FR 105, the quizzes are replaced by a series of writing workshops, in which the students learn to write first words and then sentences and paragraphs, and gradually increase the complexity of their sentence structures by adding adjectives and adjective clauses beginning with *qui* or *que*.

Instructional approaches are quite varied, but all aim at fostering both fluency and accuracy. After an initial 15-class-hour stretch of Total Physical Response (TPR)<sup>9</sup> enhanced by the department's locally-produced IBM vocabulary program,<sup>10</sup> then role playing, scenarios, small-group activities of all sorts, *sondages*, reports, and other communicative techniques are used, along with occasional drills on grammatical points and textbook/workbook exercises. The texts used help provide additional articulation between the levels, since for the most part they serve more than one course.

## Team Teaching the Curriculum

The administrative structure of our team teaching program consists of three course coordinators, each of whom oversees one of the courses in the sequence, and a sequence supervisor who is concerned with assuring that the courses articulate as they are designed to do. The sequence supervisor and the course coordinators constitute the textbook-selection committee, an arrangement which facilitates proper articulation.

Before the beginning of the semester, each course coordinator convenes all teams teaching his/her particular course to review the goals of the course and to examine the calendar established by the coordinator for that semester. General guidelines regarding class attendance, participation, homework, testing, and grading are offered by the

coordinator at that time. It is then up to each team to work out in detail what its policies on these matters will be and to establish an efficient system of common bookkeeping. Involvement in this process constitutes a valuable apprenticeship in course management for the teaching assistant or part-timer.

During the semester, teammates meet weekly to make a general plan of the next week's activities: what will be done, when, by whom, and—often—how. They also arrange for communication with each other during the rest of the week, which is frequently handled by a notebook passed back and forth, with each teammate recording what was done in his or her class that day; in this manner the following day's lesson plan can be adjusted as necessary.

For instance, when the *passé composé* is introduced, the teammates must decide who will make the initial presentation and by means of what technique(s)—TPR, grammatical analysis, strategic interaction scenario, reading activity, etc. After the class meeting, the original presenter must report to his or her teammate what actually transpired during the lesson, whether the class as a whole and individual students in particular appeared to understand the concepts and to have grasped the forms, and what kinds of problems were encountered, and then make recommendations for adjustments to the plan necessitated by the team member's experience in class. This report is usually made in the team's notebook or by a telephone call.

When a quiz is to be given, the teammates decide on the format, on what day it will be given, and on who will grade it and according to what criteria. Exams are prepared and graded by the teammates in accordance with a format and grading criteria established by the course coordinator.

While each team has a significant degree of autonomy, there is continued contact between all instructors teaching the same course. The course coordinator holds course-wide planning sessions on a regular basis during the semester to ensure that goals, as plotted out in the syllabus, are being met and to give an opportunity for exchanging ideas and teaching techniques, working out problems, planning exams, and gathering suggestions for improving the course in subsequent semesters. These course-wide meetings guarantee some measure of uniformity among sections and enable teaching assistants to benefit from a broader base of shared ideas and to become aware of more general program concerns.

Course coordinators are convened regularly by the sequence supervisor to report on their respective courses and share the concerns of their instructors. These periodic meetings identify problem areas before they become too serious, and keep the persons responsible for the

different levels of instruction in close communication with one another. The sequence supervisor also organizes workshops pre-, mid-, and post-semester, to which all members of the teaching staff are invited. On these occasions demonstrations of teaching methods and communicative activities are offered by experienced staff members. These plenary meetings have also provided a forum for discussion and evaluation of our system of team teaching. The suggestions of teaching assistants and part-timers as well as veteran teachers have thus been taken into account as our team teaching program has evolved.

In these ways, we attempt to surround the inexperienced TAs and part-timers with guidance and support, to engage them in discussion of the problems and challenges they are facing in the classroom, and to help them to analyze and improve their performance.

## **Advantages and Disadvantages of Team Teaching**

### **The Point of View of the Faculty**

From the start, we discovered as a group both the difficulties and the advantages of team teaching. The major concern voiced at first was, not surprisingly, the extraordinary need for meetings. It was not easy to fit so many into already busy schedules. However, these frequent meetings, initially seen only as a disadvantage, have come to be recognized as an advantage as well. They provide an occasion for very productive brainstorming; the ideas which result are abundant and creative, and can actually reduce the amount of time that needs to be spent individually on preparation. It seems that two (or more) heads are indeed better than one. If one teammate is having difficulty finding a way to present a lesson or is not satisfied with the class response, the second teacher can try a different approach.

Teachers have discovered that discussing and evaluating activities together help them keep their activities purposeful, since explaining or justifying ideas to each other forces each to re-evaluate his or her own. As one assistant professor said, "I found that teaching the same course with another person over the whole semester was an enormous and invaluable source of moral support, as well as practical support: two lots of ideas to draw on, someone to share the workload with, discuss problems, laugh, etc." An experienced instructor noted, in a practical vein, "Teachers can replace each other easily in case of illness (they know the students, and they know what is being done in the class)."



Another advantage of team teaching is that oral exams can be administered in half the time if each teammate tests half the class; or, if they prefer, they can work together on oral testing, allowing one person to conduct the interview while the other observes and takes notes. This is also less disquieting to the students, who can be unnerved by seeing their teacher writing virtually constantly while they are speaking; the practice of having two teachers conduct the oral exam, while it might not produce better results, does provide a more relaxed atmosphere for conversation.

Finally, teachers feel that grading is more objective, not only in the oral exams but also in assessing written work and class performance, since the two instructors tend to confirm (or, more rarely, to compensate for) each other's grades over the course of the semester, and since they jointly decide the students' final grades. Moreover, in order to assure some degree of uniformity in grading, the team must discuss in considerable detail which aspects of the students' progress are to be graded at a particular point, and how the grading scale will work. This practice also leads to a greater degree of objectivity, in that the criteria, established beforehand, are verbalized and made more explicit than is the usual practice in a single-teacher situation.

Nevertheless, despite these advantages, meetings continue to pose a challenge. Finding times for meetings with different teammates can be difficult—for the TAs because their schedules include hours when they are taking classes, in addition to the hours when they are teaching; for the experienced instructors because they teach several courses and therefore have more meetings to schedule with different teammates. This, their most frequently-stated problem, has been lessened by an attempt to team primary instructors with no more than two different TAs. But another problem persists: the day-to-day communication between teammates. As one instructor explains, "Partners cannot possibly know everything that happens in the other teacher's class. Although notes are kept and phone calls are made, we inevitably forget [some of] the details (e.g., every single vocab. word introduced, students who won't be in class a certain date, etc.)." Experienced teachers also complain that, because they give so many activities and ideas to TAs and beginning instructors, they find that their partners sometimes seem to rely on these ideas and activities rather than create new ones of their own. In the most extreme cases, experienced teachers have felt that they were in effect doing the planning for all five class meetings of the week.

The work of the senior instructor in such a team is in reality a form of mentoring. Although it is time consuming, the regular staff perceives that this mentoring process is not without its rewards, and that the system of team teaching we practice has significant benefits.

### **The Point of View of the Teaching Assistants and the Part-timers**

For their part, the teaching assistants and the part-timers have expressed great satisfaction with their experience in the team-teaching program, especially for their first year. Although administratively "secondary" instructors, they enjoy equal status in the classroom. They do not have the burden of full responsibility for running the course, yet they are being initiated into all aspects of that responsibility. For them, the extensive contact with older faculty members offers guidance and, when needed, reassurance. Those with no previous teaching experience have occasionally been disconcerted by the necessity of changing lesson plans at the last moment when informed that their class was not ready for the lesson they had prepared for the next day; however, they have found the collaborating instructor consistently helpful in providing ideas for making the necessary adjustments. These findings are similar to those reported by Magnan (p. 462), who found that TAs perceived in their team-teaching experience a "benefit...for their own professional training: by observing and working closely with a professor, they felt that they gained in expertise, objectivity, and professionalism."

Overall, there seems to be a good symbiosis in the situation, with the teaching assistants learning from their more experienced colleagues, and the latter in turn benefiting from the enthusiasm of their junior teammates. Pleased with their success, TAs have expressed a desire to teach a course on their own, once they have learned the ropes (a finding consistent with Magnan, pp. 462-63). We are considering ways of accommodating them in this reasonable request.

### **The Point of View of the Students**

The students, too, appear to find the team-teaching experience generally to their liking. They rate their courses at the department average of about 4 on a 5-point scale; this appears especially impressive in view of the fact that half of most teams consists of an inexperienced teacher. Furthermore, a formal survey of several sections and anecdotal evidence from the other sections on all three levels of instruction—written comments on course-evaluation forms and remarks made informally to teachers—suggests a high degree of satisfaction. Comments focus on three main points: first, a variety of teaching styles and accents is provided; second, student interest is maintained; third, the risk of having a poorly taught course is diminished.

One student, for instance, writes: "Both teachers' aspects, ideas, views, knowledge can be used to teach students." The fact that teacher talents tend to be complementary is one of the most frequently-cited advantages of team-teaching from the students' point of view: "You can

hear two different accents, and get a different perspective on the language." "Both instructors contain a wealth of information they can share with their students, thereby getting two reactions on a particular place or way of life." On maintaining a high interest level, students comment: "It's a change from having the same teacher every day, which can be quite boring." "It is often a good thing, especially when a class meets every day. You do not become tired of the same style of teaching day after day." "Minimizes boredom." And, on the quality of individual instructors, students write: "If it is difficult to understand one, the other may be clearer." "One does seem less formal than the other, funner [*sic*]." Negative comments are few, and even when caveats are offered, it is most often in a constructive context, as in this comment: "Team teaching works well if the two profs are in constant communication." Another student notes: "Even though some material is repeated, it can be seen as a review." Still, a perceived breakdown of communication between the two instructors has caused unmitigated negative reaction in a small number of students, such as the one who wrote, "The two teachers should communicate more so they know what each other is doing and so they can tell the students what's going on."

These typical student reactions, generally if not universally accentuating the positive, seem to indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the team-teaching aspect of the program. (Similar general satisfaction was found in Magnan, pp. 459-61.) Indeed, our students' reactions to the team of teachers often echo those of Magnan's students, one of whom said (p. 460): "It breaks up the monotony of having the same class five days a week, and also provides different learning experiences on different days (teaching styles, point of view, accents...)."

## Conclusions

The organization of the team-taught syllabus-driven curriculum has proven to be very satisfactory, allowing as it does maximum communication among all persons involved in the elementary/intermediate program. Each team meets regularly and frequently to map out strategies and approaches; at each level, the course coordinators meet often and regularly with the instructional staff, and can help train new TAs and lecturers; and the sequence supervisor and course coordinators get together periodically to choose materials and to keep the articulation between the courses as smooth as possible.

The team-teaching experience has thus been a positive one. The high level of cross-fertilization of ideas and activities between team partners and, in fact, among all faculty members, has translated into a more varied and stimulating atmosphere in the classroom, and students have

expressed their appreciation of this in generally positive course evaluations. Students agree that team teaching, by exposing them constantly to two points of view, two accents, and two teaching styles, has enriched their experience in our courses, providing a variety crucial in an intensive, five-days-a-week schedule. The faculty and the TAs have noted that, while maintaining the close communication necessary with one's teammate(s) is a real challenge, team teaching has succeeded in improving communication among all faculty members, which has at the same time favored articulation between courses. After some three years of team teaching, we are convinced that it is helping us to make our program stronger and more effective.

Nevertheless, our experience also suggests that it might be a good idea to limit team teaching to first-year TAs and beginning instructors, both because of the practical problems noted above—the enormous expenditure of time and energy required to meet regularly and to coordinate efforts within each team—and because the TAs' request to have a chance to teach on their own is well founded. If in fact we are training them to become effective teachers, they will need opportunities to work independently once they have acquired the skills necessary to conduct a class on their own. Thanks to their team teaching experience, TAs can build a solid foundation in the practice of our craft which will better enable them to perform as skilled professionals.

## Notes

1. For purposes of this report, a more recent search was undertaken, with similarly meager results: computer searches of ERIC and the MLA Bibliography yielded only one (as it turned out) inapplicable entry on team teaching in foreign languages; searches of the *Modern Language Journal*, *Foreign Language Annals*, and the *French Review* yielded only Magnan's article. We are aware of the existence of other team-teaching efforts (for example, at the University of Texas at Austin and at Simon Fraser University) but our knowledge is only anecdotal: since 1980 (the beginning limit of our search) almost nobody has written on the subject. It would appear that our colleagues have not shared in print the good and bad experiences they have had, or the results of their research in this field.
2. See the list of works cited. Rassias and Rassias-inspired modes like Otto W. Johnston's at the University of Florida, make extensive use of undergraduates to conduct the drill sections. Most other modes, including Magnan's and ours, make use of graduate teaching assistants.
3. In fact, we subsequently learned that in our four-classroom-hours-per-week courses, team-taught on a 3-1 basis, the TA or part-timer's role was virtually untenable. These courses have since been phased out. We attempted at first to team-teach these courses, but with the secondary instructors' time being reduced to one hour per week we discovered that students did not respect

them as equal partners, and tended to be absent much more frequently on their teaching day. As a result, these courses were taught subsequently by a single instructor until they were phased out.

4. Since we were obliged to initiate the team-teaching program within months, we did not have the time or the opportunity to set up a scientific, controlled experiment contrasting student performance in one-teacher sections versus student performance in team-taught sections, or their performance in classes taught by teams consisting of an experienced teacher and a TA or part-timer versus those taught by teams consisting of two experienced teachers.

5. Savard and Richards' book was an invaluable aid in choosing the vocabulary for the first semester's work and for the IBM program we have incorporated into the course work.

6. These goals are just that: goals. They are not requirements for passing the courses, and for this reason we do not claim to have a proficiency-ordered curriculum. The goals are, however, used to determine grade levels, with a B awarded to students who achieve these goals on the final oral and written exams, and higher or lower grades assigned to those who surpass them or fall below them.

7. Students have five class hours to use the new points before we actively correct them, and another five hours before we grade their oral and written work on these topics. The original intervals were ten hours, but it soon became obvious that this was an excessive amount of time, and might even have been counter-productive, in that some students were beginning to "learn" their errors.

8. Programs described in Rosenthal (1987) and Pons-Ridler (1987) have some parallels to our program and methods. Rosenthal's experiments and experiences are similar to ours, and have produced similar results; we believe, however, that the team-teaching aspect of our program has made possible a degree of success we would not otherwise have achieved, and has added a dimension to the students' (and the teachers'!) classroom experience not attainable in a single-teacher environment. We have, as a matter of informal policy, been for some years following many of the guidelines Pons-Ridler summarizes so well in her article; this has allowed us to concentrate on more essential matters of communication.

9. This approach was invented by psychologist James Asher in the 1960s. A good presentation of his ideas and of the psychological basis of TPR can be found in Asher (1981).

As we practice TPR, students are discouraged from speaking French during the first eight to ten hours of class. During this time, by acting out commands, listening to the instructor speak to them in simple but complete sentences utilizing highlighted vocabulary items, students develop in just two weeks an active vocabulary of about 200 words, plus an assortment of noun markers; they also learn the basic sentence structure of French, and to an amazing extent the pronunciation of the language; in short, they appear to internalize the language process.

The use of TPR has had an important side effect: the real beginners are less intimidated by those false beginners who somehow manage to get into a first-semester course, and feel more confident of their own abilities once they begin speaking. TPR also develops the students' listening skills.

10. The vocabulary lesson used is *Words*, developed by Theodore E. D. Braun and George W. Mulford. It is based on the word-usage list researched and published by Savard and Richards. We also make use of a locally-produced verb morphology lesson called *Verbs*, developed by Theodore E. D. Braun, George W. Mulford, and Bonnie A. Robb.

## Works Cited

- ACTFL *Proficiency Guidelines*. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL Materials Center, 1986.
- Asher, James J. *Learning Another Language through Actions: The Complete Teacher's Guidebook*. Third Printing. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions, 1981.
- Capretz, Pierre. *French in Action* videotapes, Washington, DC: The Annenberg-CPB Project, 1987.
- Johnston, Otto W. "The Intensive Language Model at Florida." *Methods That Work*. Ed. John W. Oller & Patricia A. Richard-Amato. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983: 348-61.
- Magnan, Sally Sieloff. "Teaming Teachers and Modifying Class Size: An Experiment in First-Year French." *French Review* 60 (1987): 454-65.
- Pons-Ridler, Suzanne. "Orthographe: pourquoi être plus royaliste que le roi!" *French Review* 61 (1987): 229-38.
- Rassias, John A. "New Dimensions in Language Training: The Dartmouth College Experiment." *Methods That Work*. Ed. John W. Oller & Patricia A. Richard-Amato. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983: 363-73; see especially pp. 366-70.
- Rosenthal, Alan S. "Learning and Retaining through Context and Imagination." *French Review* 61 (1987): 219-28.
- Savard, Jean-Guy & Jack Richards. *Les Indices d'utilité du vocabulaire fondamental français*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1970.

## Appendix

### Syllabus for French 105, 106, 107 Sequence

#### Overall Program Objectives

By the end of FR 107, students should be able to satisfy most survival needs and limited social demands in French-speaking countries. Students will be expected to handle colloquial greeting/introducing/leave-taking routines, as well as to have a working knowledge of lodging- and meal-related matters. They should be able to discuss and to understand matters of personal history and immediate experience, including career goals, plans, family background, courses taken or to be taken, and different jobs held. Students should show some spontaneity in language production, although their fluency is likely to be uneven.

Errors in syntax and morphology will occur; however, evidence of grammatical accuracy in basic sentence structure and subject-verb agreement, noun-adjective agreement, use of verb tenses, use of direct and indirect object pronouns and of the basic relative and interrogative pronouns can be expected. Students will be able to use most question forms and use the most common negative expressions. While word order is in general under control, some errors will occur in more complex structures. Pronunciation will be comprehensible, but students may have difficulty in producing certain sounds in certain positions or combinations, and speech will be hesitant at times.

Students will be able to read and comprehend material intended for the general public as well as authentic or edited texts such as newspaper articles, social announcements or invitations, letters, and some literature. Students should also be able to read and understand the main ideas or points in more technical material related to their major subject or a personal interest. Students will be able to use the context of what they read to extract meaning, and to use a dictionary to look up the meaning of indispensable words or expressions.

Students will be able to write general messages, notes, informal letters and postcards, and to fill out forms of a kind used in travel situations. They will also be able to write compositions containing descriptions, narrations, and their views on topics of interest to them. Students' writing will be intelligible, personal and original, although a variety of formal errors can be expected. They will have a broad functional active vocabulary.

Evaluation will consist of both oral and written measures of functional ability in French. Scoring techniques will thus reflect students' fluency, originality, breadth of vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, critical skills, and global ability in French.

## **French 105 (Hours 1-67)**

### *Main Topics/Notions*

- Greetings and introductions
- Parts of the body; health/sickness
- The family
- School, subjects, majors
- Work, careers
- Leisure activities, sports
- Vacations, travel
- Plans for the future (winter, summer, career)
- Meals and foods
- Stores, shopping
- Clothing
- Buying, selling, paying

### *Culture*

- Geography of France (main cities, rivers, etc.)
- Some traditions, holidays, national cultural interests
- Daily lives of young French people

*Skills*

Greetings; introducing oneself and others  
Talking about oneself and one's family, friends, activities, and occupations  
Listening to other people talk about these things  
Interacting with others at the elementary level  
Asking survival questions  
Asking for help  
Asking for and giving directions  
Writing words, sentences, paragraphs in simple French  
Filling out forms (hotel, university, etc.)  
Reading simple material (signs, schedules, stories)  
Understanding basic cultural patterns  
Ordering a meal  
Shopping

*Main Grammar Points*

ACTIVE

Basic sentence structure  
Commands  
Present indicative  
Subject pronouns  
Direct object pronouns (introduced ca. hour 40)  
Future with *aller*  
Articles  
Reflexive verbs  
Modal auxiliaries (*vouloir, pouvoir, devoir*, etc.)  
Interrogation by intonation  
Relative pronouns *qui* and *que*  
Simple negation (*ne...pas*)  
Noun-adjective agreement  
*Passé composé* (introduced ca. hour 50)

PASSIVE

Indirect object pronouns  
Interrogation by inversion

*Vocabulary*

Important items associated with main topics/notions, culture, skills  
Colors, sizes  
Time expressions  
Weather expressions  
Prepositions and adverbs of location  
Numerals, dates  
Days of the week, divisions of the day, months, seasons

*Proficiency Goal*

Novice High



*Accuracy Goals*

Subject-verb agreement for present indicative (corrected starting ca. hour 15, graded for written work ca. hour 20, graded for oral work ca. hour 25)

Noun-adjective agreement, (corrected starting ca. hour 20, graded for written work ca. hour 25, graded for oral work ca. hour 30)

Direct object pronouns (corrected starting ca. hour 45, graded starting ca. hour 50)

Comprehensible pronunciation

Solid knowledge of vocabulary

Use of *passé composé* (corrected starting ca. hour 55, graded starting ca. hour 60)

*Materials*

TEXT: *Petits contes sympathiques*

OTHER: Computer programs on IBM micros (WORDS, VERBS, TOUCHÉ, etc.)

Slides and overheads

Maps

Audiotapes

Videotapes (*French in Action*)

**French 106 (Hours 68-135)**

In addition to French 105 material:

*Main Topics/Notions*

More on sports and leisure activities

More on meals and foods

More on traveling

Urban life in France

Study abroad/French education system

Important/popular people

Francophone countries (Canada, Caribbean, European, African)

Everyday problems

Women, young people

More on vacations: changing currency, shopping, expressing preferences

*Culture*

Regional differences

Society, government, politics

Patterns relating to family, traditions, interpersonal relations, celebrations, festivities

*Skills*

Talking and writing about oneself and others  
Finding out information, ideas, opinions about important persons, places,  
issues  
Finding your way around a city, a country  
Reading for general information  
Writing descriptive and narrative prose

*Main Grammar Points*

ACTIVE

Review direct object pronouns  
Imperfect (introduced ca. hour 75)  
Use of *imparfait* and *passé composé*  
Indirect object pronouns (introduced ca. hour 90)  
Present subjunctive (introduced ca. hour 95)  
The indefinite pronoun *on*  
Review/refinement of imperative (ca. hour 110)  
Indirect discourse  
Future tense (introduced ca. hour 120)  
Interrogation by inversion

PASSIVE

Passive voice  
Relative pronouns as objects of prepositions  
Interrogative pronouns as objects of prepositions  
Stressed forms of pronouns  
Double object pronouns

*Vocabulary*

Greater variety and detail to lead to greater skill and ease of expression in  
main topics/notions, culture, skill  
Development of passive vocabulary for reading ordinary prose passages in  
books, newspapers, etc.

*Proficiency Goal*

Intermediate Low

*Accuracy Goals*

Correct forms and basic uses of imperfect (corrected starting ca. hour 80,  
graded starting ca. hour 85)  
Correct use of direct object pronouns (graded starting ca. hour 70)  
Correct use of indirect object pronouns (corrected starting ca. hour 100,  
graded starting ca. hour 110)

Correct forms and basic uses of present subjunctive (corrected starting ca. hour 100, graded starting ca. hour 105)

Correct forms and uses of future (corrected starting ca. hour 125, graded starting ca. hour 130)

Correct use of indirect discourse (verb tense, use of *que*)

*Materials*

TEXTS: *Rendez-vous; Contes pour débutants, I*

OTHER: Computer programs on IBM micros (VERBS, TOUCHÉ, etc.)

Maps

Audiotapes

Videotapes (*French in Action*)

**French 107 (Hours 136-202)**

In addition to French 105 and 106 material:

*Main Topics/Notions*

More on entertainment and leisure activities

More on dining out and ordering food

Reading extensively in different kinds of material

Topics raised in material read (short stories, articles, essays, etc.)

More on interpersonal relationships

*Culture*

General cultural issues

French and Francophone countries' main values and traditions

Sociopolitical ideas typical of France and of Francophone countries

*Skills*

More on filling out forms

Making comments, expressing preferences and opinions

Defending opinions

Making small talk and keeping listener interested

Expressing agreement and disagreement

Defending own positions and those of others

Negotiating an outcome

Reporting current events

Simple analyses of themes, characters, plots, motives in material read

Writing critical essays and compositions to discuss ideas

Talking and writing about oneself or others

*Main Grammar Points*

**ACTIVE**

Review future

Conditional (introduced ca. hour 140)

Review and refinement of main grammar points covered in previous levels,  
with a focus on improving oral and written expression in French

Past conditional, *plus-que-parfait*

**PASSIVE**

Reading tenses

*Vocabulary*

Development of vocabulary needed for topics/notions, culture, skills

Systematic review of earlier levels' vocabulary items

*Proficiency Goal*

Intermediate Mid or High

*Accuracy Goals*

Correct forms and uses of conditional (corrected starting ca. hour 145,  
graded starting ca. hour 150)

Correct use of relative pronouns as objects of prepositions, in writing

*Materials*

TEXTS: *Interaction; Autour de la littérature*

OTHER: Computer programs on IBM micros (VERBS, TOUCHÉ, etc.)

Maps

Slides, projections

Audiotapes

Videotapes (*French in Action*)