

The Dynamics of Language Program Direction

David P. Benseler
Editor

Heinle & Heinle Publishers
Boston, Massachusetts 02116, U.S.A.

Copyright 1993 by Heinle & Heinle. 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 0-8384-5456-9

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

TA Programs: The Fit between Foreign Language Teacher Preparation and Institutional Needs

Lynn Carbón Gorell
University of Michigan
Jorge Cubillos
University of Delaware

This chapter represents part of a larger investigation that examines several major issues and practices in second and foreign language teacher education. The first phase (discussed here) is aimed at determining the fit between teacher—including teaching assistant (TA)—preparation and institutional objectives and needs in postsecondary foreign language programs across the country.¹

Overview of TA Development Programs

Teacher education as a field has been relatively underexplored, particularly when it is compared with the increasingly available scholarship on issues such as methods and techniques for classroom teaching. Many of the articles on the topic published since 1966 consist primarily of lists of characteristics that are associated with good teaching; some coincidentally include developmental information for foreign language teachers (see, for example, Paquette, 1966; Larsen-Freeman, 1983; Alatis, Stern & Strevens, (1983); Lange, 1983; Phillips, 1989; Woodward, 1991). Bernhardt and Hammadou (1987) examined research between 1977 and 1986 on the process

and preparation of foreign language teachers, and suggested that TAs know very little about either process or preparation. They tally 78 articles written on foreign and second language teacher education during those years on such topics as general position statements, teacher classroom behaviors, teaching preparation for teaching assistant and university professors, in-service opportunities, supervision, and methods courses. As Bernhardt and Hammadou note (1987), few of the seventy-eight articles were databased research, that is, quantitative studies. Included in their review of scholarship is Lanier and Little's third edition of the *Handbook on Research on Teaching* (1986) which, unlike the first two editions, does not contain any articles on foreign language education, but does include one essay on bilingual education. Bernhardt and Hammadou conclude that very little research or attention is devoted to teacher development in second languages.

Benseler and Cronjaeger (1991) provide the first comprehensive listing on the topic of TA development in foreign languages in their extensive bibliography, providing both the faculty member entrusted with TA development and the TA with information on the preparation and support of TAs. Yet of the 364 entries they list, fewer than half are concerned with programs that meet both staff and institutional needs.

Lange (1983, 1987) suggests that few data have been gathered on the kinds of TA development programs that work or do not work. Furthermore, he decries the reluctance to analyze the assumptions behind current approaches and practices. He describes the move from "teacher training," which includes familiarizing student teachers with techniques and skills to use in the classroom, to "teacher education," which encompasses theories of teaching, teacher decision making, and learning strategies for critical self-awareness and self-evaluation.² Because of this shift, program directors, or "teacher educators," need to reassess their current positions and practices, examining anew the assumptions underlying their own programs and practices.

In a series of articles dating from 1987, Nunan (1989, 1990) argues that TAs should be involved in curriculum development and innovation through an action-research orientation to their own classrooms. He encourages teachers to link theory and practice through observation, identification of a problem or issue, intervention, and evaluation. Wright (1987), as well as Menges and Rando (1989), suggest that teacher development programs must achieve a balance between theory and practice, particularly if theories are systematically and carefully examined. Several researchers have explored the connection between second language acqui-

sition theories and teaching practices, suggesting that both are a necessary component of a teacher's education (DiDonato, 1983; Chaudron, 1988; Larsen-Freeman, 1989; Azevedo, 1990; Magnan, 1990; Lalande, 1991). Weimer, Svinicki, and Bauer (1989) and Rava (1987) look in particular at TAs and are concerned with designing programs that prepare them to teach.

The discrepancy between graduate students' own objectives for pursuing a degree and the courses for which they are being prepared to teach has raised many questions about the preparation such students receive prior to teaching. DiDonato (1983: p. 34) deplors the lack of preparation TAs receive, even in institutions where some attempt at TA development takes place. Based in part on his suggestions for a three-part development program (see also Pons, 1987), many institutions in the United States (such as Pennsylvania State University, the University of Oregon, Ohio State University, and the University of Virginia) now offer an orientation program or a series of workshops to prepare foreign language TAs for foreign language classroom teaching. The orientation session is frequently followed by a methods course and/or weekly meetings that are specific for the language level the TA is teaching. Typical TA preparation programs also usually include some form of TA evaluation.

The present study questions to what extent the various orientation programs focus on teaching a specific course rather than preparing the graduate student both to teach basic instruction courses and to become an excellent overall faculty member after graduation. The following research is based on a survey conducted at graduate schools where TAs are employed to teach basic instruction courses. The questions addressed include: 1) Is teacher education meant to serve just specific institutional needs? or 2) Is teacher education supposed to prepare students to become independent and self-reliant informed language professionals? and 3) To what extent do the course syllabi reflect the issues talked about in pedagogical journals today?

The research examines issues raised at orientation programs to ascertain where new TA attention is focused. Such issues include the topics dealt with in general and those that are dealt with in detail. The orientation program itself was explored to determine its scope, its length, what was taught during the orientation, and by whom it was taught.

The null hypothesis of the study is that no relationship exists between specific institutional needs and teacher preparation in foreign language programs in the United States.

Procedure

The initial phase of the investigation was diagnostic and sought to establish a profile of TA programs currently used across the country. One hundred ninety-six institutions in the United States were contacted and asked to participate in the study by submitting copies of their syllabi of TA development programs; our requests included a call for documents from orientation programs, methods courses, in-service activities, and weekly practica. Out of the initial 196 institutions, only sixty-five (about 28%—see Appendix 1) responded to the invitation by submitting requested documentation. Of the responding sixty-five institutions, twenty-four were eliminated either because they did not have a TA development program of any kind in place at the time of the survey or because they employed regular faculty or part-time personnel, neither of whom were required to attend orientation programs or methods courses.

Components of TA Programs

The survey requested participating institutions to submit information if an orientation were offered, and if so, to indicate whether it was obligatory or optional. In addition, responding institutions were asked to provide 1) a syllabus of the orientation period or course; 2) a syllabus of the methods course; 3) information specifying the duration of the course (number of weekly meetings, hours per meeting); 4) who was required to attend the course; and 5) a syllabus of the first- and second-year language programs. Only thirty-two of the sixty-five institutions surveyed (49%) have teacher development programs that combine an orientation program with a teaching methods course.

Orientation Courses

The orientation courses covered many different topics, but we were interested in seeing the extent to which those topics were discussed. Using anecdotal information from participants as well as examining syllabi, we organized the data on the orientation courses according to the following six categories:

1. Theory and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Issues (C1) refers to the amount of theoretical information imparted at the orientation. Under this category, we include general SLA topics such as the role of

- formal instruction, communicative language teaching, learning strategies, and the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines.
2. Five Skills and Testing (C2) includes all four skills and culture, plus the testing of those skills. This category dealt specifically with the development of speaking, writing, listening, and reading skills, as well as testing and the teaching of culture.
 3. Practicum (C3) refers to some form of microteaching; this category included all demonstrations and peer teaching, particularly when they dealt with course-specific syllabi or materials.
 4. Administrative Information (C4) covers such things as curriculum sequencing at the institution, academic preparation of the undergraduate and graduate students, and departmental rules and regulations concerning absences, testing procedures, and the like; this category included departmental procedures and course policies.
 5. Integrative Activities (C5) refers to activities that enabled the new TA to meet and interact with faculty and returning TAs; this category incorporated all scheduled opportunities for teachers to interact with each other and to develop a more personal working relationship.
 6. Graduate Assistant Issues (C6) was a category added once we started our analysis, for we discovered that many universities devoted part of their orientation programs to issues such as graduate student registration procedures, drop/add mechanisms, and student advising.

The source of our figures is based on the following calculations. We speculated about what happens in the classroom on the basis of the syllabi for the various methods courses and globally assigned a number of hours to each topic. We divided the hours evenly into the stated themes; that is, if two themes were stated in the syllabus for a given day, each one was assigned half an hour; if three themes were stated, each one was assigned one third of an hour, and so forth.

On paper the institutions claim to cover the following themes. No actual "field data" were collected at any of the programs, although a follow-up study is currently under way: the institutions are being contacted for permission to gather on-site data to verify what actually does occur.

Orientation programs across the country appear to be geared toward issues pertaining exclusively to the institution at hand. A look at the correlation coefficients among the different aspects of the orientation program reveals a positive and significant correlation between the practicum <C3> and the administrative categories <C4> ($r = .588, p .005$).

Table 1
Distribution of Orientation Courses

Requests sent	196		
Replied	65		
No training	24		
<i>n</i> = 41			
Themes	Correlations	Combined total hours	Percentage
SLA theory	C1	69.5	8.5
Five skills	C2	103.5	12.6
Practicum	C3	303	36.7
Administrative	C4	174	20.5
Integrative	C5	88.5	10.8
Graduate asst. issues	C6	90.5	11

The magnitude and significance of this correlation suggests that the orientation programs investigated have in general what we might call “an institution-specific” identity. General professional issues represent only 20% of the total orientation time. The remaining 80% is devoted to concrete activities and information specific to the institution.

In view of this evidence, we partially reject the null hypothesis. The data from these forty-one institutions suggest a relationship between the orientation programs and the specific administrative needs of each individual institution.

TA Methods Courses

The syllabi for the methods courses were analyzed and compared on the basis of the following categories, the subsets of which are like those of the orientation courses: 1) theory and SLA issues; 2) five skills and testing; 3) materials and syllabus design; and 4) practicum. The resulting data were distributed as follows.

Emphasis on SLA issues and the teaching of the five skills appears to be the norm across the country. Both categories appear to be highly associated. The correlation chart shows that SLA theory <C7> and the five skills <C8> correlated positively at the .615 level.

Table 2**Components of Methods Courses**

Themes	Correlations	Combined Total Hours	Percentage
SLA	C7	288	35.8
Five skills	C8	290	36
Materials	C9	57	7
Practicum	C10	184	21

Correlations among Components of TA Development Program

	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9
C2	.530								
C3	.345	.351							
C4	.180	.054	.588						
C5	.184	.390	.089	.262					
C6	-.002	.062	.361	.474	.411				
C7	.455	.325	.201	.266	.418	.277			
C8	.269	.329	.242	.184	.333	.402	.615		
C9	.046	.309	-.121	-.225	.167	-.010	.221	.324	
C10	-.002	.042	.212	.354	.502	.356	-.011	.140	.096

The non-institution-specific nature of the methods course led us to partially uphold the null hypothesis for this aspect of teacher education programs across the country.

TA Development Programs

After isolating each aspect of the teacher development programs offered by the 41 institutions that participated in the study, we examined this issue in a global manner by combining all data from all 10 categories.

Four new variables were calculated on the basis of the sum of all related categories (C11, C12, C13, and C14). C11 represents the SLA theoretical component of TA development programs ($C11 = C1 + C7$); C12 is the sum of the five skills component of these programs ($C12 = C2 + C8$); C13 stands for the sum of hours spent on a practicum ($C13 = C3 + C9$); and C14 corresponds to the sum of all the components of TA development

programs in all surveyed departments ($C14 = C1 + C2 + C3 + C4 + C5 + C6 + C7 + C8 + C9 + C10$).

Based on the information provided by the 65 institutions that responded to the survey, it appears that the average TA development program lasts just over 35 hours. This figure includes only formal development offered through orientation programs or methods courses. Instructional observations, peer reviews, conferencing, or any other form of institutional support for TAs not specifically included in the syllabi were not included in this figure (for a summary of data, see Table 3).

Table 3
Summary of Correlations for Related Variables

	C11	C12	C13	C14	C4	C5
C12	.636					
C13	.316	.458				
C4	.287	.173	.552			
C5	.426	.483	.133	.262		
C6	.235	.326	.354	.474	.411	
C11 = C1 + C7						
C12 = C2 + C8						

The strength of the correlations found between C11 and C12 ($r = .636$), and between C13 and C4 ($r = .552$) suggests two basic trends among TA development programs in this country: a theoretical one, characterized by emphasis on the exploration of SLA issues; and a practical one, focused on a form of practicum and institution-specific administrative concerns (See Table 4).

We see from the interquartile range that Q1 (the first quartile) was 15.48 and Q3 (the third quartile) was 54.13, which means that 50% of the observations in this study fell within this range. However, the minimum and maximum values (0.00 and 103.00) reveal the enormous variation between responding institutions (standard deviation = 24.16). The orientation mean was 17.5 hours (49% of the total), and the methods mean was 18.25 hours (51% of the total TA development time).

Table 4
Variables (C14 = C1 C10)

Variables (C14 = C1 C10)							
Descriptive Statistics							
	<i>n</i>	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Q1	Q3
	65	35.12	4.21	0.00	103.00	15.48	54.13
					Mean		Percent
Orientation					17.5		49
Methods					18.25		51

The validity of the central hypothesis of this investigation can be upheld in the light of these results (but only by the narrow margin of 1 point). A tendency to give a professional, "institution-independent" character to TA development courses appears to have emerged among graduate programs across the country. However, we must be quite cautious when interpreting these results, given the great variability observed among the responses of the participating schools.

Twenty-three institutions provided an orientation program of at least 20 hours; 19 of those 23 institutions consistently devoted more than 20 hours to their orientation. The remaining 27 institutions offered less than 20 hours, of which 11 devoted less than a total of 5 hours. Surprisingly, two Big Ten institutions, Northwestern and Ohio State, differed greatly on the number of hours offered during the orientation program, with Ohio State offering nearly 30 hours compared to Northwestern's 4 hours of orientation.

This substantial difference between programs cannot be dismissed, and, in fact, we believe that it should be a reason for concern. What is behind those differences? Do they respond just to institutional limitations, such as the number of TAs per year? Or do they reflect a lack of commitment to effective teacher preparation on the part of those institutions? Perhaps there are other problems not specifically addressed through the syllabi or anecdotal information provided by the institutions. Are TAs required to arrive one to two weeks before classes begin, and are they paid for participation in the orientation course? Is any help provided for them in finding housing? What other financial problems need to be addressed?

Teacher Development Programs: Are They Addressing the Needs of Specific Institutions or the Needs of the Profession?

Based on the previous research results, the answer to the question we pose here appears to be that institutions are meeting their own needs *and* those of the profession. On the average, institutions of higher education are attempting to address their own specific curricular needs, while supporting the professional development of their instructors. This tendency is only general, and we must stress that responses varied greatly from one institution to the next.

To investigate this tendency further we looked at the regression analysis of one of the variables in the study <C12> (the sum of <C7>, SLA theory, and <C8>, five skills and testing).

Table 5

Regression	C12	1	C4	(C12 = C7 + C8)		
The regression equation is $C11 = 9.99 + .898 C4$						
Predictor		Coef		SD	t-ratio	p
Constant		9.994		2.520	3.97	0.000
C4	0.8980	0.5340		1.68	0.100	
s = 11.21			R-sq = .63			R-sq (adj) = .41

Only 6% of the variance in <C12> can be predicted in terms of variance in <C4>. As can be seen, the *p* value was not significant, and our expectation to find a strong and significant connection between institution-specific issues in the orientation course and a professional focus in the methods course was not upheld.

Based on the sample data collected in this investigation, we conclude that the tendency to have a clear shift in focus between the orientation and the methods courses is not yet the norm in colleges and universities across the country. For example, Pennsylvania State University devoted approximately three hours out of thirty to the discussion of administrative issues during orientation, while UCLA spent twelve of the sixteen hours presenting those same issues. Conversely, Pennsylvania State University dedicated over fifteen hours during orientation to discussions concerning methods and second language acquisition, while UCLA devoted fewer than four hours to the same topic.

Conclusions

Preliminary data would suggest that overall the orientation programs prepare TAs only for the immediate courses they are to teach, rather than prepare them to teach the various skills at any level. Further review of the data suggests little relation between the basic instruction programs and research currently being conducted. That is, for the most part, findings in SLA research remain at the theoretical level; little or no attempt to implement research findings into practitioners' curricula is obvious.

Additional information with data based on actual classroom observation, followed by personal interviews with faculty involved in TA development, is required before reaching conclusions. Gathering these data will be the second phase of the project. We will also examine the basic instructional syllabus in relation to current methodology and its articulation with upper-level courses.

As faculty working closely with TAs, we need to know the implications of continuing current processes and procedures. We need to establish the efficacy of efforts to prepare excellent foreign language teachers. Our contribution has to be centered on the type of course we consider necessary to establish the level of excellence we seek. For the present, a few things are clear: institutions vary tremendously in their approach to foreign language TA preparation, and few trends can be identified as overall tendencies in the practice of TA development across the country. Nevertheless, the main tendencies we have noticed so far are that 74% of the institutions do provide a combination of orientation and a methods course for a combined length of roughly thirty-five hours, that is, seventeen hours for orientation and eighteen hours for the methods course. The focus of the typical orientation course combines administrative issues and practicum, whereas the methods course focuses on SLA theory and skills.

The first set of data clearly indicates that institutions are struggling to deal with two apparently divergent goals: institutional necessity (the demands of specific basic language instruction courses) and professional desiderata (the individual needs of the graduate TAs defined in terms of foreign language pedagogy). Institutional needs appear to require abundant hands-on experience and a deliberate focus on the specific materials and syllabi of the basic language series. Professional needs appear to require extensive exposure to the theoretical aspects of second language acquisition, while tying the theory to potential future research for the TA (see, for example, Barnett & Cook, 1992; Fox, 1992). Do faculty, in fact, really influence what TAs do in the classroom by making them think about the

principles and practice of teaching in sessions away from the classroom? At the heart of the dichotomy between institutional and professional needs is the issue of time. Time is not an ally of the foreign language faculty working in TA development. Most institutions have explicit TA development programs for only one semester. Given the structure of the majority of graduate study programs, it may be unrealistic to prescribe or to expect two or more semesters of TA preparation as attainable goals, although a few institutions do provide such opportunities. How much can we accomplish, then, in terms of teacher preparation in the time allotted to us?

Perhaps time is not the only issue; commitment is also involved. The question should perhaps become: How committed are institutions to promoting excellence in teaching? How much are we committed to preparing teachers who can face the challenges of language instruction in the twenty-first century? Boehrer and Sarkisian (1985) suggest that the needs of an accomplished teacher require a type of preparation that generates pedagogical self-awareness as well as exposure to current trends in foreign language instruction. Excellence in teaching, then, must include both general/theoretical and specific/practical issues. However, that ideal balance is not achieved in most universities. Apparently, some institutional practices restrict the establishment of such a balance.

At this point, we can only speculate about the nature of those restrictions. Perhaps they are due to the eternal conflict between literature and linguistics. Or they may result from a lack of awareness on the part of the teacher developer. A quick look at the most current *MLA Job Information List* (1992) would indicate that too many positions are offered in which the primary expertise expected is in a literary field, but the candidate is also expected to have a pedagogical background in order to coordinate basic instruction. This discrepancy in the job descriptions clearly points to a lack of preparation teacher developers must necessarily bring to the job of preparing new TAs. Is it any wonder, then, that TAs receive little pedagogical preparation to prepare them to become excellent overall teachers?

What we have found in our research so far is a fairly heavy concentration on the preparation of teachers to serve the curricular needs of the specific institution that employs them. This pattern needs to change if we are going to be truly committed to preparing independent language instructors. Most programs are not currently preparing TAs to make informed choices; instead they are taught to “apply” teaching techniques. Christine Uber Grosse (1993) points out, for instance, that the topic of “Theories of Language Learning” appears in only 47% of the programs she surveyed, with an average time of 1.2 weeks spent on the topic, while “Methods”

appears over 76% of the time, with an average of 1.09 weeks spent discussing the topic, the largest amount of time among the top five methods course topics.

While the next phase of our research has yet to be completed, a glance at the articles appearing in a list of 14 journals from 1988 to 1991 indicates that the contents of 170 articles in 12 different journals (36% of the total number of articles) dealt with the five skills and testing. Seventy-four articles in the 12 journals (15%) dealt with materials development and evaluation, such as evaluation of textbooks, multimedia instructional materials, or computer-assisted instruction (see Appendix 2). Clearly, over 51% of the journals are addressing specific issues that are tangible, hands-on, and as Ellis (1985) refers to it, experiential as opposed to awareness raising. According to published research, our efforts should be aimed at skill development, valid testing procedures and materials, strategy training, and proficiency orientation. While the journals use the term "proficiency," reference is clearly intended to any and all communicative approaches, under which the proficiency orientation per se would be subsumed. Many institutions show limited awareness and/or concern for these issues. Perhaps they sin by omission, but it is possible there is more behind those curricular choices. Our ongoing research will continue to analyze institution-specific versus professional issues by looking at the syllabi and their relation to the orientation and methods courses.

Notes

1. A shortened version of this chapter was first presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, held in Chicago in November 1992. We are grateful to Howard Altman and David Benseler for their helpful comments and remarks.
2. Please refer to Keith Mason's (1992) article, in which he outlines a proposal for a graduate seminar designed to develop and train the graduate student who will ultimately become a program director.

Works Cited

Alatis, James, H. H. Stern & Peter Strevens. (Eds.). *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers*. Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages & Linguistics. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1983.

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL, 1986.
- Azevedo, Milton. "Professional Development of Teaching Assistants: Training versus Education." *ADFL Bulletin* 22, 1 (1990): 24–28.
- Barnett, Marva. "Peer Observation and Analysis: Improving Teaching and Training of TAs." *ADFL Bulletin* 15, 1 (1983): 30–33.
- Barnett, Marva & Robert Francis Cook. "The Seamless Web: Developing Teaching Assistants as Professionals." In Walz, 1992: 85–11.
- Benseler, David & Christine Cronjaeger. "The Preparation and Support of Graduate Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages: A Bibliography." In Magnan, 1991: 207–32
- Benseler, David & Renate Schulz. "Methodological Trends in College Foreign Language Instruction." *Modern Language Journal* 64 (1980): 88–96.
- Bernhardt, Elizabeth & JoAnn Hammadou. "A Decade of Research in Foreign Language Teacher Education." *Modern Language Journal* 71 (1987): 289–99.
- Boehrer, John & Ellen Sarkisian. "The Teaching Assistant Point of View." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 22. Ed. John D. Andrews. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985: 7–20.
- Chaudron, Craig. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- DiDonato, Robert. "TA Training and Supervision: A Checklist for an Effective Program." *ADFL Bulletin* 15, 1 (1983): 34–36.
- Dvorak, Trisha R. "The Ivory Ghetto: The Place of the Language Program Coordinator in a Research Institution." *Hispania* 69 (1986): 217–22.
- Elling, Barbara. "National Trends: Implications for Graduate Student Training and Career Placement." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, 1 (1988): 45–48.
- Ellis, Rod. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Ervin, Gerard & Judith A. Muyskens. "On Training TAs: Do We Know What They Want and Need?" *Foreign Language Annals* 15 (1982): 335–44.
- Fox, Cynthia. "Toward a Revised Model of TA Training." *The Development and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages*. In Walz, 1992: 191–207.

- Freed, Barbara. "Why Train Teaching Assistants? Foreign Language and Communication at the University Level." *ADFL Bulletin* 7, 2 (1975): 9-14.
- Grosse, Christine Uber. "The Foreign Language Methods Course." *Modern Language Journal* 77 (1993): 303-12.
- Henderson, Ingeborg. "Training Teaching Assistants in the Yearlong Methods Course." *ADFL Bulletin* 16, 2 (1985): 49-52.
- Lalande, John F., II. "Advancing the Case for the Advanced Methods Course." 1991a. In Magnan, 1991: 151-56.
- _____. "Redefinition of the TA Supervisor-Language Program Coordinator Position into the Lecturer Series: A Sensible Idea?" *ADFL Bulletin* 22, 2 (1991b): 15-18.
- Lange, Dale L. "Teacher Development and Certification in Foreign Languages: Where Is the Future?" *Modern Language Journal* 67 (1983): 374-81.
- _____. "The Nature and Direction of Recent Proposals and Recommendations for Foreign Language Education: A Response." *Modern Language Journal* 71 (1987): 240-49.
- Lanier, Judith E. & Judith W. Little. "Research on Teacher Education." *Third Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Ed. Merlin C. Wittrock. New York: Macmillan, 1986: 527-69.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. "Training Teachers or Educating a Teacher." *Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: Toward a Rationale*. Ed. James Alatis, H. H. Stern & Peter Strevens. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1983: 264-74.
- _____. "Teacher Training Development and Decision-Making." *TESOL Quarterly* 23, 2 (1989): 27-45.
- Magnan, Sally Sieloff. "Preparing Inexperienced TAs for Second-Year Courses: Are Our Orientations and Methods Courses Adequate?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Nashville, TN, November 1990.
- _____. (Ed.). *Challenges in the 1990s for College Foreign Language Programs*. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction 1990. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1991.

- Mason, Keith. "Beyond the Methods Course: Designing a Graduate Seminar in Foreign Language Program Direction." In Walz, 1992: 113–34.
- Menges, Robert J. & William C. Rando. "What Are Your Assumptions? Improving Instruction by Examining Theories." *College Teaching* 37 (1989): 54–61.
- MLA Job Information List*. New York: Modern Language Association, December 1992.
- Nunan, David. *Understanding Language Classrooms: A Guide for Teacher Initiated Action*. London: Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- . "Action Research in the Language Classroom." *Second Language Teacher Education*. Ed. Jack C. Richards & David Nunan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990: 62–81.
- 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, 1989: 11–40.
- Pons, Cathy R. "A Three-Phase Approach to TA Training: The Program for Associate Instructors in French at Indiana University." *Institutional Responsibilities and Responses in the Employment and Education of Teaching Assistants: Readings from a National Conference*. Ed. Nancy Van Note Chism. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Center for Teaching Excellence, 1987: 239–43.
- Rava, Susan. "Training Teaching Assistants." *ADFL Bulletin* 19, 2 (1987): 26–27.
- . "Minding Our Business." *ADFL Bulletin* 22, 3 (1991): 51–53.
- Richards, Jack C. *The Language Teaching Matrix*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Walz, Joel (Ed.). *The Development and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages*. AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction 1992. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1992.

- Weimer, Maryellen, Marilla D. Svinicki & Gabriele Bauer. "Designing Programs to Prepare TAs to Teach." *Teaching Assistant Training in the 90s: New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. Ed. Robert D. Abbott, Jody D. Nyquist & Donald H. Wulff. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989: 57-70.
- Woodward, Tessa. *Models and Metaphors in Language Teacher Training: Loop Inputs and Other Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Wright, Teresa. *Roles of Teachers and Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- _____. "Understanding Classroom Role Relationships." *Second Language Teacher Education*. Ed. Jack C. Richards & David Nunan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990: 82-97.

Appendix 1

Institutions and Departments Submitting Requests for Orientation and Methods Courses

University	French	German	Slavic	Spanish	Italian
University of Akron	X			X	
University of Albany	X				
University of Arizona	X			X	X
Boston College	X			X	X
Brown University				X	
University of California					
Los Angeles	X			X	
Santa Barbara	X			X	
Carnegie Mellon	X			X	
Catholic University	X			X	
University of Cincinnati				X	
Colorado State University				X	
Columbia University				X	
University of Delaware				X	
Emory	X			X	
Georgetown University	X	X			

Appendix 1 *continued*

University	French	German	Slavic	Spanish	Italian
University of Georgia	X				
Highline	X				
Illinois State University	X			X	
Indiana University	X				X
University of Iowa	X	X		X	
University of Kansas		X			
University of Maryland	X			X	
University of Massachusetts	X				
University of Michigan	X				
Michigan State University		X			
Michigan Technological University	X				
Middlebury College	X			X	
University of Minnesota	X				
New Mexico State University				X	
University of North Carolina	X	X		X	
Northwestern University	X			X	
Ohio University				X	
Ohio State University	X			X	
University of Oregon	X			X	X
Pennsylvania State University	X	X		X	X
University of Rochester	X	X		X	
Southern Illinois University Carbondale	X	X		X	
Stanford University				X	
University of South Carolina				X	
University of Texas, Arlington		X			
University of Utah	X	X		X	
University of Virginia	X			X	
University of Wisconsin	X		X		

Appendix 2

Pedagogical Content of Selected Journals

THEMES

A: Learner Styles & Strategies: Personality; MBTI; Anxiety

B: Skills: Write; Read; Listen; Speak; Culture Testing

C: Linguistic Issues: Interlanguage; Linguistic Competence

D: Learning Issues: Proficiency; L/R Brain; Deductive/Inductive Approaches;
Attrition; Grammar Games; Feedback

E: Materials: Textbook Evaluation; Adapting Text; CAI; Multimedia

F: Curriculum Development: TA Training; TA Development

JOURNAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
SSLA	1	4	3	8	0	0	16
System	2	9	1	0	3	5	520
Hispania	0	11	1	16	4	2	232
Unterrichtspraxis	1	3	0	2	2	1	9
LangTstng	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
MLJ	1	4	0	1	0	0	6
TesolQ	1	9	1	5	1	5	22
LangLrng	2	3	2	4	0	2	13
FLAnnals	15	37	0	7	27	20	106
FrenRev	2	30	0	0	1	0	33
IRAL	4	18	40	7	1	0	70
CMLR	6	37	8	31	35	13	130
Totals	35	170	56	81	74	48	464
Percent	7%	36%	12%	17%	15%	10%	