

SECTION C: TOPICS IN INTEGRATED APPROACHES

Research in Language-Literature Instruction: Meeting the Call for Change?

Kate Paesani

The purpose of this review is to assess whether recent scholarship on language-literature instruction—the deliberate integration of language development and literary study at all levels of the foreign language curriculum—within the context of U.S. institutions of higher education reflects shifts in thinking regarding the role of literature in foreign language curricula. These shifts have come in response to the 2007 Report of the Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, which recommended replacing the traditional two-tiered program structure with more coherent curricula that merge language and content, and to the general questioning of communicative language teaching as a viable method for language instruction and adequate preparation for advanced-level work in a foreign language. Current approaches to language-literature instruction and foreign language curriculum design favor multimodal language development that places equal importance on oral and written language and interpretative interaction with literature to construct textual meaning and establish form-meaning connections. This review surveys empirical and classroom practice research on literature in language courses and language in literature courses and concludes with a consideration of larger curricular issues and areas for future research.

For more than a century, literature has been an important component of foreign language (FL) programs in U.S. institutions of higher education and a valuable tool for understanding language, culture, and history (see Paran [2008] for a discussion of the value of literature and research arguing for and against its use in FL learning). During the early part of the 20th century, literature was the primary object of study and the ultimate goal of FL study, in part because of the nearly exclusive focus on reading and writing. As a result, literature held a place of prestige in the academic community and served as a source of moral and ideational inspiration and content. Yet, with the advent of audiolingualism in the postwar years, the onset of communicative language teaching in the 1970s, and the increased focus on oral competence that resulted, the role of literature in FL study began to shift. Instead of solely serving as the end goal of FL study,

literature had also become a way to provide an authentic look into target language cultures and a means of learning the language itself (Kramersch & Kramersch, 2000).

According to Nance (2010), the end of literature's unquestioned place of prestige at the end of the 20th century was due in part to the fact that literature instruction and curriculum structure continued to follow the same model that had been in place for decades: adherence to the literary canon and a text-centric, transmission model of literary interpretation. In contrast, multiple developments in language instruction took place over the years to respond to new findings in second language (L2) acquisition research. Today, informed by empirical and classroom practice research on language-literature instruction and literary scholarship extending well beyond the canon, the profession is re-thinking the role of literature in FL programs. In particular, a recent report of the Modern Language Association (MLA) Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages (hereinafter, MLA Report, 2007), "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World," which recommended creating articulated, coherent language-literature curricula, and related scholarship questioning the usefulness of communicative language teaching (CLT) as an approach to language development, have fueled discussions about reconfigured FL curricula and the role of literature in developing learners' ability to engage in multimodal language use and textual thinking. As such, in the 21st century, this reconfigured view has allowed literature to reclaim its primacy at all levels of FL instruction. Indeed, as Swaffar and Arens claimed,

Increasingly, FL acquisition research suggests that literature is the necessary textual environment for creating strong readers, readers who have the cognitive strategies and linguistic resources to comprehend and interpret a work as well as an aesthetic object as a complicated act of communication within a culture. (2005, p. 79)

The purpose of this review is to assess whether recent empirical and classroom practice scholarship in language-literature instruction, defined as the deliberate integration of language development and literary study at all levels of the curriculum, reflects shifts in thinking regarding the role of literature in FL curricula. This review is restricted to FL instruction in U.S. institutions of higher education not only to reflect the content of current debates in the applied linguistics literature but also to avoid overlap with other recent review articles on language-literature instruction. These articles have focused on pedagogical research in English as a second language and English as a foreign language (ESL/EFL) contexts (Carter, 2007); empirical reports and their pedagogical implications in ESL and FL contexts (Paran, 2008); research developments across the history of one journal (Kramersch & Kramersch, 2000); language-literature instruction with a specific focus on poetry (Melin, 2010); and teaching reading, with literature as only a peripheral consideration (Bernhardt, 2005; Grabe, 2004). The research on language-literature instruction in ESL/EFL contexts, which reports on studies in the United Kingdom, the United States, Europe, and Asia, is considerable and touches on numerous issues such as English for academic purposes (e.g., Minkoff, 2006;

Viswamohan & Torche, 2007), links between reading literature and writing (e.g., Hirvela, 2001, 2005), and literary stylistics (e.g., Watson & Zyngier, 2007).

THE LANGUAGE-LITERATURE DIVIDE

Starting in the mid-1980s and continuing through the 1990s, scholars in applied linguistics produced a large body of research on what is now known as the language-literature divide in university FL programs (e.g., Barnett, 1991; Bernhardt, 1995; Henning, 1993; Hoffman & James, 1986; Kramsch, 1985; Muyskens, 1983; Schultz, 1995). This divide is characterized by fixed lines of demarcation between language study in lower-level courses and literary study in upper-level courses, the assumption being that once students have completed lower-level language courses, they are ready to carry out the advanced-level tasks expected in literature courses. However, as Byrnes and Maxim (2004) demonstrated, this assumption has not been realized. In fact, lack of attention to literary texts in lower-level courses and to language development in upper-level courses has made advanced work in literature inaccessible to many undergraduate students (Bernhardt, 1995; Schultz, 1995).¹

The sources of the language-literature divide are numerous. In 1967, the MLA created the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), signaling a long-standing professional and symbolic rift between language and literature—and those who teach each subject—in FL departments (Donato & Brooks, 2004). This rift corresponded with a growing sense of decreased responsibility on the part of literature faculty toward language development (James, 2000) and the resultant administrative and personnel divisions that persist today (e.g., language courses staffed by graduate student or adjunct instructors, and few tenured or tenure-track faculty teaching introductory courses). In addition, different pedagogical goals grew out of this rift in each camp: functional, interactive language use on the one hand, and literary-cultural interpretation on the other. The view of literary analysis as the ultimate goal of language instruction compounded the problem and reinforced a number of assumptions: Literature should not be taught before students attain a high level of language proficiency; language is merely a tool for analyzing and appreciating literature; and students in literature classes deepen language knowledge passively by reading and listening to lectures (Barnett, 1991; Hall, 2005; Muyskens, 1983). Kramsch (1985) summed up the problem as follows: Communicative and literary goals in FL departments are at odds with one another; the former encourages two-way communication and negotiation, and the latter treats literary texts “as finished products, to be unilaterally decoded, analyzed, and explained or . . . to illustrate grammatical rules and enrich the reader’s vocabulary” (p. 356).

CALLS FOR CHANGE

Starting in the late 1990s, discussions about the language-literature divide began to shift toward a focus on larger curricular issues such as program redesign

to promote development of advanced-level FL abilities through the study of texts, literary and otherwise (e.g., Byrnes, 1998; Byrnes & Maxim, 2004; Paesani, 2004; Scott & Tucker, 2002; Swaffar & Arens, 2005). This shift was punctuated by the MLA Report (2007), and the stream of responses to its recommendations (e.g., Geisler, 2008; Maxim, 2009; Pfeiffer, 2008; Pireddu, 2008; Porter, 2009; Walther, 2009; Wellmon, 2008). The report recommended “replacing the two-tiered language-literature structure with a broader and more coherent curriculum in which language, culture, and literature are taught as a continuous whole” (MLA Report, p. 3). Further, the report proposed that this reform be accomplished through development of students’ “translingual and transcultural competence,” or “the ability to operate between languages” (pp. 3–4), and increased emphasis on cultural narratives present in FL texts such as poetry, prose, film, and journalism. Within this proposed structure, literature, therefore, is one of many text types that comprise FL study.²

The call for curricular reform in the MLA Report and elsewhere has been coupled with a general questioning over the past decade of CLT as a viable method for language instruction and of communicative competence as adequate preparation for advanced-level work in a FL (e.g., Byrnes, 2006; Byrnes & Maxim, 2004; Schultz, 2009). CLT has come to be associated primarily with interactive, transactional, oral language use that encourages student recall of information rather than analysis and critical evaluation of that information (Schultz, 2009; Swaffar, 2006). However, this practice does not articulate well with the kind of language use that FL departments consider desirable to carry out their intellectual and academic missions. Indeed, as Byrnes (2006) argued, because of its propensity to separate language from literary-cultural content, a focus on CLT “may unintentionally sustain the long-standing bifurcation of FL programs into language courses and content courses with all the attendant negative consequences” (p. 244).

Following Swaffar’s (2006) recommendation that FL programs redefine communicative competence as the ability to read, write, listen, speak, and reflect critically and intelligently about a culture’s multiple facets, recent research has argued in favor of situating texts at the center of the curriculum and developing multimodal language abilities, such that reading, writing, listening, and speaking are viewed as complementary rather than separate skills (e.g., Byrnes, Crane, Maxim, & Sprang, 2006; Kern, 2008; Kern & Schultz, 2005; Maxim, 2008, 2009). Moreover, the text-centric transmission model of literary instruction, in which texts are seen as having a fixed interpretation, is slowly being replaced by approaches that encourage interpretative interaction with texts representing the literary canon and beyond and that highlight “the sociological, cultural, and historical dimensions of the literary” (Kern & Schultz, 2005, p. 383). These changes in curricular and pedagogical thinking are major advances in discussions about the language-literature divide and move the profession closer to a merging of the two sides. To determine whether these changes have been reflected to date in the research, I turn now to a critical summary of scholarship presenting empirical and classroom practice perspectives on the use of literature in language courses followed by a critical summary of the role of language in literature courses.³ It should be noted from the outset that very

little of the existing scholarship on language-literature pedagogy is empirical in nature; most published articles provide examples of pedagogical and curricular best practices and policy statements.

LITERATURE IN LANGUAGE COURSES

The traditional structure of language courses includes an orientation toward the development of communicative competence, a preference for oral versus written language use, explicit focus on language forms, reliance on language-oriented textbooks, and little systematic linking of form and meaning through the study of FL texts. However, as the research reviewed thus far suggests, the nature of collegiate language instruction is changing, and literature is seen as an important element in this change. Numerous scholars have argued over the past decade for the integration of literature from the very start of language study (e.g., Kern, 2008; Paesani, 2004, 2005; Walther, 2007). For instance, Walther (2007) suggested that literature be given a greater role in introductory-level courses to show how language works in context and to draw students' attention to connections between language and communicative intent. Likewise, Scott and Huntington (2007, 2008) argued that studying literature in introductory language courses can help students gain insight into FL cultures, understand differing cultural perspectives, develop critical thinking skills, and interpret textual content. Their empirical research investigated the role of literature within the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (ACTFL, 2006).⁴ Their first study (Scott & Huntington, 2007), which focused on the interpretive mode of communication, investigated students' interpretive processes when reading a Francophone poem in teacher-moderated versus student-centered small group discussions. Results showed that students were able to engage in interpretive communication and access the content of literature in teacher-moderated discussions. Their second study (Scott & Huntington, 2008), which focused on the cultures standard, compared students' understanding of and attitudes about Francophone culture after reading a fact sheet versus a Francophone poem. Results showed that the group who read the poem had more personal reactions to culture and were more likely to engage in discussions about cultural content. Both studies underscored the importance of incorporating literary texts in introductory FL courses.

Maxim (2006b) and Stewart and Santiago (2006) provided further empirical support for the integration of multimodal language use with textual thinking, literary analysis, and development of academic literacy. Maxim's study on the use of extensive reading in a first-semester German course showed that reading a novel as part of the curriculum did not interfere with students' linguistic development. Indeed, students who spent half of class time reading a novel and half of class time doing communicative development activities scored at least as well on departmental exams testing grammar and vocabulary as those students who only completed communicative development activities. Stewart and Santiago integrated a novel into intermediate-level language courses through an instructional unit shaped by the *Standards*. Their case study included two groups

of students, one consisting of first language (L1) English learners of Spanish and one consisting of L1 Spanish learners of English who read a novel (in their respective L2) about a bicultural Puerto Rican American's search for identity in the United States. Stewart and Santiago found that the study of the literary text encouraged a complex level of cultural understanding and sensitivity and had a lasting and profound effect on both student groups.

In spite of such empirical support for more fully integrating multimodal language development with textual thinking and literary analysis, some attempts at integrating literature into the language classroom are instrumental in nature, wherein literature is viewed only as a tool for developing language proficiency. In such approaches, little attention is paid to the social, historical, and cultural content of literary texts or to the development of students' analytical and critical thinking skills. In their study of 16 course syllabi from first- and second-semester Spanish language courses and instructor questionnaire responses, Alvstad and Castro (2009) found that literature was indeed used instrumentally. In the syllabi examined—which included assignments, schedules, course descriptions, and objectives—the concepts of literature and culture were simplified or not clearly defined. Furthermore, the objectives for literature reflected the course objectives as a whole, such as development of grammatical and lexical knowledge and improved written and oral language skills. Two examples of instrumental uses of literature are evident in scholarship on classroom best practices as well. Paesani (2005) proposed a model of grammar instruction that uses literary texts as comprehensible input in introductory language courses. Although some of the activities in the sample lesson plan asked students to think about the content, themes, and role of narrative voice in a French poem, literature was used primarily as an inductive presentation of grammatical forms and as a model for student writing. Davidheiser (2007), who used fairy tales in introductory German courses to teach European culture and social practices, also presented an instructional sequence focused on students' language development. Through the reading of shortened and linguistically modified tales, Davidheiser suggested that learners engage in retelling activities for oral and written language development, sentence creation activities for grammar development, and true/false or yes/no question answering for listening development. Davidheiser also outlined an approach to fairy tales in advanced literature courses that, he claimed, integrates language development. However, the brief description of the approach does not make clear that language development is explicitly addressed.

Apart from these isolated examples, the majority of scholarship on literature in language instruction fully integrates textual thinking and literary analysis with multimodal language development across instructional levels. This work can be grouped into two major pedagogical emphases: process-oriented and literacy-based.

Process-Oriented Approaches

Process-oriented approaches are concerned with the cognitive act of reading and the ways in which learners engage in both top-down and bottom-up reading processes. Process-oriented pedagogy seeks to engage learners in the act of

reading through strategy instruction and structured lessons that include pre-reading activities to activate background knowledge; reading activities to focus on textual content, features, and organization; and postreading activities to expand on learners' knowledge and encourage creative language production. Scholarship on process-oriented best practices for literature instruction in language classes include Barrette, Paesani, and Vinall (2010) and Paesani (2006a, 2006b, 2009). Barrette et al. (2010) argued in favor of interweaving literary analysis, stylistics, and culture at all levels of the FL curriculum through the use of literature. They outlined an intermediate-level process-oriented lesson plan for a Spanish short story that develops multimodal language competence (reading, writing, and speaking) as well as analytical and critical thinking skills, and then provided suggestions for using the same story at introductory and advanced levels. The series of articles by Paesani (2006a, 2006b, 2009) focused on the integration of literature into advanced language courses, in which textual thinking is usually absent. In two articles, Paesani (2006a, 2009) explored the uses of Raymond Queneau's *Exercices de style* (1947), which tells the same story 99 times using various linguistic and stylistic devices, as a way to spiral literature into an advanced grammar course, develop critical thinking and analytical skills, and improve writing competence. In both cases, sample lesson plans focused on the study of grammar and stylistic features through text comparison and the development of a writing portfolio modeled on the literary texts studied. Similarly, in the third article, Paesani (2006b) presented a process-oriented instructional sequence whose goals were to heighten learners' awareness of language varieties, develop multimodal language competence, and incorporate cultural and literary content into a phonetics and pronunciation course. Several text types in addition to literature (music, film, maps, and images) were explored and compared in instructional activities.

The pedagogical approaches outlined in Maxim (2006a), making the case for reading and writing poetry in introductory courses to give learners a voice, and Maxim (2006b), arguing for the development of textual thinking and academic literacy through extensive reading, serve to segue between process-oriented and literacy-based literature instruction in language courses. Although not explicitly labeled as process-oriented, Maxim's (2006a) contextualized approach to poetry, modeled on Maley and Duff (1989), included prereading, reading, and postreading activities. Moreover, the approach is characterized by five tenets, many of which reflect a literacy orientation: development of students' creative self expression, de-emphasis of the native speaker model as the ultimate goal of language learning, recognition of students' multicompetence (in L1 and L2), encouragement of playfulness in language learning, and increased dialogue between students and instructor. Likewise, Maxim (2006b) outlined a pedagogy for the extensive reading of a novel, modeled on Swaffar, Arens, and Byrnes (1991), that begins with prereading and then proceeds with the following four reading and postreading steps: initial reading with attention to major events, their organization, and their linguistic expression; location of details and the language used to express them; reproduction of textual language through summary writing; and application of real-world knowledge to assess cultural implications in the text. In both articles, Maxim's focus on genre, on form-meaning connections,

and on historically and culturally situated text interpretation further illustrates the literacy orientation of the pedagogical approaches, as well as their careful, process-oriented integration of language and literature.

Literacy-Based Approaches

Literacy-based approaches (e.g., Kern, 2000; New London Group, 1996; Swaffar & Arens, 2005) to FL instruction see texts as central to language development and promote “dynamic, culturally and historically situated practices of using and interpreting diverse written and spoken texts to fulfill particular social purposes” (Kern, 2000, p. 6). Unlike process-oriented approaches, which place primary importance on cognitive aspects of reading and strategies to encourage top-down and bottom-up text processing, literacy-based approaches place primary importance on the text itself, the sociocultural contexts that influence meaning, the form-meaning connections that contribute to interpreting textual messages, and the learner’s interaction with the text to engage in meaning making. Reading and writing, often seen as separate skills in CLT and process-oriented approaches, are complementary and integral to meaning construction, which involves critical thinking about, and interpretation and transformation of discourse through, a variety of contexts and textual genres. Transmission models of literary analysis in which texts are viewed as having a fixed interpretation, therefore, do not figure into literacy-based instruction. Although a detailed discussion of literacy-based pedagogy is beyond the scope of this review, the brief description here and the summary of pedagogical practice research below make clear that literacy-based approaches aim to merge language and content in the ways recommended by the MLA Report (2007) and other calls for change.

Allen and Paesani (2010) explored the implications of the MLA Report recommendations for introductory FL courses and argued in favor of literacy-based pedagogy as a viable approach for implementing curricular reform. To support their position, they identified three challenges to realizing curricular change and fostering literacy in introductory courses—pedagogy, course content, and departmental buy-in—and proposed solutions to address each one. In addition, they proposed a sample literacy-based, second-semester French curriculum organized around literary and other texts and grounded in pedagogical activities designed to enhance students’ linguistic development as well as their ability to think critically about textual content. Allen and Paesani concluded that in light of the changing landscape in U.S. higher education today, literacy-based approaches represent a means of keeping introductory FL courses relevant to students as well as the broader intellectual mission of the university.

Hoecherl-Alden (2006), Redmann (2008), and Schultz (2009) presented examples of pedagogical best practices for integrating literature into language courses through literacy-oriented instruction. Hoecherl-Alden (2006), for instance, argued for a multidimensional, workshop-style (i.e., student-centered) approach to intermediate language courses in which literary and cultural content form the basis of the curriculum, and language instruction is contextualized within discussions about literature and culture. Classroom activities in workshop-style courses may include dramatic readings of texts, cooperative tasks, peer

evaluation and feedback, and reflective journaling. Such collaborative activities, Hoecherl-Alden argued, promote development of a classroom community that facilitates student-initiated analysis of and deeper connections with literary texts.

Redmann (2008), who also targeted intermediate-level language courses, developed a literacy-based approach with similar goals to Hoecherl-Alden (2006): to encourage textual analysis and interpretation, to make form-meaning connections, to create a discourse community in the classroom, and, ultimately, to help bridge the language-literature divide. She described a fourth-semester German course in which four young-adult novels complemented the regular textbook content. In her sample lesson plan, Redmann described activities such as a reading journal, summary writing, genre comparison, examination of linguistic features, creation of and responses to critical questions, and text reformulation that put literacy into practice.

Finally, Schultz (2009), whose sample intermediate-level language course was informed by the *Standards*, implemented a “literary approach to language learning” (p. 140). Her approach reflects a literacy orientation because it combines aspects of reader-response theory to promote individual, experiential interaction with texts and semiotic analysis to encourage form-meaning relationships. The French course she described, intended to meet the needs of students in a global studies course, is text-based and thematic. Students studied various genres, including literature, but applied strategies of literary analysis to all texts in an effort to bridge the language-literature divide and prepare them for more advanced FL study.

LANGUAGE IN LITERATURE COURSES

The traditional structure of literature courses includes an orientation toward the exclusive focus on literary analysis and the study of literary movements, themes, and genres, with little if any systematic or substantive focus on language development. Yet, as many researchers have pointed out (e.g., Allen, 2009a; Byrnes & Maxim, 2004; Maxim, 2008; Steinhart, 2006), it is unrealistic to expect that content be the sole focus of literature courses, given that students are still working toward advanced language abilities. According to Maxim (2008), attending to linguistic development only in language courses and failing to focus on language forms in literature courses “does not fully take into account the (con)textual nature of language use that permeates all levels of language use and that inherently requires grammar to be inextricably linked to meaning, and function to form” (p. 173). Indeed, because language is inherently meaning based, it must be studied in contextualized, discourse-length texts. Literature courses, therefore, seem an ideal venue for continued language development.

Empirical research on the nature of classroom discourse in literature courses underscores the need for continued attention to students’ language development. Donato and Brooks (2004) studied classroom discourse in a fourth-year Spanish literature course to see whether literary discussions played a role in

development of advanced language functions. They found that teacher talk dominated classroom discussions and that students did not have opportunities for elaborated responses. Donato and Brooks concluded that literature instructors should become aware of types of advanced-level speaking functions and provide opportunities for students to use them in a variety of discussion activities. Mantero (2006), in response to the findings in Donato and Brooks (2004) and Mantero (2002), proposed a theoretical model of instruction that provides opportunities for extended discourse and language learning in literature-based classrooms. Mantero's (2006) applied literacy in L2 education (ALL2E) model allows students to actively construct textual meaning through interactions with other students. As such, "an understanding and command of grammar emerges through dialogic interaction about and with the text" (p. 108).

Studies by Zyzik and Polio (2008) and Polio and Zyzik (2009) further support the need to develop students' speaking abilities and provide linguistic support in FL literature courses. Both examined form-focused classroom discourse in three fourth-year Spanish literature courses. Zyzik and Polio (2008) investigated the types and frequency of incidental focus on form (e.g., techniques that draw students' attention to language forms as problems arise) in classroom discourse and literature instructors' perceptions of its use. Polio and Zyzik (2009) investigated teacher and student perceptions of explicit focus on language development in literature classes. Similar to Donato and Brooks (2004), both studies found that teacher talk dominated classroom discussion and that students were not provided with adequate opportunities for negotiation or extended discourse. Zyzik and Polio (2008) and Polio and Zyzik (2009) concluded that pedagogical attention to advanced speaking functions with explicit linguistic support is necessary in literature courses and suggested several strategies for achieving this, including reading journals, vocabulary notebooks, weekly language-focused break-out sessions, and hybrid courses with online language support and development activities.

Given the empirical support for attention to language development in literature courses, it is important to see whether this need is addressed in scholarship on classroom practice. Overall, this scholarship reflects not only a focus on language development merged with literary study (as called for in the MLA Report [2007] and elsewhere) but also on interpretative interaction with texts. The majority of articles surveyed reflect literacy-based approaches to language in literature courses, however, a handful of articles share characteristics of process-oriented instruction. It is this latter group of articles to which I now turn.

Process-Oriented Approaches

The scholarship in this group presents a variety of models for integrating language in literature instruction: literary pragmatics (Warner, 2009), input-to-output (Weber-Fève, 2009), a *Standards*-based 3R (recognize, research, relate) model (McEwan, 2009), and literature for engagement (Nance, 2010). Although not all framed as process-oriented per se, the four approaches share a structure of prereading, reading, and postreading activities that focus on simultaneous

engagement with literary language and content, as well as on strategy development and bottom-up/top-down text processing. Warner's (2009) model of literature instruction through literary pragmatics is the most explicitly language focused of the process-oriented approaches summarized here. According to Warner, literary pragmatics develops students' "critical linguistic awareness" (p. 162), or their understanding of complex aspects of culture and their relationship to language use. Warner's sample lesson plan for an intermediate-level German literature course integrates literary pragmatics and analysis. Activities include activation of students' knowledge about language conventions; recognition and discussion of text conventions; identification of the links connecting the narrator, conventions, and cultural meaning; and written responses to in-class discussion.

Weber-Fève (2009) proposed an input-to-output approach to literature instruction that combines reading, speaking, and writing activities with close reading to target language features. Although not focused on literary pragmatics, the types of activities Weber-Fève implemented in a third-year "introduction to French literature" course (e.g., activation of background information, focus on text conventions, and written responses to literary texts) share similarities with the activities presented in Warner (2009), as well as with process-oriented approaches to teaching literature.

Using the *Standards* as a general framework, McEwan (2009) proposed a 3R model of literature instruction to respond "to the call by postsecondary language instructors for greater precision in linguistic and literary analysis in standards-based instruction" (p. 146). The 3R model—recognize, research, relate—draws on both reader-response and schema theories. In the recognize (pre- and while-reading) stage, students identify linguistic and literary elements in a text that reflect the FL culture to reveal prior knowledge and areas for further investigation. In the research stage (while- and postreading), students identify and discuss underlying cultural perspectives in a text, link these to linguistic and literary elements, and choose a topic to investigate further. Finally, in the relate stage (postreading), students merge their newly acquired knowledge from the research stage with the linguistic and literary elements identified in the recognize stage to create a unique interpretation of the text. According to McEwan, this approach to literature promotes a multifaceted view of culture.

Although not explicitly focused on language forms, Nance (2010) proposed a four-stage pedagogy of teaching for engagement that responds to the mismatch between the structure of classroom discussion in language versus literature courses and develops students' speaking abilities. The first stage (prereading) is intended to activate students' prior knowledge and scaffold key terms and concepts. The activities in the second and third stages (while- and postreading) move from overall comprehension, summary, and observation to specific study of conventions, and finally to writing about literature by taking a position and formulating an argument. The final stage encourages students to read and discuss literature outside of the classroom context. Nance claimed that this pedagogy not only engages students in elaborated discourse, but it also encourages them to view the study of literature as a socially constructed intellectual endeavor.

Literacy-Based Approaches

As was the case with the pedagogical best practices scholarship on literature in language courses, literacy-based approaches are abundant in work on language in literature courses. Most of this work foregrounds the notion of genre, yet one exception is Redmann (2005), who proposed the use of interactive reading journals, an activity type consistent with literacy-based pedagogy, to bridge the language-literature divide, and discussed their use in intermediate and advanced literature courses. According to Redmann, interactive reading journals develop FL literacy because they require students to engage critically with literary texts and to interpret meaning individually and socially, all through the use of multiple language modalities (reading, speaking, writing). The multipart journal entries are carried out before, during, and after reading and discussion of literary texts and include tasks that activate background knowledge, develop summarizing skills, establish form-meaning connections, and encourage reflection.

Swaffar and Arens (2005), Kern and Schultz (2005), Bridges (2009), and Allen (2009c) explore in multiple ways the role of genre—understood broadly as the study of various culturally situated text types and the discourse conventions that characterize them—in literacy-based approaches to language in literature instruction. Swaffar and Arens (2005) proposed a holistic, genre-based curriculum that integrates language, literature, and various other genres across levels. Their literacy-based pedagogy is implemented through the reading matrix and the *précis*, structured reading tasks that lead from focused comprehension activities to specific language production activities through the identification of textual patterns and form-meaning connections. These genre-oriented activities facilitate the socially and culturally situated interpretation of texts and development of multimodal language abilities. Similarly, Kern and Schultz (2005) examined the role of literary analysis in the development of socially and culturally embedded FL literacy. They outlined a sample intermediate-level French reading and composition course focused on multimodal language development through the use of language in context. In the course, students derived meaning from literary texts and various other nonliterary genres such as film, newspaper articles, and paintings, and engaged in critical thinking, close reading, vocabulary building, and cultural and genre comparison activities. Bridges (2009) argued for an expanded definition of literature to include genres such as the graphic novel (see also Chute [2008], who made a case for the graphic novel as a form of literature in English curricula). Graphic novels, according to Bridges, are multimodal due to their visual and textual elements, contribute to students' advanced-level language development, and serve as a gateway to more traditional, canonical literary texts. Bridges incorporated a graphic novel into a third-year German literature course with a literacy-based approach; activities included brainstorming, completion of graphic organizers, genre analysis, directed reading, reflective journals, and story rewriting with the goal of encouraging students to make connections between language and its cultural context as they build textual meaning. Finally, Allen (2009c) used genre as a fundamental element in an advanced writing course organized around the reading and analysis of contemporary French texts, including various types of literature.

In her integrated, multimodal approach, students examined rhetorical moves, discourse conventions, stylistic devices, and form-meaning connections, and then applied this knowledge to the development of a digital writing portfolio. In self-reporting of objectives from the beginning of the class and self-evaluation of achievement at the end of the class, half of students reported “that through completing reading and writing tasks in the course, they had greater awareness of how and why stylistic devices are used in texts,” and two-thirds of students reported that class content and activities contributed to “new understandings of the relationships between reading and writing, reader and writer” (pp. 379–380).

Maxim (2008) and Eigler (2009) provided examples of language-literature instruction within the genre-based curriculum of the Georgetown University German Department.⁵ Maxim (2008) explored the use of multiple genres, including literature, to develop advanced-level language abilities in a Level IV course on Berlin. An instructional unit in which students read a short story and scholarly analysis of the story is intended to develop students’ skills in literary analysis, reading, and writing. In addition, Maxim argued, this merging of language and literary study prepares students for the type of work required in Level V courses such as that described by Eigler (2009), who demonstrated how the development of advanced speaking and writing abilities is integrated into literature instruction. Both sample courses employ a guided approach to literary texts, in which students develop FL literacy by activating appropriate background knowledge; reading and establishing a common understanding of the text through in-class discussion; examining word-, sentence-, and discourse-level patterns and form-meaning connections; and carrying out creative and elaborated writing tasks. This common instructional framework and complementary use of genre and activity types illustrate the curricular cohesion of this particular FL program. Indeed, Maxim and Eigler represent only two examples of a larger body of empirical, pedagogical, and policy-oriented scholarship documenting this innovative program that develops students’ critical thinking, academic literacy, and multimodal language development across the 4-year undergraduate curriculum, and encompasses program goals, pedagogy, course sequencing, and assessment (e.g., Byrnes et al., 2006; Byrnes & Sinicrope, 2008; Rinner & Weigart, 2005; Sprang, 2008).

CONCLUSION

Taken together, the research on literature in language courses and language in literature courses demonstrates a move toward multimodal language development, interpretative interaction with texts, and the integration of language and literature at all levels of the collegiate FL curriculum. Indeed, this corpus of empirical and classroom practice articles on language-literature instruction reflects the calls for change outlined at the start of this review by confirming the importance of integrating literature and other text types from the start of language instruction, and of continued attention to language development until the end of students’ course of study. Moreover, this scholarship demonstrates that a pedagogical focus on multimodal language development and critical engagement

with texts across the curriculum, rather than an exclusive focus on CLT at lower levels and on text-centric literary interpretation at upper levels, contributes to carrying out the intellectual and academic missions of FL departments.

Literacy, in particular, emerges as the predominant framework for the type of curricular and pedagogical reform that effectively bridges the language-literature divide. As Kern (2004, p. 7) argued, “an overarching goal of literacy can provide a unifying focus by drawing students’ attention to the interactions among form, context, and function in all their uses of language—whether they are speaking, listening, reading, or writing.” Furthermore, as Swaffar and Arens (2005) claimed, a genre-based orientation facilitates the organization of a holistic, coherent curriculum anchored in texts, whose goal is the development of literacy. Yet, a literacy-based orientation need not be exclusive. A number of scholars have drawn links between literacy and the *Standards*, arguing that the vagueness in the *Standards* document regarding literature provides the flexibility to open up the narrow focus of literary studies through genre and to merge literature with other aspects of FL programs, namely, language and culture (Arens, 2008; Schultz, 2009). Indeed, Schultz (2009) claimed that this vagueness is a benefit, because it allows latitude regarding how to teach literary texts. She further argued that the connections and communities standards, in particular, relate to the interdisciplinary, multicultural, and global aspects of literature and, as such, to the MLA Report’s (2007) notions of translingual and transcultural competence. Arens (2008) suggested the five content areas of the *Standards* serve as a heuristic for interactions among language, literature, and culture and proposed a reconfigured “Standards for Genre Learning” (pp. 46–48). Similarly, Kern (2004) claimed that literacy-based goals mesh well with the *Standards* framework and illustrated how the principles of literacy (cf. Kern, 2000) fall within the *Standards*’ five content areas. Yet, in spite of this scholarship, it is not clear that U.S. institutions of higher education are ready to embrace the *Standards* as an organizing framework (Scott, 2009). As Allen (2009a) noted, the *Standards* document decentralizes the role of literature, and this marginalization is troubling to FL departments, given the continued importance of literature in the curriculum and the literature-oriented research interests of many faculty members.

Regardless of whether FL programs organize curriculum and instruction around notions of genre and literacy or the five content areas of the *Standards*, further research is necessary to determine best practices for integrated language-literature instruction that moves students toward advanced-level FL abilities. As Carter (2007), Donato and Brooks (2004), and Kern and Schultz (2005) clearly stated, additional empirical research on the relationship between literature and FL acquisition is imperative. As the research reviewed here shows, important discoveries have emerged about the nature of classroom discourse and the importance of literature across the curriculum. Yet, there is still insufficient evidence regarding how students interact with literary texts to make sense of their cultural content, how literacy and literary thinking manifest themselves in language production tasks, and the role of assessment in language-literature instruction. Moreover, the body of research reviewed herein focuses on the implementation of language-literature instruction in just one course. To adequately

document the long-term nature of developing L2 “advancedness” and determine best practices in language-literature instruction, longitudinal research implemented within a coherent curricular framework is essential. Although not specific to language-literature instruction, the research in Byrnes, Weger-Guntharp, and Sprang (2005) and Ortega and Byrnes (2008) provides examples of longitudinal investigations that employ a variety of data-gathering techniques (e.g., case study, qualitative, and quantitative). Similarly contextualized, longitudinal research specific to language-literature instruction will not only assess whether curricular and pedagogical change implemented in response to the MLA Report is effective and has a lasting impact on development of learners’ academic literacy and multimodal language competencies, but it will also lend support to the findings of the single course studies presented here.

If FL programs are to implement the type of curricular and pedagogical change outlined in the publications reviewed here, then further research into language-literature instruction in precollegiate FL contexts is also needed. Such investigations are imperative for the creation of well-articulated, coherent secondary and postsecondary FL programs and for the advancement of students within those programs. Additionally, curricular and pedagogical change must be reflected in research and practice regarding graduate student teacher development. As several scholars have noted (e.g., Allen, 2009b; Maxim, 2005; Mills, 2011; Schechtman & Koser, 2008; Wurst, 2008), graduate student teachers typically do not receive formal training in the teaching of FL literature or in the merging of language and literature across the curriculum. Moreover, graduate students are often socialized into the language-literature divide in their one methods course and subsequent teaching workshops, where the focus is on language instruction, and language and literature are presented as clearly distinct program elements. Although scholarship in this area is emerging, more empirical and classroom practice research is essential to bring about principled, theory-driven practice and to help FL departments make sound decisions regarding curriculum, instruction, and graduate student professionalization.

Finally, a consideration of the role of new technologies in language-literature instruction may also shed light on the development of FL literacy and advanced language abilities. A handful of studies have provided empirical support for the effectiveness of hybrid learning modules (Kraemer, 2008a, 2008b), electronic glosses and online dictionaries (Johnson, 2010), and collaborative online writing practice (Grossman, 2009) for integrating language and content and increasing student success and interest in reading literature. Future research might explore these and other technologies, such as computer-mediated communication with target language cultures to create communities of learning, or online collaborative text applications (e.g., eComma) to analyze and interpret literature. Technology has the potential to make literature relevant to today’s students and to provide multimodal access to literature through sound, text, hypertext, images, and video. As such, this and other new research can keep discussions of language-literature instruction current and move collegiate FL programs more closely toward meeting the call for curricular and pedagogical change through the full integration of multimodal language development and interpretative interaction with literature at all levels of the curriculum.

NOTES

- 1 Although developing students' advanced-level capabilities is the goal of most FL programs, a clear characterization of "advancedness" remains to be determined. Several scholars have carried out important work in this area (e.g., Byrnes & Maxim, 2004; Byrnes et al., 2005; Ortega & Byrnes, 2008). However, more research is needed.
- 2 As the references cited thus far suggest, this call for curricular change had already been made many times over in the applied linguistics and FL pedagogy literature. That this more recent call came from the MLA is therefore not without significance, particularly given the already established professional rift between scholars and practitioners in language and literary studies. Furthermore, nearly all the members of the ad hoc committee that authored the report represent the literature side of the aisle, further punctuating the seriousness of the divide and the urgent need for change.
- 3 In some respects, this distinction between literature in language courses and language in literature courses is artificial, given that these lines have started to blur; nonetheless, it serves as an efficient way to organize the review in order to investigate whether or not recent scholarship has indeed responded to the calls for change and shifts in thinking outlined here.
- 4 The *Standards* propose five content areas (communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities) and related standards for FL curriculum organization, implemented through three modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational). Although the *Standards* are not an instructional approach per se, they have received attention in recent scholarship regarding their potential application outside of K-12 contexts to collegiate FL programs (e.g., Scott, 2009). Of particular interest in this research is how literature fits within the *Standards* framework and which of the standards might be met through literary study.
- 5 The well-documented innovations of the Georgetown University German Department (e.g., Byrnes et al., 2006; Byrnes & Kord, 2002) are an example of the type of curricular and pedagogical reform referred to throughout this article. Their genre-based curriculum is composed of five levels that integrate language and content throughout. Literary texts figure prominently in Levels IV and V but are also integral to Levels I-III as students gradually move from the study of primary (private) to secondary (public) discourses.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kern, R., & Schultz, J. M. (2005). Beyond orality: Investigating literacy and the literary in second and foreign language instruction. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 381-892.

This article argued for an approach to research in L2 acquisition and pedagogy that considers the development of socially and culturally embedded literacy and the relationship between literacy and literature. The authors called for increased qualitative and quantitative research to look at how students interact with texts and the classroom community to interpret cultural content and to explore how literacy and the literary manifest themselves through language production tasks. A sample course illustrates the authors' vision of literacy and the literary implemented through an approach that is multimodal, contextualized, and text-based.

Maxim, H. H. (2006b). Integrating textual thinking into the introductory college-level foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 19-32.

This empirical study explored the development of textual thinking and academic literacy through extensive reading in a first-semester German course. Students in the experimental group spent half of class time doing communicative development activities and the other half reading a German novel. Students in the control group

spent all of class time doing communicative development activities. Results showed that students in the experimental group scored at least as well as those in the control group on departmental exams. The author concluded that extensive reading is not only feasible in introductory courses, but it is also desirable for preparing students for advanced-level language tasks.

Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession 2007*, 234–245.

The MLA Report recommended replacing the traditional two-tiered FL program structure with more coherent curricula that merge language, literature, and culture to develop students' translingual and transcultural competence (i.e., the ability to operate between languages and cultures). The report further recommended an increased emphasis on cultural narratives present in FL texts such as poetry, prose, film, and journalism, and changes to departmental governance that increase collaboration and ensure that all department members contribute to implementing a shared educational mission.

Polio, C., & Zyzik, E. (2009). Don Quixote meets *ser* and *estar*: Multiple perspectives on language learning in Spanish literature classes. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 550–569.

This empirical study investigated student and instructor perspectives on language-focused instruction in advanced Spanish literature classes. Data revealed that whereas more than half of students stated language learning as a course goal, only one of three instructors stated language-oriented goals. Moreover, both groups reported minimal improvement in students' speaking abilities, and both viewed language learning in class as incidental rather than explicit. The authors concluded that pedagogical attention to advanced speaking functions with explicit linguistic support is necessary in literature courses and suggested several strategies for achieving this, including vocabulary notebooks, weekly language-focused break-out sessions, and hybrid courses with online language support and development activities.

Schultz, J. M. (2009). A *Standards*-based framework for the teaching of literature within the context of globalization. In V. M. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the Standards in college foreign language education* (pp. 128–143). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

This article situates the role of literature within the framework of the *Standards*, with a specific focus on connections and communities, which the author argued relates to the interdisciplinary, multicultural, and global aspects of literature. The proposed pedagogical approach to language-literature instruction develops higher-order critical thinking skills and combines aspects of reader-response theory to promote individual, experiential interaction with texts; semiotic analysis to encourage form-meaning relationships; and the connections and communities standards to situate texts outside of the individual. A sample text-based course illustrating the approach is provided.

Swaffar, J., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum: An approach through multiple literacies*. New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America.

Swaffar and Arens argued in favor of literacy and genre as organizing principles for a holistic curriculum that eschews the language-literature divide and presents a coherent program anchored in texts. The authors developed a literacy-based pedagogy implemented through the reading matrix and the *précis*, and they defined learning outcomes for a genre-based curriculum. Several chapters focus specifically on

the place of literature within the holistic curriculum and the types of genre-based activities that facilitate the socially and culturally situated interpretation of texts and the development of multimodal language abilities.

REFERENCES

- Allen, H. W. (2009a). In search of relevance: The *Standards* and the undergraduate foreign language curriculum. In V. M. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the Standards in college foreign language education* (pp. 38–52). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Allen, H. W. (2009b). Moving beyond the language-literature divide: Advanced pedagogy for tomorrow's foreign language professors. *ADFL Bulletin*, 41, 88–99.
- Allen, H. W. (2009c). A multiple literacies approach to the advanced French writing course. *French Review*, 83, 368–385.
- Allen, H. W., & Paesani, K. (2010). Exploring the feasibility of a pedagogy of multiliteracies in introductory foreign language courses. *L2 Journal*, 2, 119–142.
- Alvstad, C., & Castro, A. (2009). Conceptions of literature in university language courses. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 170–184.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2006). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. New York, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.
- Arens, K. (2008). Genres and the *Standards*: Teaching the 5 C's through texts. *German Quarterly*, 81, 35–48.
- Barnett, M. A. (1991). Language and literature: False dichotomies, real allies. *ADFL Bulletin*, 22, 7–11.
- Barrette, C. M., Paesani, K., & Vinall, K. (2010). Toward an integrated curriculum: Maximizing the use of target language literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, 216–230.
- Bernhardt, E. (1995). Teaching literature or teaching students? *ADFL Bulletin*, 26, 5–6.
- Bernhardt, E. (2005). Progress and procrastination in second language reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 133–150.
- Bridges, E. (2009). Bridging the gap: A literacy-oriented approach to teaching the graphic novel *Der erste fröhling*. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42, 152–161.
- Byrnes, H. (1998). Constructing curricula in collegiate foreign language departments. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages* (pp. 262–295). New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America.
- Byrnes, H. (Ed.). (2006). Perspectives: Interrogating communicative competence as a framework for collegiate foreign language study. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 244–266.
- Byrnes, H., Crane, C., Maxim, H. H., & Sprang, K. A. (2006). Taking text to task: Issues and choices in curriculum instruction. *ITL: International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 152, 85–110.
- Byrnes, H., & Kord, S. (2002). Developing literacy and literary competence: Challenges for foreign language departments. In V. M. Scott & H. Tucker (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 35–72). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Byrnes, H., & Maxim, H. H. (2004). *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Byrnes, H., & Sinicrope, C. (2008). Advancedness and the development of relativization in L2 German: A curriculum-based longitudinal study. In L. Ortega & H. Byrnes (Eds.), *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities* (pp. 109–138). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Byrnes, H., Weger-Guntharp, H. D., & Sprang, K. (2005). *Educating for advanced foreign language capacities*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Carter, R. (2007). Literature and language teaching, 1986–2006: A review. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 3–13.
- Chute, H. (2008). Comics as literature? Reading graphic narrative. *PMLA*, 123, 452–465.

- Davidheiser, J. C. (2007). Fairy tales and foreign languages: Ever the twain shall meet. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40, 215–225.
- Donato, R., & Brooks, F. B. (2004). Literary discussions and advanced speaking functions: Researching the (dis)connection. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 183–199.
- Eigler, F. (2009). From comprehension to production: Literary texts in the advanced foreign language classroom. *ADFL Bulletin*, 41, 24–34.
- Geisler, M. E. (2008). The MLA report on foreign languages: One year into the future. *Profession 2008*, 229–239.
- Grabe, W. (2004). Research on teaching reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 44–69.
- Grossman, K. M. (2009). Creating e-learning communities in language and literature classes. In I. Lancashire (Ed.), *Teaching literature and language online* (pp. 331–342). New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America.
- Hall, G. (2005). *Literature in language education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Henning, S. D. (1993). The integration of language, literature, and culture: Goals and curricular design. *ADFL Bulletin*, 24, 51–55.
- Hirvela, A. (2001). Connecting reading and writing through literature. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 109–134). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hirvela, A. (2005). ESL students and the use of literature in composition courses. *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, 33, 70–77.
- Hoecherl-Alden, G. (2006). Connecting language to content: Second language literature instruction at the intermediate level. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 244–254.
- Hoffman, E. F., & James, D. (1986). Toward the integration of foreign language and literature teaching at all levels of the college curriculum. *ADFL Bulletin*, 18, 29–33.
- James, D. (2000). Kleiner mann, was nun? In R. M. Terry (Ed.), *Agents of change in a changing age* (pp. 237–270). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.
- Johnson, L. P. (2010). Electronic literary texts: A survey of tools and some strategies for developers. *CALICO Journal*, 27, 477–490.
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kern, R. (2004). Literacy and advanced foreign language learning: Rethinking the curriculum. In H. Byrnes & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 2–18). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Kern, R. (2008). Making connections through texts in language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 41, 367–387.
- Kraemer, A. (2008a). *Engaging the foreign language learner: Using hybrid instruction to bridge the language-literature gap*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
- Kraemer, A. (2008b). Happily ever after: Integrating language and literature through technology? *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 41, 61–71.
- Kramsch, C. (1985). Literary texts in the classroom: A discourse. *Modern Language Journal*, 69, 356–366.
- Kramsch, C., & Kramsch, O. (2000). The avatars of literature in language study. *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 553–573.
- Maley, A., & Duff, A. (1989). *The inward ear: Poetry in the language classroom*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Mantero, M. (2002). Bridging the gap: Discourse in text-based foreign language classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 437–456.
- Mantero, M. (2006). Applied literacy in second language education: (Re)framing discourse in literature-based classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 99–114.
- Maxim, H. H. (2005). Enhancing graduate student teacher development through curricular reform. *ADFL Bulletin*, 36, 15–21.
- Maxim, H. H. (2006a). Giving beginning adult language learners a voice: A case for poetry in the foreign language classroom. In J. Retallack & J. Spahr (Eds.), *Poetry and pedagogy: The challenge of the contemporary* (pp. 251–259). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Maxim, H. H. (2008). Developing advanced formal language abilities along a genre-based curriculum. In S. L. Katz & J. Watzinger-Tharp (Eds.), *Conceptions of L2 grammar: Theoretical approaches and their application in the L2 classroom* (pp. 172–188). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Maxim, H. H. (2009). An essay on the role of language in collegiate foreign language programmatic reform. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42, 123–129.
- McEwan, E. K. (2009). Incorporating the *Standards* into a 3R model of literary and cultural analysis. In V. M. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the Standards in college foreign language education* (pp. 144–160). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Melin, C. (2010). Between the lines: When culture, language, and poetry meet in the classroom. *Language Teaching*, 43, 349–365.
- Mills, N. A. (2011). Teaching assistants' self-efficacy in teaching literature: Sources, personal assessments, and consequences. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 61–80.
- Minkoff, P. (2006). Talking it over in class. In A. Paran (Ed.), *Literature in language teaching and learning* (pp. 45–57). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Muyskens, J. A. (1983). Teaching second-language literatures: Past, present and future. *Modern Language Journal*, 67, 413–423.
- Nance, K. A. (2010). *Teaching literature in the languages: Expanding the literary circle through student engagement*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 60–92.
- Ortega, L., & Byrnes, H. (2008). *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Paesani, K. (2004). Using literature to develop foreign language proficiency: Toward an interactive classroom. In C. J. Stivale (Ed.), *Modern French literary studies in the classroom: Pedagogical strategies* (pp. 13–25). New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America.
- Paesani, K. (2005). Literary texts and grammar instruction: Revisiting the inductive presentation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 15–23.
- Paesani, K. (2006a). *Exercices de style*: Developing multiple competencies through a writing portfolio. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 618–639.
- Paesani, K. (2006b). A process-oriented approach to *Zazie dans le métro*. *French Review*, 79, 762–778.
- Paesani, K. (2009). Exploring the stylistic content of *Exercices de style*. *French Review*, 82, 1268–1280.
- Paran, A. (2008). The role of literature in instructed foreign language learning and teaching: An evidence-based survey. *Language Teaching*, 41, 465–496.
- Pfeiffer, P. C. (2008). The discipline of foreign language studies and reforming foreign language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 296–298.
- Pireddu, N. (2008). Literature? *C'est un monde*: The foreign language curriculum in the wake of the MLA report. *Profession 2008*, 219–228.
- Porter, C. (2009). The MLA recommendations: Can we get there from here? *ADFL Bulletin*, 41, 16–23.
- Queneau, R. (1947). *Exercices de style*. Paris, France: Galimard.
- Redmann, J. (2005). An interactive reading journal for all levels of the foreign language curriculum. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 484–493.
- Redmann, J. (2008). Reading Kästner's *Emil und di Detektive* in the context of a literacy-oriented curriculum. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 41, 72–81.
- Rinner, S., & Weigart, A. (2005). From sports to the EU community: Integrating curricula through genre-based culture courses. In H. Byrnes, D. Weger-Guntharp, & K. Sprang (Eds.), *Educating for advanced foreign language capacities* (pp. 136–151). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schechtman, R. R., & Koser, J. (2008). Foreign languages and higher education: A pragmatic approach to change. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 309–312.

- Schultz, J. M. (1995). Making the transition from language to literature. In M. A. Haggstrom, L. Z. Morgan, & J. A. Wiczorek (Eds.), *The foreign language classroom: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 3–20). New York, NY: Garland.
- Scott, V. M. (2009). *Principles and practices of the Standards in collegiate foreign language education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Scott, V. M., & Huntington, J. A. (2007). Literature, the interpretive mode, and novice learners. *Modern Language Journal* 91, 3–14.
- Scott, V. M., & Huntington, J. A. (2008). Reading culture: Using literature to develop C2 competence. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 622–631.
- Scott, V. M., & Tucker, H. (2002). *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Sprang, K. A. (2008). Advanced learners' development of systematic vocabulary knowledge: Learning German vocabulary with inseparable prefixes. In L. Ortega & H. Byrnes (Eds.), *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities* (pp. 139–162). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Steinhart, M. M. (2006). Breaching the artificial barrier between communicative competence and content. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 258–261.
- Stewart, J. A., & Santiago, K. A. (2006). Using the literary text to engage learners in a multilingual community. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 683–696.
- Swaffar, J. (2006). Terminology and its discontents: Some caveats about communicative competence. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 246–249.
- Swaffar, J., Arens, K., & Byrnes, H. (1991). *Reading for meaning: An integrated approach to language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Viswamohan, A., & Torche, U. (2007). Literature and media in an ESP classroom. In B. Beaven (Ed.), *IATEFL 2006 Harrogate Conference Selections* (pp. 104–5). Canterbury, UK: International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (IATEFL).
- Walther, I. (2007). Ecological perspectives on language and literacy: Implications for foreign language instruction at the collegiate level. *ADFL Bulletin*, 38, 6–14.
- Walther, I. (2009). Curricular planning along the fault line between instrumental and academic agendas: A response to the report of the Modern Language Association on Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42, 115–122.
- Warner, C. (2009). Hey, you! The Germans! Using literary pragmatics to teach language as culture. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 42, 162–168.
- Watson, G., & Zyngier, S. (2007). *Literature and stylistics for language learners*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weber-Fève, S. (2009). Integrating language and literature: Teaching textual analysis with input and output activities and an input-to-output approach. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42, 453–467.
- Wellmon, C. (2008). Languages, cultural studies, and the futures of foreign language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 292–295.
- Wurst, K. A. (2008). How do we teach language, literature, and culture in a collegiate environment and what are the implications for graduate education? *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 41, 57–60.
- Zyzik, E., & Polio, C. (2008). Incidental focus on form in university Spanish literature classes. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 53–70.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.