

***Development and  
Supervision of  
Teaching Assistants  
in Foreign Languages***

***Joel C. Walz  
Editor***

**THOMSON**  
—★—  
**HEINLE**



**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	<a href="http://www.thomsonrights.com">www.thomsonrights.com</a>

**ISBN: 0-8384-5124-1**

# Teaching Assistant Development: A Case Study

*Julia Herschensohn*  
*University of Washington*

The apprenticeship of teaching assistants (TAs) of foreign languages can be likened to language learning by a true beginner: both novices are required to gain mastery of several areas of expertise at once. The language learner must be able to pronounce the foreign tongue before using its salutations and syntax, yet must have some knowledge of the words before being able to pronounce them. Language students must learn rudimentary cultural characteristics in order to use forms as basic as the personal pronouns. Likewise, TAs are expected to have an understanding of administration, methodology, and content, that is, subjects ranging from placement tests to cultural subtlety. Language TAs are often given broader administrative duties than TAs in other disciplines (such as complete responsibility for their own class) and must excel in a methodology that is quite discipline-specific. The multifaceted role of language TAs requires that a training program address nearly simultaneously a wide range of issues that are of relevance to them. In addition, the home department must provide an administrative system that supports and enhances their teaching. The morale of language instructors is crucial to the excellence of the language program.

The first-year French program of the University of Washington teaches approximately one thousand students per year; over 80% of the classes are taught by TAs. Numbers such as these are typical of research universities

with large language programs and graduate TAs. Our TA development program aims to provide TAs with necessary information regarding administration, methodology, and content to enable them to serve the undergraduate language population. This chapter describes the development program for graduate TAs in French at the University of Washington and the implementation of a one-quarter methodology seminar initiated in the fall of 1991. The first section presents an overview of the background and issues involved in foreign language teacher preparation in this country; the second section describes the rationale and planning of the TA program in French at the University of Washington; and the third recounts the implementation and evaluation of the TA seminar.

## Foreign Language Teacher Preparation

In describing “What Constitutes a Well Trained Foreign Language Teacher” in the twenty-fifth anniversary issue of *Modern Language Journal*, Freeman (1941, p. 304) portrays an individual who “must possess a rich store of mature knowledge, untiring energy and vigor, contagious enthusiasm for his subject and his profession as a teacher, limitless patience, human understanding and sympathy.” In the decades following his article, many others have built teacher preparation programs that aim to develop foreign language teachers according to Freeman’s description (see, for example, Paquette, 1966; Brickell & Paul, 1982; Alatis, Stern & Strevens, 1983; Lange, 1983; Mellgren, Walker & Lange, 1988; Phillips, 1989; Morain, 1990; Richards & Nunan, 1990; Wallace, 1991; Woodward, 1991). Appropriately, one of the most thorough documents to articulate issues in foreign language teacher training, and a prototype for later work, was the fiftieth anniversary issue of *Modern Language Journal* (Paquette, 1966). In it Paquette incorporates relevant articles and documents dealing with foreign language pedagogy that ranged from content preparation and methodology to certification. An article by MacAllister (1966) deals with the role of TAs in college language teaching.

The “development” (a term Lange [1983] prefers to “training” or “preparation”) of preuniversity teachers is similar, but not equivalent to that of TAs. Foreign language instructors in elementary and secondary schools are career teachers whose background and professional roles are broader and more complex than those of TAs. High school teachers, whose undergraduate specialization may not have been a foreign language, are perhaps better

prepared in areas other than knowledge of the foreign civilization and proficiency in its language. This "content" knowledge is considered one of the most important prerequisites of the language teacher by most authors dealing with teacher education. Freeman (1941), whose ideal language teacher is both virtuously patient and maturely knowledgeable, underscores the necessity of thorough grounding in the target language and culture. The specific content that should be attained by foreign language teachers is spelled out in the MLA "Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages" (Paquette, 1966, pp. 342-44). The seven areas of competence in which the teacher should achieve a level of "good" are as relevant today as they were 25 years ago: (1) oral comprehension; (2) speaking ability; (3) reading comprehension; (4) writing ability; (5) understanding of the structure of the foreign language and its systematic differences from the native one; (6) knowledge of the cultural context; and (7) "knowledge of the present-day objectives of modern foreign language teaching as communication." Phillips (1989, p. 12) points out the importance of content knowledge and makes recommendations to assure this competence in the certification of teachers.

Once certified, high school teachers represent their profession in interactions with colleagues in school and with members of the community. They are expected to be professionally active and to keep up with current ideas in the field. Extracurricular demands and multiple preparations for classes in varied fields are not uncommon for high school teachers. Finally, the necessity of teaching five to seven classes daily, with over a hundred students, and of handling disciplinary problems, requires that high school foreign language teachers deal with much more than simply the content of foreign language teaching.

TAs, on the other hand, are usually graduate students working on an M.A. or Ph.D. in the literature or linguistics of a foreign language while teaching one or two classes a term. TA training is designed more to expedite the teaching of beginning language classes than to prepare a teacher for a lifetime profession, as Benseler and Schulz (p. 94) deplored as long ago as 1980. Recent work in TA preparation (e.g., Henderson, 1985; Nyquist, Abbott, Wulff & Sprague, 1991; Rava, 1991) has emphasized the long-term importance of preparation in pedagogy, since teaching is the profession that many TAs will seek to enter. Such preparation is not, however, the first short-term priority in TA training, since some new TAs enter the program with no training whatsoever. Unlike high school teachers whose academic

preparation may be in an area other than a foreign language, TAs in foreign languages must meet minimum requirements of language proficiency and academic preparation in the field of literature or linguistics to be admitted to a graduate program. Finally, TAs as teachers have far fewer extracurricular demands and disciplinary issues to deal with than high school teachers.

Studies that have looked at the training of foreign language TAs (Nerenz, Herron & Knop, 1979; Schulz, 1980; Gibaldi & Mirollo, 1980; Ervin & Muyskens, 1982; Azevedo, 1990; Murphy, 1991; Waldinger, 1990) bear out MacAllister's (1966, p. 402) comment: "As to the training given these assistants before or during their first experience, the situation with respect to methods courses proved to be more complex and varied than could be reliably ascertained by a questionnaire." Di Donato (1983, p. 34) echoes MacAllister in lamenting the inadequacy of much of TA training. "These observations and studies on TA training and supervision make it clear that improvements are still needed." He furnishes a checklist that makes recommendations similar to those of the articles he cites and others dealing with training (see also Gilbert & McArthur, 1975; Henderson, 1985; Lalande, 1991; Strozer, 1991). The main areas he delineates are TA orientation, in-service training, and TA evaluation, areas described in typical programs of TA preparation. Within each category he makes suggestions for procedures.

To summarize his checklist for TA orientation, he recommends: (1) a "shock" foreign language lesson; (2) role-play of Day One; (3) administrative information; (4) language lab tour; (5) presentation by experienced instructors; (6) panel of experienced instructors; (7) observation of teaching video; (8) office sharing with experienced TAs; (9) videotaping of new TAs; (10) idea sharing; (11) incorporation of target culture; (12) classroom problems; and (13) classroom procedure. For in-service training he recommends: (1) methods course; (2) observation of experienced TAs; (3) videotaping of new TAs; (4) observation by experienced TAs; (5) materials file; (6) introduction to professional organizations; (7) program articulation; (8) upper division literature; and (9) counseling. For TA evaluation he recommends: (1) predistribution of an evaluation checklist; (2) visitation by more than one supervisor; (3) peer observation; (4) preobservation conference; and (5) consideration of student reaction. Judging from the literature, methodology courses for TAs are closely tied to other aspects of the training program, that is, orientation, supervision, observation, and evaluation (see Gilbert & McArthur, 1975; Henderson, 1985; Strozer, 1991). The methods course is usually offered the first term the new TA is teaching, although it

may extend for the whole year (as in Henderson's case). As do many other universities, the University of Washington French program closely ties together all aspects of TA preparation, integrating many of Di Donato's suggestions.

## University of Washington TA Preparation

### TA Training Before 1991

The seminar for French TAs at the University of Washington was a logical addition to an apprenticeship program that was already in place. The training sequence before fall 1991 provided information on the mechanics of the course itself and on campus resources, while attempting to acquaint TAs with issues in language pedagogy and a repertoire of classroom techniques. First-year French courses at the University of Washington are taught through a methodology that entails extensive use of the target language in the classroom and emphasizes communication skills, interactive presentation of grammar, and daily practice outside of class. Language learning requires skill acquisition as well as the cognitive integration of syntax, vocabulary, and culture. The goals of the first-year program are to develop the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing to a level equivalent to intermediate-low proficiency on the ACTFL scale (ACTFL, 1986), so that the student can communicate basic ideas in the target language and understand the cultural context of the language. Our methodology requires the use of a variety of materials — videotapes, recorded conversation and music, slides, overhead transparencies, maps, photographs and other visuals and cultural artifacts — to foster participatory learning on the part of the students. The role of the individual teacher cannot be underestimated in a language classroom requiring such intensive preparation and teaching.

In order to train TAs in our approach, we set up a program with the following components: an intensive, week-long orientation in the fall before classes begin; a weekly practicum to discuss ongoing issues in pedagogy; intervisitations by TAs; supervisor visitation; videotaping of TA classes; and meetings throughout the year to discuss issues and problems as they come up. In addition, with the assistance of the Center for Instructional Development and Research (CIDR) and the Language Learning Center (LLC), we have developed a computer-assisted language learning (CALL) program that students use to complete and self-correct their daily homework. The TAs

also receive ongoing in-service enrichment to sharpen teaching ability and extend evaluatory and conceptual skills. Enrichment includes workshops given by professionals in language pedagogy such as Pierre Capretz and Claire Kramersch.

In principle, the first-year training program included necessary information and practice, but in reality it did not provide sufficient time to develop the requisite knowledge and skills. All Romance language TAs participated in a one-week orientation prior to the first day of classes in fall. Theoretical and practical information was conveyed in sessions covering a "shock" foreign language lesson, general methodology, program requirements, lesson planning, first-week activities, evaluation procedures, administration, CALL, potential problem areas, idea sharing, and the functions of the LLC. During the orientation experienced TAs gave model presentations and worked with new TAs in pairs and groups doing hands-on preparation of materials.

During fall and winter quarters the new TAs met weekly with the TA supervisor in a one-hour practicum to discuss lesson planning, supplementary materials, evaluation procedures, test writing, grading policies, campus resources, and idea sharing. The teaching issues were always dealt with experientially so that TAs learned through doing. For example, test correction and grading were presented through the experience of correcting a sample exam and subsequently comparing grades. Written guidelines were provided for the evaluation of oral interviews and compositions. Each new TA made a presentation of an original teaching technique and submitted sample lesson plans and materials. TAs received one credit for each quarter of the practicum.

The supervisor visited TAs once a year. She evaluated the class and spent an hour discussing it with the TA. TAs received a copy of the written report, which became part of their file. New and experienced TAs were expected to visit each others' classes and to turn in an evaluation indicating what they found useful in the visit. TAs were asked to have their class videotaped at least once by CIDR. They discussed the resultant videotape with a CIDR specialist and informed the supervisor of their response to the videotaping experience. CIDR performs this service on a strictly confidential basis.

Through our training program in the three areas of administration, methodology, and content, we tried to instruct TAs not only in the specifics of our language program, but also in general issues of pedagogy. We found, however, that one hour a week was insufficient to provide even the minimum



necessary for the administration of the program, let alone instill an interest in the educational process that might shape their professional lives beyond French 101.

### Entry Level Initiative

In the beginning of the 1989–91 biennium the University of Washington designated nearly \$4 million to be used exclusively for the improvement of undergraduate education. This project, which affected courses with large enrollments of first- and second-year students, became known as the Entry Level Initiative. A task force on foreign languages worked intensively in the fall of 1989 to draft a proposal that would improve first-year language teaching. The major thrust of the Romance Languages' proposal was the development of a TA training program that would include both a generic methodology section and a language-specific practicum. The relevant excerpt of the proposal reads as follows (University of Washington Romance Languages Memo, December 1989):

We take as [our] premise that teaching excellence is central to the language learning process, and that it should be the focal point of undergraduate education. We believe that TA training, supervision, and support are the most important issues for entry-level language courses, for it is only through adequate preparation that language instructors can realize their own potential and improve the quality of the language program. The availability and development of technological support systems, while useful adjuncts, cannot replace the teacher–student interaction at the core of the language learning process. Our top priority recommendation is a TA training program that would include an interdisciplinary graduate methodology course coupled with language-specific support and supervision. We view the TA training and support program as a necessity from two perspectives. First, adequate preparation of language TAs is essential for teaching excellence, a characteristic central to the improvement of the entry-level language program. Second, a top-notch training program accompanied by adequate support and professional preparation are requisite to attracting outstanding graduate students to our language programs.

The Romance Languages' proposal was accepted in spring 1990; the recommended positions were funded; and, in addition, the College of Arts and Sciences decided to hire a language pedagogy specialist who would work

with CIDR and the LLC as well as teach a generic methodology course. In the fall of 1991 the French section implemented the five-credit graduate seminar on language methodology. The Spanish section of the department has had a five-credit seminar in place since 1987 (Strozer, 1991).

## TA Development Seminar

In expanding the TA apprenticeship from a one-hour practicum to a five-hour seminar, we retained many aspects of the program already in place. We covered most of the points in Di Donato's checklist, but a large amount of the training information was dealt with very intensely during the orientation. We wanted to reduce the information overload of the preservice orientation while providing adequate preparation for the first week of class. We saw all aspects of TA development as linked: the orientation, the seminar, coordinator evaluation, intervisitations, and videotaping. The seminar was then designed to integrate all these components.

We wanted to provide both "received" and "experiential knowledge" (Wallace, 1991, pp. 14-17). In the first, "the trainee becomes acquainted with the vocabulary of the subject and the matching concepts, research findings, theories and skills which are widely accepted as being part of the necessary intellectual content of the profession" (p. 14); in the second, "the trainee will have developed knowledge-in-action by practice of the profession, and will have had, moreover, the opportunity to reflect on that knowledge-in-action" (p. 15). We were interested in teaching process as much as content (Woodward, 1991, p. 4), in providing a holistic approach that would not only prepare instructors for the University of Washington French program, but also furnish the tools for language teaching and the development of cognitive skills beyond those needed for teaching first-year French. Richards and Nunan (1990, p. 9) describe a holistic approach as "the examination of the total context of classroom teaching and learning in an attempt to understand how the interactions between and among teacher, learners, and classroom tasks affect learning." They advocate a preparation that develops teaching strategies and problem-solving skills rather than simply the memorization of classroom routines.

The one-week preservice training program before the first week of classes in the fall was expanded to eight days in order to foster mentoring relationships among new and experienced TAs, promote acclimation to the University of Washington, and provide information necessary for the first

week of classes (administration policies and pedagogical goals). The new preservice orientation focused more on the essentials for teaching the first chapter than on general issues of language pedagogy. We included a day of microteaching by the new TAs, who were videotaped by CIDR. As a group, the new TAs evaluated each others' video microlessons with a CIDR staff member. Another innovation was the use of experienced TAs not simply as presenters, but also as leaders of the practica in which the new TAs prepared lesson plans and materials.

At orientation TAs received a "TA Packet" that includes the following information sections: I. GENERAL INFORMATION FOR INSTRUCTORS; II. MATERIALS FOR DAY ONE; III. PEDAGOGICAL MATERIALS; IV. AUDIO-VISUAL MATERIALS; V. EVALUATING STUDENT PERFORMANCE. Section I includes a list of "TA Responsibilities" (see Appendix A) and a sample TA evaluation form (see Appendix B). TAs thus had from the outset clear, written guidelines concerning their responsibilities and the criteria on which their work was judged. Knop (1977, p. 634) points out that such guidelines are an integral part of TA development: "TAs react very positively to having such a checklist. They feel secure in knowing ahead of time the specific items that supervisors are going to look at and comment on after a visit. They use it for self-evaluation and for obtaining their students' evaluations."

The five-credit graduate-level course required of all new French instructors was offered during the fall quarter (two hours on Mondays and Wednesdays, one hour on Fridays). It was designed to include three components: on Mondays the two-hour lecture/workshops dealt with general issues of language pedagogy; on Wednesdays the two hours were devoted to particular aspects of the French language program (how to grade an exam, how to conduct an oral interview); and on Fridays the hour meeting was targeted to dealing with the grammar, vocabulary, culture, and idiosyncrasies of the chapter being taught. Both the general methodology and the language-specific sessions emphasized participatory learning on the part of the TAs.

Issues dealt with in the general theory of methodology sessions included (see sample syllabus, Appendix C): first and second language acquisition; history of language methodology; survey of current language methodologies; ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines; phonological, syntactic, and semantic variation among languages; interface of culture and language; emerging technologies in language pedagogy; curriculum planning; evaluation procedures; and teaching styles. The new TAs did weekly readings and completed

a one- to two-page written assignment related to the week's topic or to an aspect of their teaching. For example, one assignment entailed short identifications of current methodologies, while another was a lesson plan that the TA had found worked well. Groups of new TAs worked together to develop classroom approaches drawing on authentic materials and audiovisual supplements.

The "French program" sessions dealt with language specific issues (e.g., lesson planning, inductive grammar presentation, using realia and audiovisual materials, exam writing and grading, oral interviews, calculating course grades, classroom techniques), class observation, and videotaping of the new TAs. Techniques included group work, panel discussions, role-playing, and use of video training tapes. TA intervisitation was modified to include a mentoring system by which new TAs were paired with experienced ones. We felt that for the new TA, senior TAs are an invaluable resource and are able to advise the new TA on their dual roles of teacher and graduate student. Senior TAs can also foster the socialization and integration of new TAs. In turn, the senior TA gains experience in interpersonal relationships and supervision. The methodology course also encouraged intervisitation among instructors (within French and in other languages) to foster cooperation and cross-linguistic sharing.

In order to develop a more interactive approach to class visitation (Acheson & Gall, 1987, p. 10), the coordinators established several feedback mechanisms. The TA responsibilities and evaluation form provided in the TA Packet were discussed in the seminar before class visitations, and TAs were given a preobservation form asking which particular areas they would like the supervisor to observe closely. Before receiving the supervisor's visit in the fall quarter, the new TAs were videotaped for a class period by CIDR. They reviewed their video with the assistant coordinator, who discussed the class in terms of the criteria on the TA evaluation form. After the visitation the supervisor and TA discussed the class using the evaluation form as a point of departure.

Evaluation of the new methodology programs was done by surveys distributed to TAs at the end of the preservice orientation and the methodology seminar. As the surveys conducted by Ervin and Muyskens (1982) and Nerenz, Herron, and Knop (1979) indicate, it is somewhat difficult to quantify responses that are in part attitudinal. In order to establish a baseline of comparison, we decided to compare responses of this year's TAs with those of earlier years. An examination of the responses of the new TAs and

those prepared under the previous system shows a clear improvement in their perception of professional preparedness. We like to think that this apparent self-confidence contributed to greater self-assurance in teaching. The TAs were asked to "indicate how knowledgeable you feel about the following issues after your first quarter as a TA, on a scale of 1 to 3 (1 lowest to 3 highest)."

*Figure 1*  
**TA Response to Evaluation Survey (12/91)**

Issue	New TAs	Experienced TAs
TA role in general	2.9	2.3
TA responsibilities	3.0	2.3
Departmental responsibilities	2.4	2.2
Language methodology (Theory)	2.4	2.1
Classroom technique (Practice)	2.6	2.3
Exam construction	2.4	1.9
Oral interview	2.7	2.1

The average of new TAs' opinion was 2.62, whereas that of experienced TAs was 2.17, an increase suggesting that the seminar attained its objectives of better preparing the TAs for their first quarter of teaching.

## Conclusion

The development program for French TAs at the University of Washington seems to have been positively influenced by the addition of a methodology seminar. The seminar complemented other aspects of the program already in place and assured adequate preparation and feedback for the first quarter of teaching, and also provided a forum for discussion of issues. Continuing in-service workshops and projects for TAs after the first quarter gives them the opportunity of teaching at various levels and of gaining advanced training in language administration. Discussion of pedagogy and materials preparation in areas such as interactive reading or writing enables TAs to prepare for professions that will include those activities on a more advanced cognitive level.

## Works Cited

- Acheson, Keith A. & Meredith Damien Gall. *Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications*. New York: Longman, 1987.
- Alatis, James, H.H. Stern & Peter Strevens (Ed.). *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers*. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1983.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL]. *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*. Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL, 1986.
- Azevedo, Milton M. "Professional Development of Teaching Assistants: Training vs. Education." *ADFL Bulletin* 22, 1 (1990): 24-28.
- Bailey, Leona G. "Observing Foreign Language Teaching: A New Method for Teachers, Researchers and Supervisors." *Foreign Language Annals* 10 (1977): 641-48.
- Benseler, David & Christine Cronjaeger. "The Preparation and Support of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Bibliography." In Magnan, 1991: 207-32.
- & Renate Schulz. "Methodological Trends in College Foreign Language Instruction." *Modern Language Journal* 64 (1980): 88-96.
- Brickell, Henry M. & Regina H. Paul. "Ready for the '80s? A Look at Foreign Language Teachers and Teaching at the Start of the Decade." *Foreign Language Annals* 15 (1982): 169-86.
- Buerkel-Rothfuss, Nancy L. & Pamela L. Gray. "TA Training: The View from the Top." *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*. Ed. Jody Nyquist, Robert D. Abbott, Donald H. Wulff & Jo Sprague. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1991: 29-52.
- Di Donato, Robert. "TA Training and Supervision: A Checklist for an Effective Program." *ADFL Bulletin* 15, 1 (1983): 34-36.
- Ervin, Gerard & Judith A. Muyskens. "On Training TAs: Do We Know What They Want and Need?" *Foreign Language Annals* 15 (1982): 335-44.
- Freeman, Stephen A. "What Constitutes a Well Trained Foreign Language Teacher?" *Modern Language Journal* 25 (1941): 293-305.
- Gibaldi, Joseph & James V. Mirollo (Ed.). *The Teaching Apprentice Program in Languages and Literatures*. New York: Modern Language Association, 1980.

- Gilbert, Claire P. & James F. McArthur. "In-service Teacher Preparation of French Graduate Assistants: Design and Evaluation." *French Review* 48 (1975): 508-21.
- Henderson, Ingeborg. "Training Teaching Assistants in the Yearlong Methods Course." *ADFL Bulletin* 16, 2 (1985): 49-52.
- Knop, Constance K. "Developing a Model for Student-Teacher Supervision." *Foreign Language Annals* 10 (1977): 623-38.
- Lalande, John F., II. "Advancing the Case for an Advanced Methods Course." In Magnan, 1991: 151-66.
- Lange, Dale L. "Teacher Development and Certification in Foreign Languages: Where Is the Future?" *Modern Language Journal* 67 (1983): 374-81.
- MacAllister, Archibald. "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages." *Modern Language Journal* 50 (1966): 400-15.
- Magnan, Sally Sieloff (Ed.). *Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs*. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction 1990. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1991.
- Mellgren, Millie Park, Constance L. Walker & Dale L. Lange. "The Preparation of Secondary Language Teachers through Postbaccalaureat Education." *Foreign Language Annals* 21 (1988): 121-29.
- Morain, Genelle. "Preparing Foreign Language Teachers: Problems and Possibilities." *ADFL Bulletin* 21, 2 (1990): 20-24.
- Murphy, Joseph A. "The Graduate Teaching Assistant in an Age of Standards." In Magnan, 1991: 129-49.
- Nerenz, Anne G., Carol A. Herron & Constance K. Knop. "The Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Review of Literature and a Description of Contemporary Programs." *French Review* 52 (1979): 873-88.
- Nyquist, Jody D., Robert D. Abbott, Donald H. Wulff & Jo Sprague (Ed.). *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1991.
- Paquette, F. André. "Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages — An Exposition." *Modern Language Journal* 50 (1966): 323-425.
- Phillips, June K. "Teacher Education: Target of Reform." *Shaping the Future: Challenges and Opportunities*. Ed. Helen S. Lepke. Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1989: 11-40.

- Rava, Susan. "Minding Our Business." *ADFL Bulletin* 22, 3 (1991): 51-53.
- Richards, Jack C. & David Nunan. *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Schulz, Renate A. "TA Training, Supervision and Evaluation: Reports of a Survey." *ADFL Bulletin* 12, 1 (1980): 1-8.
- Strozer, Judith. "The TA Training Program in Spanish at the University of Washington." *Preparing the Professoriate of Tomorrow to Teach*. Ed. Jody D. Nyquist, Robert D. Abbott, Donald H. Wulff & Jo Sprague. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt, 1991: 205-09.
- Waldinger, Renée. "Training Ph.D. Students to Teach in College." *ADFL Bulletin* 22, 1 (1990): 20-23.
- Wallace, Michael. *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Woodward, Tessa. *Models and Metaphors in Language Teacher Training: Loop Input and Other Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.



## Appendix A

### TA Responsibilities

#### I. PARTICIPATION IN TA ORIENTATION IN SEPTEMBER

#### II. CLASSROOM

1. Class list: monitor class enrollment, keep records of students, maintain grade book; post enrollment figures during first week.
2. Write lesson plans for each lesson; teach daily classes. If you are unable to meet your class because of illness or a conflict, arrange a substitute. Do not go through the supervisor or the secretaries. Each instructor is responsible for teaching or covering his or her class. New TAs submit to the supervisor two lesson plans and two examples of supplementary materials (e.g., quizzes, dialogues) in the fall quarter.
3. Enrichment: provide supplementary materials (e.g., cultural documents and realia) and quizzes, *dictées*, etc. Use slides, tapes, etc., as indicated to teach culture component of course.
4. Work in language lab; do oral comprehension testing; use available videotapes and slide programs as indicated on the syllabus.
5. Do correction of daily work, quizzes, midterms, and final exam. Collect workbooks during exams, and check that students have completed work. The teacher should randomly correct the workbooks for error, and should give pop quizzes taken from the workbook assignment for the day. Students are expected to do one or two short writing activities in each lesson.
6. Do oral grading; this includes one oral interview per quarter, and one class evaluation per quarter. The class evaluation may be a composite score (based on several observations) or a single-event evaluation.
7. Administer and grade quizzes, midterms, and final; keep track of student attendance.
8. Submit final grades to supervisor, indicating clearly the components (e.g., quiz average, oral interview).
9. Meet with supervisor to discuss her visitation to the class (fall quarter); arrange with CIDR to have class videotaped (winter quarter).

### III. OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

1. Give one 7- to 10-minute oral interview with each student during the quarter; this may be accomplished by doing a pair interview, but each student should be allotted 7–10 minutes.
2. Be available for office hours at least two hours per week.
3. Attend meetings in fall and winter quarters; instructors will contribute ideas, comments, quizzes, material, etc., at each meeting.
4. Write sections of exams requested; participate in the composition meetings in which the exam committee critiques and puts together the parts of the midterms and final.
5. Make class visitations of other instructors: all TAs make two visitations in the fall; it is recommended that new TAs make additional visitations. New TAs should visit experienced ones, and vice versa.
6. Run off all personal dittos. Each exam committee is responsible for running off quizzes and midterm–final during its tenure.
7. Turn in all requested materials, including exam grading data, and especially final class grades (a copy of the grades should be kept on the tenth day enrollment list) for each individual file. TAs should keep the individual grade sheets used for calculating each student's grade for the academic year.
8. Have students complete the student evaluation form. The envelope with forms will be put in your box the week before the end of the quarter. Be sure that a copy is sent to the chair of the department.
9. Tell students *not* to call the department to leave messages for you. The secretaries in the main office cannot handle the potential volume of calls from two thousand students.

## Appendix B

### Teaching Assistant Evaluation

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Course: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_ No. students: present \_\_\_\_\_  
 enrolled \_\_\_\_\_

#### I. ORGANIZATION OF COURSE

##### A. Plan of class hour

---



---



---

	Needs attention	0	Exceptional +
<b>B. Organization</b>			
• warm-up, review of previous lessons	-	0	+
• well organized, planned ahead	-	0	+
• practice of written/oral language	-	0	+
• skill-getting/skill-using activities	-	0	+
<b>C. Tempo</b>			
• set immediately, without waste of time	-	0	+
• sustained throughout the hour	-	0	+
• appropriateness of time management	-	0	+
• ten-minute rule	-	0	+
• effective use of book, board	-	0	+

#### II. CLASS ACTIVITIES

##### A. Teacher techniques

• general student-teacher rapport	-	0	+
• include original materials	-	0	+
• target language used throughout period	-	0	+
• meaning reinforced via visuals, intonation, etc.	-	0	+
• inductive grammar presentation	-	0	+
• ability to deal with student difficulties	-	0	+



## Appendix C

French 590B

Fall 1991

*Herschensohn*

Date	Subject	Assignment	Reading
09/30	Language	IPA transcription	Ch. 1, #1
10/02	Exam construction		#8, #11
10/07	Language acquisition	Lesson plan 1	Ch. 2, #4
10/09	Teaching technique		
10/14	Methodology	Observation report	Ch. 3, #3
10/16	Observation discussion		Ch. 4, #6
10/21	CALL (K. Brandl)	Methodology ID	Ch. 13
10/23	CALL and homework		#10, #12
10/28	ACTFL guidelines	Lesson plan 2	Ch. 5, 6
10/30	Oral interview		#5
11/01	Moreau workshop, "La presse quotidienne," 2 P.M.		
11/04	Curriculum, text	Text report	Ch. 12
11/06	No class		
11/11	Holiday		Ch. 7
11/13	Text discussion		(Ch. 8-11)
11/18	Cultural authenticity	Materials 1	#13 (1)
11/20	A-V, realia		
11/25	Styles (K. Brandl)	Materials 2	#13 (2)
11/27	Productive skills		
11/29	Holiday		
12/02	Comprehension	Materials 2	Project
12/04	Receptive skills		
12/09	Student presentation	Project report	
12/11	Final grading		

The weekly assignments, which are due on Friday of the week indicated, should be one to two pages.

Chapters 1-13 and readings #1-8 refer to Richard-Amato; #10-13 are indicated below [see Appendix D].

The final project will be a 7- to 10-page report including either: (1) a review of a book selected from the following list [see Appendix E]; the review will evaluate the book critically and relate it to pedagogical issues treated in FR 590; *or* (2) a short research paper dealing with a topic in language pedagogy (e.g., the writing curriculum, teaching literature in the language classroom).

Each student will give a 10- to 15-minute oral presentation of the report during the last week of class.

## Appendix D

### Required Readings for FR 590

Richard-Amato, Patricia. *Making It Happen: Interaction in the Second Language Classroom*. London: Longman, 1988.

#10. Ariew, Robert & Judith C. Frommer. "Interaction in the Computer Age." *Interactive Language Teaching*. Ed. Wilga M. Rivers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987: 177-93.

#11. Herschensohn, Julia. "Toward a Theoretical Basis for Current Language Pedagogy." *Modern Language Journal* 74 (1990): 451-58.

#12. LaReau, Paul & Edward Vockell. *The Computer in the Foreign Language Curriculum*. Santa Cruz, CA: Mitchell, 1989: Chap. 2.

#13. Swaffar, Janet K., Katherine M. Arens & Heidi Byrnes. *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991: Chaps. 1 and 2.

## Appendix E

### Bibliography for Report in FR 590

- Berns, Margie. *Contexts of Competence*. New York: Plenum, 1990.
- Brinton, Donna M., Marguerite Ann Snow & Marjorie Bingham Wesche. *Content-Based Second Language Instruction*. New York: Newbury House Publishers, 1989.
- Carrell, Patricia, Joanne Devine & David E. Eskey (Ed.). *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Goodluck, Helen. *Language Acquisition: A Linguistic Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Horwitz, Elaine & Dolly J. Young (Ed.). *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991.
- Johnson, Robert Keith (Ed.). *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Krashen, Stephen. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman, 1985.
- Omaggio, Alice. *Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency-Oriented Instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1986.
- O'Malley, J. Michael & Anna Uhl Chamot. *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Richards, Jack C. *The Language Teaching Matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Rivers, Wilga (Ed.). *Interactive Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Wenden, Anita & Joan Rubin (Ed.). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1987.
- White, Lydia. *Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1989.