DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 456 651 FL 026 876

AUTHOR Byrnes, Heidi
TITLE Toward a Comprehensive Conceptualization of TA Education: Contents, Commitments, Structures.
PUB DATE 2001-05-17
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference on Language Teacher Education (2nd, Minneapolis, MN, May 17-19, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Participant Observation; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Teacher Education; *Teaching Assistants; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Georgetown University DC

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the preparation of graduate students for teaching within graduate foreign language departments. Despite big changes and much effort that has gone into reforming the training and teaching of language education professional in recent years, teaching assistant education within the intellectual-academic work of graduate programs has been given limited attention. Very little is done to help graduate student teaching assistants become productive and successful teacher-researchers. It is argued that the foreign language profession in general and graduate programs in particular must aggressively pursue a comprehensive reconceptualization of the preparation of graduate students for teaching. An academic focus must be found that is encompassing enough to accommodate teaching and research issues in an inclusive fashion. Faculty members of a graduate program must take responsibility for educating the department's graduate students as teachers. These issues are examined in the context of a case study relating to such issues as they were encountered at the German Department at Georgetown University. The details and results of attempts to implement these changes in that department are discussed in detail. (Contains 41 references.) (KFT)

Toward a Comprehensive Conceptualization of TA Education: Contents, Commitments, Structures[1]

Heidi Byrnes
German Department
ICC 469
Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057

Phone
H: 703 821-8709
W: 202 687-8386
FAX: 202 687-7568
byrnesh@georgetown.edu

[1]This is a slightly revised version of the paper presented at the Second International Conference on Language Teacher Education, "Building on our Strengths," Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, May 17-19, 2001. A significantly expanded version, entitled "Reconsidering Graduate Students' Education as Teachers: "It takes a Department!" can be found in *The Modern Language Journal, 85*,4 (2001):512-530.

Toward a Comprehensive Conceptualization of TA Education: Contents, Commitments, Structures

This paper focuses on a small segment of language teacher education, but one that is of great importance for the future of the profession, the preparation of graduate students for teaching within graduate foreign language (FL) departments. In the wake of changing beliefs about language learning and teaching but also as a result of oftentimes dramatically changed conditions for language departments, the preparation of TA's has, in the last decade or so, received much attention in publications and conference presentations. Although important changes resulted from these deliberations, many developments amount to limited adjustments of various kinds rather than a thorough reconsideration of how we might educate future members of the profession for teaching in ways that explicitly respond to increasingly diverse programmatic contexts for increasingly diverse learners and toward increasingly diverse learning goals. Most notable among these shortcomings is that they have largely left untouched the marginal position of TA education within the intellectual-academic work of graduate programs, have retained existing structures that institutionalized that marginalization and even trivialization of language instruction, and have offered little relief, not to mention active support, for those who bear responsibility for preparing the graduate students for productive and successful careers as teacher-researchers (Guthrie, 2000; 2001).

By contrast, I argue in this paper that the FL profession in general, and graduate programs in particular must aggressively pursue a comprehensive reconceptualization of the preparation of graduate students for teaching. While institutional contexts differ, programs tend to share a number of broad characteristics that an unsparing analysis readily identifies as highly detrimental

to an appropriate socialization of graduate students into the field. The following are particularly limiting:

- The preparation of graduate students for future teaching in higher education is usually restricted to language teaching considered as a skill, particularly at the beginning and intermediate levels. It does not explicitly include upper level content courses, much less issues that arise in conjunction with the teaching of literary and cultural studies content and texts to non-native users of a second language so that they may simultaneously develop differentiated, perhaps even sophisticated forms of literacy in the L2.
- It takes place within essentially bifurcated departments, split between a language component that is separated from the intellectual work of the undergraduate content courses and, even more egregiously, from the intellectual-academic pursuits of the graduate program as an educational activity that is dedicated to apprenticing students as researchers in literary-cultural studies.
- Responsibility for the education of graduate students as teachers typically falls to only one, generally overworked faculty member, the TA supervisor or language program director or coordinator. Though the recent push toward professionalization has meant that younger colleagues who fill that role are now educated in applied linguistics with an emphasis on second language teaching and learning, augmented by expertise in supervisory and administrative tasks, the position itself all too often continues to be so conflicted in departmental practice as to limit the extent to which they can bring their knowledge and expertise to bear on the issues. They tend to be excluded from many aspects of departmental life and decision-making, they lack security of employment, are thought of

primarily as administrators rather than faculty colleagues, and have only limited access to research support and the reward structures of the ordinary faculty. Even when they do hold tenure-track positions, by no means a customary matter, they find it difficult to affect larger programmatic decisions within a department, to help specify suitable language learning goals and pedagogies for an entire undergraduate program, and, most importantly, to put into place those practices in the socialization of graduate students as teacher-researchers that the changing times call for.

- Finally, further illustrating the isolation of supervisors as well as TA preparation programs taken as a whole, graduate FL departments rarely build up well-considered relationships to Schools of Education, the academic unit with natural affinity to the work they must accomplish in the preparation of their students as teachers. In fact, unproductive dichotomies between teaching and scholarship and between the acquisition of skills, techniques, and methods as against intellectually meritorious work of inquiry and interpretation as graduate departments claim it for themselves are all too often heightened between these two units. The result is more reductive treatment of TA education.

For these reasons I propose to continue in this paper a line of thinking which I have begun elsewhere and which explicitly locates TA education within a department's full range of intellectual work, as that is expressed both in teaching and in scholarship (Byrnes, 2000; Byrnes, 2001; Byrnes, Crane, & Sprang, in press). I will explore that possibility in two interwoven strands that broadly organize the paper. First, reiterating terms that already appeared in the title, issues pertaining to content, to commitment, and to structures serve as broad frames for the intended reconceptualization: "Contents" addresses the need to find an academic focus that is

encompassing enough to accommodate teaching and research issues in an inclusive fashion as well as content issues for the resultant TA program itself; "commitments" refers to new roles and responsibilities for all faculty members as they share in the responsibility of educating a department's graduate students as teachers; and "structures" looks at consequences for programmatic and administrative conduct if such an approach were taken. The second strand is a case study which relates experiences with such a reorientation in my home department, the German Department at Georgetown University.

Bridging the Gap in TA Education – A Curricular Solution

Beyond specifying the paper's organization, this two-fold approach reflects a deeper concern, namely the increasingly debilitating avoidance in the FL profession, but particularly in graduate FL programs, of a discussion about the relationship between knowledge and L1 and evolving L2 abilities and, by extension, the nature of L2 learning and teaching. On the one hand, both traditional literature and cultural studies departments assert an intimate, even symbiotic relationship between knowledge or culture and language and consider that fact to be a key characteristic of the humanities. On the other hand, prevailing practice in program construction and in faculty research and teaching reveals little of that conviction: knowledge acquisition and language acquisition are essentially kept apart except in the most trivial sense, as is well exemplified by the frequent use of English in undergraduate and graduate courses. The consequences of this conflictedness are particularly debilitating for TA education.

Therefore, to plan and implement changes that would reassert and use to advantage the sophisticated relation between knowledge and the first as well as the second language in a FL

programmatic context at least three issues must be confronted. First we must ask how we can link content or meaning and language form and how we can conceptualize that link so as to result in an extended instructional sequence for adult L2 learners. The second question is: how will the essential qualities of that link come to life in carefully considered pedagogical choices within individual courses and classes so as to facilitate the complex and long-term process of adult literate learners' acquiring a FL to professional levels of performance? And, third and most pertinent to this discussion, what would an integrated approach to helping learners acquire content knowledge as well as upper levels of L2 performance mean for the preparation of TAs as teachers in such a reconceptualized educational environment for the FL profession?

Answers to these questions might be found along the following lines: From the programmatic standpoint, we might begin to imagine graduate students' education for teaching as one component of a two-fold responsibility which graduate programs have toward their students: they are to educate them to make valued, long-term contributions to the field in a range of scholarly areas; *and* they are to educate them to make knowledgeable and competent choices in teaching contexts to the benefit of their students as FL and culture learners. From the intellectual standpoint, we could endeavor to expand our horizons regarding education toward teaching by conceptually linking research and teaching through the integrating potential of the foreign language itself. As stated, language is not an addendum to acquiring other cultural knowledge. It is not a mere instrument nor is language learning merely the skillful use of that instrument applied to preexisting meanings. Instead, language is itself a construer of knowledge and learning a language is learning how to mean differently. Finally, from the structural standpoint and in terms of delivery, we should explore the benefits of relocating the responsibility for educating graduate

students as teachers from the individual person of the supervisor into the entirety of a graduate FL department and its faculty.

This proposed direction is motivated by the often acknowledged need that departments must provide an intellectual and a social foundation for the preparation of graduate students, in both research and in teaching, if the FL profession is to be more successful at meeting the challenges and societal demands that are clustered around sophisticated literacies in increasingly multilingual societies and the global context of communication. Furthermore, it suggests that, for purposes of socializing graduate students as future members of the profession, departments are not so much defined by the quality of individual faculty scholarship and individual teaching as they are defined by jointly created and jointly pursued programmatic goals, curricular frameworks, and publicly held pedagogical practices, in short, by the totality of behaviors of a discursive academic community that shares an educational vision. This is so since departments taken as a whole constitute the primary functional-structural unit within which the full range of intellectual pursuits associated with FL study, in teaching and research, is manifested and realized. Thus, if graduate students are to experience, at some depth, the complex work and decision-making processes of college-level FL professionals and to begin to understand some of the educational policy issues that confront the field they must see how these matters are negotiated by all faculty members within a functional graduate FL department.

In sum, I advocate that we establish a two-way linkage between teaching and research, through creating a comprehensive intellectual-academic center which touches upon all practices in research and teaching by all of the department's members, faculty and graduate students. Such a foundation provides a context which, hopefully, will lead to new practices and new ways of being

in a department, in short a new departmental culture.

In the following I relate how my home department, the German Department at Georgetown University, obtained such a linkage through a carefully conceptualized, integrated four year content-oriented and task-based curriculum with a literacy focus. As it overcame the traditional split of language and content an integrated curriculum set in motion a reconsideration of departmental practices in teaching and in the relationship of teaching and research that engaged all members of a department, faculty and graduate students. The remainder of the paper pursues these issues by concentrating on two areas:

- the consequences of the curricular reorientation with regard to assumptions about language, language learning, and language teaching and, by implication, with regard to educating graduate students as teachers in FL departments;
- and the reconfigured roles of all parties–graduate students, supervisor, and faculty–in this environment and, by extension, the nature of graduate student socialization into academic life and their identities as scholars and teachers who can be effective in a range of institutional settings.

The Curriculum Project "Developing Multiple Literacies"

The curricular reform project "Developing Multiple Literacies" that provides the backdrop for my observations has the following characteristics (for a more detailed account, see the department's web site under "Developing Multiple Literacies;" and Byrnes 2001): Spanning all aspects of the department's four-year undergraduate program and taking a content-oriented and task-based approach in all courses, it focuses on content from the beginning of the instructional

sequence and commits to explicit attention to the acquisition of German until the time of students' graduation. It is divided into five levels, with courses in Levels I-III having to be taken in sequence, and levels IV and V encompassing a variety of courses which, nevertheless, share certain learning goals.

The curriculum is built on the centrality of narrativity and a presumed facilitative relationship between diverse genres, as reflected in texts and topics, and real world and pedagogical tasks that foster language acquisition by literate adult learners. It uses thematically clustered content areas which are exemplified by a range of textual genres and the actual texts chosen, including literary texts. The curriculum as a whole, and each course in turn, derives from these texts a variety of carefully sequenced pedagogical foci and forms of instructional intervention.

The close link between genre, theme, text, and task enables different pedagogical opportunities and also requires different pedagogical practices at different instructional levels (cf. Long & Crookes, 1993; Robinson, in press; Skehan, 1998). These varied pedagogical interventions are chosen under a developmental trajectory. That means, they are intended to enhance learners' continually shifting forms of attentiveness to meaning-form relationships as these characterize different topics, different texts, and different tasks at different stages of language learning (Doughty & Williams, 1998a and b; Mohan, 1986; Long & Robinson, 1998). In particular, pedagogical choices consider task complexity, task difficulty, and task performance conditions as psycholinguistically important notions that affect learner processing, learners' likely performance, and therefore their language development (Skehan, 1998; Yule & Powers, 1994). In this fashion the curriculum and its pedagogies support efficient and effective interlanguage

development toward advanced levels of competence, including the interpretive abilities at the heart of work with literary, other discipline-specific academic, or essayistic texts.

The project required considerable materials development since, with the exception of Level I, no commercially produced textbooks are used. This took place over successive summers as well as during the semester, followed by numerous revisions during the three-year implementational phase, a process characterized by a strong sense of agency regarding materials and pedagogies that the curriculum renewal had engendered through a heightened awareness of the interrelationships between curriculum, materials, and pedagogies. In effect, materials development became an intensive and continuous faculty development effort that incorporated results from teaching experiences, from collegial classroom visits, informal and formal observations, sharing of instructional suggestions and, of course, assessment outcomes, all washed back into the curricular goals themselves.

Naturally, the project also necessitated a thorough rethinking of all assessment practices. In particular, it called for explicitly stated assessment criteria based on the notion of task, supplemented by performance indicators as derived from previously stated curricular goals and recommended pedagogical practices, a knowledge base that was gained in a needs-derived series of faculty development workshops, in extensive discussion in diverse groupings (e.g., by instructional level, among level coordinators, or by language modality), and, of course, in hands-on work (see Byrnes, in press c).

The effort has been highly collaborative, both by necessity and by design, engaging in various ways all ten tenured or tenure-track faculty and essentially all of the department's graduate students that held teaching assignments over that time. Surprisingly quickly, this intense

collaboration brought about a notable change in departmental culture toward a confident and openly shared competence, vis-à-vis our program as a whole and vis-à-vis our teaching as a public good. I attribute this change to the redistribution of participant structures and responsibilities, both among the faculty and between the faculty and graduate students.

Accepting New Commitments: The Curricular Embeddedness of FL Teaching and FL Teacher Education

While I have thus far emphasized major aspects and consequences of the curriculum renewal itself, my reason for relating them is because the integrated content-oriented and task-based nature of the curricular sequence has had a profound effect on graduate students' knowledge and practices as developing teacher-researchers. In light of the reluctance in most departments to engage in substantive, cooperative curricular planning this is both a most encouraging and a thought-provoking realization. Specifically, reflecting and projecting the department's shared intellectual work, the curricular framework acquired both high validity and high buy-in as it rendered irrelevant and dispersed the insidious hierarchizing distinctions that otherwise sustain bifurcated practices and structures. Over time faculty members and graduate students developed the kind of pedagogical reasoning that Shulman locates in a cycle involving the activities of comprehension, transformation, instruction, evaluation, and reflection (1987, p. 14). Three aspects stand out:

- *The priority of content instruction*, through an in-depth exploration of the language of texts in all modalities for the purpose of learning content and language together. That exploration pertained to the texts in a two-fold way: first, as genre, understood as a

staged, goal-oriented social process, and, second, as individual text, understood as situated social action. Pedagogical tasks were created on that basis.

- *A deliberate relating of our pedagogies to best knowledge in the field.* Published research and pedagogical recommendations had to be interpreted in light of our educational setting, our teaching situation, and our students' needs and abilities since many research contexts involved rather different presuppositions and goals for language learning, not to mention different learners. Because of these discussions, the department evolved from an initially largely experiential and private knowledge base regarding teaching and learning toward a principled knowledge base that is publicly held and shared within the group (Byrnes & Kord, 2001; Byrnes et al., forthcoming; Shulman, 1993).
- *A willingness to consider the curriculum project and its attendant pedagogical reorientation an open and social process.* The dialogic nature of the process and the communal nature of much of our thinking are unmistakable. Indeed, dialogue shaped all aspects of the curriculum, from its inception, to materials, to pedagogies, to assessments and back into the curriculum.

In that sense, this project exemplifies how a post-methods condition is by no means an "anything goes"environment, even though the terminology of well-defined "skills" or "methods" no longer adequately describes the educational processes (Freeman, 1989, 1991, 1994; Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Larsen-Freeman, 1983, 1990; Pica, 1994, 1995). To some extent even "mentoring" does not adequately describe the fact that learning now occurs within an academic discourse community whose members have become well accustomed to addressing its educational-intellectual interests and practices in a cooperative and mutually supportive way. For

example, faculty and graduate students deliberate the appropriateness of particular pedagogical choices on the basis of an expanding awareness of options and knowledge structures which the project has facilitated (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). In its totality the impact of this experience might be described as the practitioners' version of what perceptive SLA researchers also attempt to capture, namely context-sensitive information about the nature and processes of instructed FL learning.

In fact, our experience highlights a necessary symbiotic relationship between teachers and researchers: (1) a content-oriented and task-based approach to language teaching depends on well-researched insights into the nature of learner processing at different points of the extended interlanguage continuum in order to be able to make appropriate educational decisions; and (2) instructed SLA research requires a well considered curricular context in order to arrive at sound judgments with regard to the relationship of teaching and learning and the relationship of language use and language development (Byrnes, 1999).

Most encouragingly, within the enlarged context of the new curriculum graduate students and faculty began to see new relationships between the role of literary-cultural content and the acquisition and use of a FL to upper levels of performance, including careful literary analysis as their own research demands it. This is a highly desirable development, not only because research and teaching are now seen as being connected through the FL but because it affirms the intellectual merit of our work and, hopefully, enhances its long-term sustainability.

It goes without saying that such interests enable graduate students to consider important issues that pertain to their own identity as future members of the academy: (a) a sophisticated metalinguistic awareness of their L2 use and continued development, a central concern because

the profession regularly demands of nonnative students elaborated discursive practices to support *both* teaching and research, a demand that becomes nearly nonnegotiable at the point of hiring (Byrnes, Crane, & Sprang, forthcoming); (b) an expanding ability to make motivated choices as reflective practitioners in the classes they themselves teach; and (c) an integration of the demands of research and teaching, and, by implication, their emerging identities as researchers and as teachers.

Curricular Commitments and Teacher Identity

The following points further highlight how the integrated curriculum facilitated the kind of socialization into a professional community of researchers and teachers that experts have advocated for a number of years (Richards, 1994; Richards & Lockhart 1996; Tedick & Walker, 1994; Tedick et al, 1993):

First, the education of graduate students is not about TA *training* "as a set of behaviors (as if they were manners, and not central), but as a set of *activities, that influence every facet of a future professional's life*" (Arens, 1993, p. 45, emphasis in original). Becoming a teacher should instead be regarded and practiced as a process of socialization which depends on a dual conceptual and affective linkage, into an evolving identity as researchers and as teachers. Central to that education is the notion of pedagogy as a publicly negotiated and publicly held good.

Second, graduate students must experience as broad an interpretation of the intellectual foundation of FL departments as possible. A literacy approach or, more correctly, a multiple literacies approach, seems to address that need particularly well. By conceptualizing language learning as social semiosis and focusing on the practices that describe both primary and secondary

discourses, a well-designed curriculum and its pedagogies offer one of the strongest counter arguments to a reductionist expertise orientation vis-à-vis the work of FL departments, and particularly with regard to language teaching,

Third, what graduate students need to acquire, then, is not so much a way of applying particular skills at a given instructional level as it is a broad understanding of interlanguage development, an awareness that they can translate into attentive choices in their own instruction and that will also aid their understanding of other instructional contexts, including quite explicitly K-12 instruction. Deep down, the Standards project that has become so influential in pre-collegiate instruction presumes that teachers have reflected on content-oriented and task-based language learning and teaching, in terms of long-term development, curriculum construction, materials development, pedagogy, assessment and, indeed, in terms of teacher education (National Standards, 1996). Thus the proposed reorientation into content-oriented programs and instructional approaches is not an abstract and remote issue for graduate programs only; it is, instead, at the heart of the paradigm shift in FL education.

Finally, a curricular context, supported by the engagement of faculty and graduate students, applies many of the tenets that recent scholarship emphasizes for all learning: knowledge construction and situated cognition, the relationship of identity to the range of activities that social actors are encouraged to perform and feel able and willing to engage in, scaffolding and mentoring as being conducive to acquiring complex decision-making capacities and abilities, discursive or otherwise, and the development of structured insights. It also applies critical theory to FL departments as peculiar sites of power. By taking up such work, the profession would prepare its graduate students to learn to "read" departments, a prerequisite for substantive

contributions to the field in administration, governance, and leadership roles. I suggest that graduate students would greatly benefit from such a departmental Zone of Proximal Development, as it were, the scaffolded, delimited environment of the FL department which brings together experienced and novice members of the profession.

In sum, a comprehensive curriculum that engages faculty at all levels seems a particularly felicitous way for introducing graduate students into the academic discourse community, as reflective teachers (Antonek, et al., 1997; Freeman, 1992; Freeman & Richards, 1993; Richards & Lockhart, 1996) who find coherent systems for decision-making (Kinginger, 1997), perhaps even as teacher activists (Crookes, 1997a) or as teacher- researchers (Crookes, 1997b). For mentoring to be most useful, mentoring activities should address as many aspects of the work of a department as possible, at the conceptual and at the practical level, and, ideally, should involve all colleagues. Graduate departments have traditionally and quite competently responded to this need in research. It is now time to expand the purview of mentoring from research to teaching and to expand the responsibility for doing so from one individual faculty member to an entire department.

Evolving Structures for Stability and Growth

While much of the work in my department continues to evolve and retains a certain fluidity and flexibility in no small part because of the manageable size of the program, we have also sought stability and the capability of building on successes that comes with putting into place certain structures. The practices and structures that respond to both of these needs are summarized in a document, "Statement on Graduate Teacher Development, Supervision, and

Curriculum," whose major provisions conclude this case study (see the departmental web page).

In line with my earlier observations, two features stand out in this approach to the education of graduate students as teachers: the intimate connection between TA education and the comprehensive curriculum, and assignment of responsibility for educating graduate students as teachers to the entire faculty. Faculty members serve as Level Coordinators at the instructional Levels I - III, a position that charges them with close supervision of and contact with graduate students teaching at that level, and with assuring that curriculum and pedagogies are aligned with stated educational goals. Those responsibilities are carefully planned and coordinated with the Curriculum Coordinator who, together with the department chair, holds administrative responsibility for the program as a whole.

Supporting this change, the department has made the following provisions. From the knowledge standpoint, the graduate program requires a minimum of two courses that address programmatic and pedagogical issues. The first of these courses, still referred to as the "methods" course, is taken during the first semester of graduate study and prior to any teaching duties. It ties broad information about L2 learning and teaching to clustered classroom observations at all levels of the curriculum, where these observations are flanked by additional meetings with those instructors. Thus, right from the start, graduate students experience the relationship between knowledge and situated pedagogical action within a curriculum by becoming aware of different learner characteristics and needs and also different demands on and different responses by faculty throughout the undergraduate sequence. The course also familiarizes students with key curricular and pedagogical documents that underlie departmental practice and with the resource management of a shared computer drive which contains all relevant curricular and pedagogical

materials available to the entire teaching staff.

Connecting knowledge from various fields (e.g., SLA research, education, social psychology) with practical experience continues throughout the program. Depending on resource needs and availability, one option is paired teaching in lower level classes, which pairs a junior and a more senior graduate student with the expectation that they will share teaching responsibilities. Another possibility is "mentored teaching" which involves extensive observation of an upper-level class, particularly level III courses and above, taught primarily by faculty, for which students have few models in their own educational history. The faculty member remains the teacher of record for this class, but includes the graduate student in teaching activities as appropriate. Students typically take sole responsibility for a beginning class either during the second semester or no later than the beginning of their second year of graduate study toward the Ph.D. At that point, they typically take the second graduate class that deals with additional teaching and learning issues. Recent topics have been aspects of advanced instructed L2 learning and teaching and curriculum construction and supervision. A jointly taught course on the opportunities for enhancing L2 learning with literary texts and particularly in literature courses is in preparation.

These formal activities and stages are flanked by numerous informal opportunities for developing an identity as a teacher. As they begin teaching, all graduate students are incorporated into diverse procedures related to the multiple observations of their teaching and also the activities planned by the faculty Level Coordinator. In addition, the department sponsors formal all-departmental events that pertain to teaching at the beginning and end of the semester and usually once or twice during the semester. Recently these have pertained to in-depth exploration of the development of writing throughout the curricular sequence (Byrnes, in press c) and the special

place of genre in our program.

On the basis of classroom visits with written feedback and the close faculty - graduate student advising relationship, the entire faculty makes recommendations for enhancing graduate students' teaching expertise. Possibilities include: (a) assuring that they have the required German language abilities, by no means a minor matter if they are to teach throughout the curriculum and use their language for careful literary-cultural research; (b) giving them the opportunity to repeat courses at the same level to refine both their own teaching as well as the existing materials. In a number of cases such refinement has involved the use of various technologies, including web-based technology for course delivery; (c) advancing them through all the sequenced levels, which not only involves varied teaching but increasing familiarity with diverse approaches to teaching as different faculty members favor them; (d) inviting them to propose a Level V course in their area of interest or specialization, usually as the result of working over an extended time with a faculty member before presenting the proposal for departmental approval; (e) giving them supervisory roles that are tied to aspects of the curriculum and outcomes assessment; (f) engaging them as teacher researchers in well-defined areas (g) advising them in the creation of a teaching portfolio that is formally presented just prior to their graduation and documents their growth as teachers, including their evolving teaching philosophy.

Having completed the actual curriculum renewal project, the department has developed a completely different set of praxes than those we held even a few short years ago. It also faces different challenges with regard to the education of graduate TAs for teaching, particularly since the learning-by-doing focus of the curriculum implementation phase cannot be replicated for

subsequent groups of graduate students. But we are beginning to appreciate that this work has opened up for us a host of benefits and opportunities that arise from collaborative intellectual work. On that foundation which we have come to value highly we can now build focused investigations of our students' evolving multiple literacies, both in their native and in the foreign language. Also on that foundation all of us, faculty and graduate students, hope to continue to grow in our teaching and in our scholarship, a prospect that is especially welcome as it goes to the heart of the educational work at colleges and universities do and, at the same time, responds to societal interests in academically valid and appropriate ways.

REFERENCES

Antonek, J. L., McCormick, D. E., & Donato, R. (1997). The student teacher portfolio as autobiography: Developing a professional identity. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 15 - 27.

Arens, K. (1993). Applied scholarship in foreign languages. A program of study in professional development. In D. P. Benseler (Ed.), *The dynamics of language program direction* (pp. 33 - 63). Boston: Heinle.

Byrnes, H. (1999). Meaning and form in classroom-based SLA research: Reflections from a college foreign language perspective. In J. F. Lee, & A. Valdman (Eds.), *Meaning and form: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 125 - 179). Boston: Heinle.

Byrnes, H. (2000). Languages across the curriculum – intradepartmental curriculum construction: Issues and options. In M. R. Kecht, & K. von Hammerstein (Eds.), *Languages across the curriculum: Interdisciplinary structures and internationalized education* (pp. 151 - 175). Columbus, OH: National East Asian Languages Resource Center.

Byrnes, H. (2001). Reconceptualizing TA education: It takes a department! *The Modern Language Journal*, 85,3.

Byrnes, H. (in press a). Imagining collegiate FL departments: A case for intellectual and social accountability. *Profession 2001*.

Byrnes, H. (in press b). Academic-level foreign language abilities: Learner profiles, pedagogies, and program considerations. In B. L. Leaver, & B. Shekhtman (Eds.), *From advanced to distinguished: Developing professional-level language proficiency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byrnes, H. (in press c). The role of task-based assessment in a content-oriented collegiate FL curriculum. *Language Testing 19*, 2.

Byrnes, H., & Kord, S. (2001, in press.) Developing literacy and literary competence: Challenges for foreign language departments. In V. Scott, & H. Tucker (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues.* Boston: Heinle.

Byrnes, H., Crane, C., & Sprang, K. A. (in press). Non-native teachers teaching at the advanced level: Challenges and opportunities. *ADFL Bulletin.*

Crookes, G. (1997a). What influences what and how second and foreign language teachers teach? *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 67 - 79.

Crookes, G. (1997b). SLA and language pedagogy: A socioeducational perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 93 - 116.

Developing multiple literacies: A curriculum renewal project of the German Department at Georgetown University, 1997 - 2000. Retrieved May 7, 2001, from the World Wide Web www.georgetown.edu/departments/german/curriculum/curriculum.html.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998a). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998b). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 197 - 261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 27 - 45.

Freeman, D. (1991). 'Mistaken constructs': Re-examining the nature and assumptions of language teacher education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art* (pp. 25 - 39). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Freeman, D. (1992). Three views of teachers' knowledge. *Teacher Development* (IATEFL Teacher Development Group), *18*, 1 - 3.

Freeman, D. (1994). Educational linguistics and the knowledge base of language teaching. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Educational linguistics, crosscultural communication, and global interdependence*, (pp. 180 - 198). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Freeman, D., & J. R. Richards (1993). Conceptions of teaching and the education of second language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 193 - 216.

Guthrie, E. (2000). New paradigms, old structures: Disciplinary tensions in TA training. In B. Rifkin (Ed.), *Mentoring foreign language TAs, lecturers and adjunct faculty* (pp. 19 - 39). Boston: Heinle.

Guthrie, E. (2001). The language program director and the curriculum: Setting the stage for effective programs. *ADFL Bulletin 32,* 3, 41-47. (Special issue: Chairing the foreign language and literature department, part 2.)

Kinginger, C. (1997). A discourse approach to the study of language educators' coherence systems. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 6 - 14.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 27 - 48.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). Training teachers of educating a teacher. In J. E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, & P. Strevens (Eds.), *Applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers: Toward a rationale* (pp. 264 - 273). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1990). On the need for a theory of language teaching. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Linguistics, language teaching and language acquisition. The interdependence of theory, practice and research* (pp. 261 - 270). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1993). Units of analysis in syllabus design: The case for task. In G. Crookes, & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 9 - 54). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15 - 41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and content.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (1996). *Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century.* Yonkers, NY: Author.

Pica, T. (1994). The language educator at work in the learner-centered classroom: communicate, decision-make, and remember to apply the (educational) linguistics. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Educational linguistics, crosscultural communication, and global interdependence* (pp. 264 - 288). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Pica, T. (1995). Teaching language and teaching language learners: Expanding roles and expectations of language teachers in communicative, content-based classrooms. In J. E. Alatis et al. (Eds.), *Linguistics and the education of language teachers: Ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic aspects* (pp. 378-397). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Richards, J .C. (1994). The sources of language teachers' instructional decisions. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Educational linguistics, crosscultural communication, and global interdependence* (pp. 384 - 402). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, P. (in press). Task complexity, cognition and second language syllabus design: A triadic framework for examining task influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 1 - 21.

Shulman, L. S. (1993). Teaching as community property. *Change, 25* (6), 6 - 7.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (1994). Second language teacher education: The problems that plague us. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 300 - 312.

Tedick, D. J., Walker, C. L., Lange, D. L., Paige, R. M., & Jorstad, H. L. (1993). Second language education in tomorrow's schools. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 43 - 75). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Yule, G, & Powers, M. (1994). Investigating the communicative outcomes of task-based interaction. *System, 22*, 81 - 91.

ERIC

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Toward a Comprehensive Conceptualization of FL Education

Author(s): Heidi Byrnes

Corporate Source: German Department, Georgetown University

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERI system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproductic Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduc and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for nc profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here please

Signature: Heidi Byrnes

Printed Name/Position/Title: Dr. Heidi Byrnes Prof. of German

Organization/Address: German Department, ICC 469 Georgetown University, Washington, DC. 20057

Telephone: (202)687-8386

FAX: (202)687-7568

E-Mail Address: byrnesh@georgetown.edu

Date: Aug. 25, 2001

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price Per Copy:

Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant a reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V.WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

You can send this form and your document to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, which will forward your materials to the appropriate ERIC Clearinghouse.