

Beyond the Language-Content Divide: Research on Advanced Foreign Language Instruction at the Postsecondary Level

Kate Paesani

Wayne State University

Heather Willis Allen

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Abstract: *This review examines research on advanced-level foreign language (FL) teaching and learning in collegiate contexts with a particular focus on the merging of language and literary-cultural content. The overarching question framing this review is: What is the relationship between language, literature, and culture, and how are they instantiated through FL curricula and instruction at the advanced level? To respond to this question, language and literary-cultural content in advanced FL contexts are addressed from the perspective of three trends evidenced in published research: (1) conceptualizations of literature and culture within the advanced-level curriculum, (2) integration of language and literary-cultural content at the course level, and (3) incorporation of advanced language and content at the curricular level. The review concludes by identifying overarching themes and directions for future research.*

Key words: *advanced FL learning, collegiate, culture, curricula, literature*

Introduction

In the decade following 9/11, foreign languages (FLs) have been under a spotlight: on the one hand, the United States has focused increased attention on the need to understand and communicate with other cultures and peoples; on the other hand, collegiate program closures and budget cuts have made headlines across the country. Interestingly, a recent Modern Language Association (MLA) survey reported that undergraduate FL enrollments increased 6.6% overall since 2006; however, enrollments in advanced courses, already dangerously low in 2006, remained unchanged (Furman, Goldberg, & Lusin, 2007, 2010, p. 3).

Kate Paesani (PhD, Indiana University) is Associate Professor of French at Wayne State University, Detroit.

Heather Willis Allen (PhD, Emory University) is Assistant Professor of French at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Foreign Language Annals, Vol. 45, Iss. S1, pp. S54–S75. © 2012 by American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
DOI: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2012.01179.x.

These facts underscore the need for collegiate FL programs to demonstrate their relevance and intellectual connection to the larger university mission if they are to survive. Yet an important barrier to this mission is the long-standing and well-documented bifurcation in many FL programs. This bifurcation is characterized by fixed lines of demarcation between lower-level language courses on one end and advanced literature and culture courses on the other, hierarchical governance structures and personnel divisions, differing instructional goals and teaching techniques in each camp, a lack of communication among various department members, and faculty members' desire to maintain their intellectual freedom. Given these realities, FL departments can no longer maintain the status quo; pedagogical and curricular change that bridges the language-content divide and contributes to the intellectual relevance of FL programs is essential.

This need for change was summarized in the 2007 report of the MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages and the resultant stream of responses to its recommendations (e.g., Maxim, 2009b; 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" (p. 3). The report further suggested implementing this curricular reform by developing students' "translingual and transcultural competence" (p. 3) through interaction with target language texts, including, but not limited to, literature.

Enrollment trends, curricular bifurcation, and the long-term nature of second language acquisition (SLA) point to the importance of investigating advanced FL teaching and learning. Indeed, according to Maxim (2009b), there is a need for systematic research on what advanced language capacities look like, how students reach them, and which pedagogies facilitate their development. Yet as several scholars have

pointed out, a definition of "advancedness" and a characterization of the pedagogies and curricular frameworks that contribute to its development remain somewhat elusive (e.g., Pfeiffer, 2008; Swaffar, 2004). In the context of this review, we define as *advanced* those learners whose language abilities allow them to enroll in courses beyond the sequenced introductory and intermediate classes that often form part of a university's FL requirement (Swaffar, 2004). It is important to note that learners in advanced-level courses represent a range of FL abilities, some of which are consistent with Advanced levels as designated by ACTFL (1999), others of which are above or below this level (e.g., Intermediate or Superior).

The purpose of this review is to provide an overview of research into advanced-level FL teaching and learning in collegiate contexts with a particular focus on the merging of language and literary-cultural content. This review may serve as a knowledge base for instructors and scholars looking for solutions to the problems outlined above, given that all FL program faculty will need to develop "considerable knowledge and practical expertise in the area of linking content and language learning in order to be able to contribute to an extended curriculum whose pedagogies would lead students toward the stated goal of [translingual and transcultural competence]" (Byrnes, 2008b, p. 23). Hence, the overarching question that frames this review is: What is the relationship between language, literature, and culture, and how are they instantiated through FL curricula and instruction at the advanced level?

Consistent with Arens's (2012) call for a more responsible approach to curriculum at all levels, this review considers how construction and implementation of advanced-level courses in collegiate FL programs can be integrated with research and theory. As such, we address language and literary-cultural content in advanced FL teaching and learning from the perspective of three trends evidenced in published research.

First, we explore how literature and culture are conceptualized and what their role is in the advanced-level curriculum. Next, we summarize research focused on integrating language and literary-cultural content at the course level. Finally, we examine the ways in which advanced language and content are merged at the curricular level.

The review encompasses research published in the past decade, from 2001 to 2010.¹ To narrow the review's scope and to avoid overlap with other review articles on this and related topics (e.g., Byram & Feng, 2004; Paesani, 2011; Paran, 2008), we focused on advanced-level FL courses (i.e., those beyond the sequenced courses at the intermediate level). We excluded research on a number of subtopics deemed tangential to our main goals, including content-based instruction (e.g., Stoller, 2004), heritage learners (e.g., Montrul, 2010), hybrid and online course delivery (e.g., Thorne & Black, 2007), model programs (e.g., Volume 35, Issues 1 and 2 of *ADFL Bulletin*), program assessment (e.g., Jade, 2009), and service learning (e.g., Grim, 2010).

Conceptualizing Literature and Culture

To gain an understanding of how literature and culture have been conceptualized in collegiate FL contexts, one must first look back to the cultural turn of the late 1980s and early 1990s, which challenged the dominance of canonical literary texts in FL programs, opened the field to include cultural studies, and considered literature more broadly as one representation of culture among many text types. Several scholars have called into question the success of the cultural turn, highlighting a lack of attention to the intersection of language, culture, and literature. Berman (2002), for instance, called this a “blind spot” in FL programs, and Byrnes (2002), focusing on the impact of the cultural turn on FL pedagogy, suggested that the rise of cultural studies merely replaced certain theoretic-

cal approaches to research on culture with others with no resulting trickle-down effect to teaching.

Such ideas are echoed in the MLA report's suggested goal of developing students' translingual and transcultural competence. However, in his response to the report, Wellmon (2008) claimed that many FL departments are unable to pursue this goal because they have downplayed the role of language as an essential domain of literary-cultural knowledge. He instead suggested that “FL departments could further their understanding of the particular place of languages in the study of cultures by incorporating more recent work in, for example, linguistic anthropology, sociocultural linguistics, and systemic functional linguistics” (p. 295). Byram (2010) proposed reconsidering the purposes of contemporary FL study and its cultural dimension in particular, stating that “educational competence can be fulfilled by a focus on intercultural competence, which includes critical reflection” (p. 320). Arens (2010b) expanded on the concept of intercultural competence, arguing that it provides a way to rethink how a language curriculum can become a culture curriculum comprising “a set of interlocking cultural literacies, including the history, traditions, and the pragmatic patterns used by individuals on that field to construct and assert their identities and to manage their negotiations with infrastructure, the community, and historical norms” (p. 322).

Concurrent with a questioning of the success of the cultural turn has been a rethinking of the notion of text. Magnan (2003) considered the question of what a text is and how it represents the multiple perspectives of department members, asserting that these views “must each inform the holistic enterprise of foreign language study and teaching” (p. 14). A key component to creating a holistic approach to the study of language and literary-cultural texts, Magnan suggested, lies in the interaction of contemporary literary and cultural studies with socially based theories

of SLA. In the following subsections, we look at this interaction by examining how literature and culture are conceptualized in published research from both theoretical and practical perspectives.

Conceptualizing Literature

Exploring theoretical perspectives on the concept of literature is the focus of several articles reviewed (Byrnes & Kord, 2002; Gramling & Warner, 2012; Scott, 2001); the common thread among them is the merging of language and literary content. Scott, for instance, proposed a theoretical model and goals for literature teaching based on SLA research. The model accounts for linguistic, cognitive, and sociolinguistic dimensions of learning by drawing on psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, interlanguage, and schema theories. Goals include having students see the literary text as a creative work with layers of meaning, helping students to develop textual meaning through negotiation between the reader and literary work, and encouraging students to consider cultural structures such as enjoyment or rituals and to find support for them in literary texts.

A second model for advanced-level literature teaching called contact pragmatics draws on field/practice theory and pragmatic stylistics (Gramling & Warner, 2012). Literature is understood as a form of social practice articulating to various, loosely concentric fields of interpretation. Contact pragmatics shifts the pedagogical focus from the literary text itself to the interstices, overlaps, misalignments, and disjunctions between the concentric fields. The authors concluded that by seeing literature as situated social practice, it is possible to speak to students drawn to advanced-level courses because they have an interest in literature and to those drawn to the same courses because their interest lies in language or culture.

Byrnes and Kord (2002) provided an even broader conceptualization of literature by exploring the theoretical frameworks of literacy and genre. In their dialogically

constructed article, Kord proposed options for linking language and literature within the context of an upper-level German literature course and explained how she reshaped one of her own courses in light of research into SLA, literacy, and genre to combine “intellectually challenging content with discourse training” (p. 43). Byrnes, meanwhile, explored insights from adult instructed SLA research that might inform pedagogies for engaging students with literary texts. She argued that to implement curricular change, a focus on literacy and genre are essential because they provide a “way of characterizing the entire enterprise of learning a foreign language in a college environment because texts and their imagined worlds, rather than the contexts of the ‘real’ world, constitute the vast majority of language use in our classroom” (p. 56).²

These theoretical perspectives are reflected to varying degrees in more practical approaches to conceptualizing literature, which range from integrating literature across the curriculum to implementing visual texts in instruction. Barnes-Karol (2002), arguing that “we must be willing to use literature in new ways ... to achieve goals that are not limited to the literary” (p. 15), posited a model that increases the space devoted to literature in the undergraduate FL curriculum. Her model integrates theoretical notions of critical literacies, multiple literacies, and communities of learners, and thus reflects similar concepts discussed by Byrnes and Kord (2002). To develop students’ narrative imagination through literary analysis, Barnes-Karol advocated that students read literature in a multiplicity of ways with varying goals according to the level of instruction, the nature of the course, and departmental objectives.

A second approach contemplated the question of how we “do” literature as a way of considering what literature teaching can add to FL pedagogy. Melin (2010) looked specifically at poetry as a starting point for extending curricular and pedagogical innovations to other literary genres. She presented several arguments supporting the

use of poetry in the advanced FL curriculum, including exploiting its linguistic features to help students understand literary conventions, developing students' creative writing skills, and reflecting on the function of literature. Like Byrnes and Kord (2002), Melin considered, but ultimately rejected, genre as an appropriate approach to literature instruction. She instead proposed a more holistic approach that "take[s] into account writerly perspective, readership issues, and performative aspects" (p. 360).

The last two practical perspectives on the concept of literature do not reflect the theoretical positions outlined above, but rather link literature to other text types. To enlarge students' traditional notion of text, Finn (2003) proposed combining the study of literature with musical comedy, thus drawing on the complementary fields of music, theater, and dance. He concluded that although FL instructors have been using auditory and visual aids for many years, a course of the type he described offers a way to combine them and make them the focus of study and analysis. In a similar vein, Etienne and Vanbaelen (2006) proposed familiarizing students with the process of textual analysis through the study of audiovisual texts (television commercials) before introducing them to literature. The authors argued that "language learning should be centered on the discovery and understanding of multiple cultural artifacts (including literary texts) that in turn make acquisition of new forms necessary" (p. 88).

Conceptualizing Culture

In conceptualizing literature, scholars writing from theoretical perspectives focused on how to merge literary study and analysis with theoretical notions from SLA, pragmatics, literacy, and genre. Urlaub (2012) built on this work by establishing a connection between language teaching, culture, and the framework of critical theory; his proposed model of cultural literacy development merges ideas from applied linguistics and hermeneutics. Urlaub explained that the

distance existing between text and reader due to gaps in linguistic and cultural knowledge is beneficial as it "serves as a constant reminder that the reader is interacting with a text that is shaped by a potentially different cultural context" (p. 50). Furthermore, encouraging learners to merge previous background knowledge and cultural identity with information within the text can move them from simple cross-cultural comparisons to transcultural reflections.

The *Standards for Foreign Language in the 21st Century* (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project [henceforth the National Standards], 2006) is another framework for conceptualizing culture. Reeser (2003), echoing Urlaub's claim that cultural literacy involves more than simple comparisons, argued that "educators forget that students need training in the active interpretation of culture—in the *process* of cultural analysis at least as much as in cultural knowledge *per se*" (p. 774; italics in original). He therefore proposed a blueprint for an advanced-level French culture course that focuses on the concept of dialogue with respect to cultural products, practices, and perspectives. This "dialogic reading technique" (p. 776) provides students with text-based cultural viewpoints that encourage critical interpretation and analysis through identification of cultural contradictions and complexity. A second Standards-based perspective on culture focused on a Web-based contemporary German culture class that highlights communication, connections, and communities (McGee, 2001). The author argued that weaving cultural content into the creation of Web pages allows students to communicate through interpretive and presentational mode tasks, make connections with other students and disciplines, and tap into target language communities. As such, language and culture are intertwined, and cultural literacy extends beyond factual knowledge.

Film provides another window through which to consider the conceptualization of culture. According to Stephens (2001), "Film ... draws attention uniquely to

ethical boundaries, conceptual frameworks, national memory and identity and, significantly, to the use of language and idioms” (p. 22). She proposed themes to be explored in a Spanish film course such as violence, sexuality, or competing images of Spain as a nation as a way of “[problematizing] the unifying concept of culture and [helping] students see culture as a site of conflict” (p. 25), while simultaneously preparing them to engage with other types of texts, including literature. Gross (2007) argued that film is an effective and efficient way to have students “engage with multiple subjectivities ... before proceeding to an analysis of the semiotic fabric of the film with its intersecting literary and filmic signifying features” (p. 782). She then described a course designed to familiarize students with the historical and sociocultural information relevant to an understanding of the French-speaking world, emphasizing multiple factors that contribute to the dynamic process of cultural identity formation and its evolution over time in different spaces.

Finally, culture is conceptualized as an active, living reality in two different immersive approaches. Sconduto (2008) introduced an approach to advanced-level French civilization and history that replicated the real-life interaction with culture students experience when studying abroad. In the course, students were “virtual travelers in time and space” to gain “a better and more personal understanding of what life was like during different time periods, how social and cultural conditions changed and evolved across the centuries, and how specific events of French history ... might influence socio-cultural attitudes today” (p. 722). Similarly, Péron (2010) outlined a global simulation project for an advanced-level course on the Vichy regime in which students actively reconstituted the past by assuming the identity of a character in the virtual yet historically and culturally grounded world of Paris during World War II. Through this project, students developed their ability to make connections, gain a better understanding of his-

tory, reflect upon their own identity, and interpret events and content through a socio-historical lens.

Integrating Language and Literary-Cultural Content in the Advanced FL Curriculum

As highlighted in the introduction to this article, a long-standing language-content bifurcation exists in many collegiate FL departments. Another division also frequently occurs between advanced-level courses focusing on linguistic development (e.g., conversation, phonetics, writing) versus those targeting the analysis of literary-cultural content. Particularly for courses focused on literary-cultural content, several problematic assumptions have been critiqued. These include the notion that “students must already have a high level of L2 competence before they can begin to read [literature] ... that further explicit L2 instruction and learning will not take place in the literature classroom,” and that higher levels of language development can be “indirectly targeted by comprehensible input and unstructured ‘discussion’” (Byrnes & Kord, 2002, p. 37), by reading in the FL, or by receiving feedback on written work (Eigler, 2009). As Steinhart (2006) claimed, without explicit attention to linking language and content, these assumptions are “completely unrealistic” (p. 260). Conversely, the notion that courses focused primarily on the development of advanced FL capabilities can succeed without being anchored in culturally meaningful content is also problematic. As Swaffar (2006) pointed out, “There is little point in teaching a student to talk about a literary style or a cultural feature in a FL unless that student can reflect on what is at stake historically, professionally, or cognitively” (p. 249).

Proposals for how collegiate FL departments might integrate a focus on continued language development with analysis of literary-cultural content across the advanced undergraduate curriculum have multiplied over the past decade, particularly for

course-level interventions. These proposals concern both the incorporation of texts into advanced language-focused courses and the integration of language-focused teaching strategies into advanced literary-cultural classes (see Frantzen, 2002, for a review of suggestions published prior to 2002). In the following subsections, we summarize these proposals and review several empirical studies that have investigated language development in advanced-level literary-cultural courses.

Language in the Land of Literary-Cultural Content

Traditionally, collegiate FL programs have tended to relegate matters of form and accuracy to language courses while stressing meaning in literature, cultural studies, and film studies courses (Krueger, 2001). However, during the past decade, numerous scholars have endeavored to integrate a focus on meaning in advanced courses with that of engaging students in learner-centered activities related to textual analysis.

Several proposals have articulated ways to adapt communicative teaching techniques typically used in lower-level language courses to advanced-level literary-cultural courses. For instance, Nance (2002, 2010) addressed the question of how to overcome students' feelings of incompetence as they transition from language to literature courses. In her 2002 publication, she argued that "unless teachers take care to make students' own knowledge and skills visible ... most of them will check those competencies at the door of the literature classroom" (p. 30). Nance provided several suggestions to counter this, including careful task sequencing with attention to task and text difficulty, an expectation of universal student participation, and use of a framework in which new knowledge can be situated (e.g., a course outline or overarching timeline). In her 2010 monograph, the author further developed how to rethink student engagement in literary discussions, proposing a four-stage pedagogy that includes assem-

bling the tools for reading, coming to terms with the text, conducting literary analysis, and moving toward independent reading.

How student-centered activities might be incorporated into a literature survey course was the focus of McLean and Savage's (2001) descriptive report. In particular, they recommended enhancing participation through weekly reading journals, student-led discussions, and oral and written *explications de texte*. The authors further suggested that rather than lecturing, instructors might begin study of a literary work by reading the text aloud before moving to first-impression questions and having students respond to a literary critic's statement related to the text.

Student-centered, active learning was the focus of Kraemer's (2008) approach to integrating linguistic development, literary analysis, and cultural learning in a German fairy tale course. Technology was used extensively to explore course content through Webquests, facilitate interaction through threaded discussions and blogs, scaffold learning through pre- and post-reading tasks, and conduct assessments such as projects and self-evaluations. The author concluded that although some students found the various online components overwhelming, results from qualitative student perception data reflected enhanced engagement and interaction in the course.

An effort to replicate the dynamic experience of the language classroom while also facilitating students' ability to discuss literature with precision and eloquence was reflected in publications by Russo (2006) and Erickson (2009). In a descriptive report related to a German literature course on humor, Russo advocated guided relinquishment of control to students through tasks such as textual performance, role-play, and student interviews that engage while also facilitating the continued development of linguistic skills. Erickson focused on the use of Oral Proficiency Interview-inspired techniques in a pre-1789 French literature and culture course. Targeting the development of Advanced-/Superior-level oral

competence (ACTFL, 1999) in narrating in the past and supporting opinions, the course incorporated group debates based on textual analysis and a tightly structured research project gradually completed over the course of the semester.

How an input-to-output approach can be combined with close reading in an introduction-to-literature course was addressed by Weber-Fève (2009), who claimed to anchor her recommendations in literacy-based concepts (Kern, 2002). By moving from input (pre-reading and close reading activities) to output (written reactions to texts and oral interactions with peers regarding texts), the author stated that students could be effectively introduced to textual analysis and exploration of stylistic and rhetorical writing conventions.

A final proposal on adapting communicative techniques to advanced-level literary-cultural courses focused on course design. In it, Thompson (2008) argued that instructors must shape course syllabi and lesson plans to explicitly merge language and content to move students from Intermediate-Mid to Advanced proficiency (as defined by the ACTFL guidelines). To do so, she demonstrated how a syllabus might be organized according to linguistic functions appropriate to Advanced-level proficiency aims (e.g., narration and description with elaboration in the past and future tenses) that are explicitly integrated into class discussions.

Beyond proposals that recommend communicative strategies to enhance student engagement in the literary-cultural classroom, other publications have addressed means of sensitizing students to how form and content mutually inform one another in FL texts. To achieve this goal through linguistic production tasks, Krueger (2001) advocated creative personalization to assist students in moving from personal reactions to texts toward developing critical and scholarly perspectives. In particular, she recommended guided, comparative analysis of student writing samples in literature courses to allow students to

“examine their own utterances in order to discover how their use of form affects perception of their meaning” (p. 19).

A similar focus was found in Berg and Martin-Berg’s (2002) descriptive report, which explored how examination of style, or the choices made by a speaker/writer among various equivalent expressions for communicating content, can bridge the gap between language and literature studies. As an example, the authors explained how analysis of syntax and vocabulary as well as the sounds, rhythm, and typography of sentences shape the textual content of a short story. They further suggested that students compare similarities and differences between how authors construct a text and their own alternative formulations of it.

A final publication (Eigler, 2009) focusing on suggestions for targeting form-content connections in FL texts looked at how genre conventions for academic writing and speaking can be taught in literature courses. The author proposed a model of moving from textual analysis to writing, starting with introducing and modeling appropriate terminology for textual analysis, assigning text-based tasks such as creating a narrative timeline for the text, and continuing with close reading-based writing focused on analysis of “implications of language use and narrative form for the text’s content” in two passages of the student’s choice (p. 29).

Literary-Cultural Content in the Land of Language

During the past decade, empirical studies (e.g., Donato & Brooks, 2004; Mantero, 2002) have demonstrated that participation in classroom discussions alone in literary-cultural courses does not ensure that students use the FL in advanced ways. Thus, the case is bolstered for building students’ advanced FL capacities through courses focused specifically on linguistic development. However, a major challenge in such courses is balancing linguistic development with grounding in meaningful content. The publications summarized below strive

to achieve this balance in the context of writing, advanced grammar, and phonetics courses.

Several proposals have articulated means of developing students' advanced writing capacities through reading or viewing and analysis of FL texts (Allen, 2009a; Bueno, 2009; Villanueva, 2005; Zinn, 2004). Both Bueno (2009) and Zinn (2004) advocated using film as a springboard to students' oral and written productions. In addition, the two authors focused on development of students' media literacy, or the convergence of literary and media studies and the analysis of written/visual texts. In Bueno's Spanish composition and conversation course, students analyzed film clips from *Yerma*, an adaptation of a Federico García Lorca play (Távora, 1998). During and after viewing, students completed a variety of oral and written tasks including written viewing logs, chat and discussion board postings, and video journals. In Zinn's writing course, the goal to bring film and language studies closer together was achieved through the German film *Bandits* (von Garnier, 1998). The author sought to move students from intermediate- to advanced-level language use by focusing on linguistic functions such as description and comparison, opinion and interpretation, narration, and hypotheses. Written tasks included semantic mapping, descriptions, and more extended writing assignments such as a creative narration of two of the bandits' lives.

Two publications (Allen, 2009a; Villanueva, 2005) addressed integration of meaningful literary-cultural content in an advanced writing class. Allen advocated a literacy-based approach (Kern, 2000) in a course wherein reading and analysis of four genres of contemporary French texts served to illustrate form-meaning relationships, facilitate students building knowledge about stylistic devices, and provide textual models for their own writing. Combining the literacy approach with elements of genre- and process-oriented instruction, the instructor had students compile a writing

portfolio including multiple drafts of four text types and self-reflections on their own writing and knowledge gained on authors and genres studied. Villanueva also focused on contemporary texts as a tool for writing development, building an advanced-level German writing course around *Fragebogen*, a collection of questionnaires covering various cultural themes. Exploration of gender, identity, history, and memory was accomplished in tandem with refinement of students' grammatical and stylistic capacities through answering questionnaires and completing follow-up journals on the text, their reactions to it, and the reactions of their peers.

Another group of proposals whose goal was to balance linguistic development with grounding in meaningful content focused on advanced-level grammar classes. In each, FL texts were used as a means of contextualized grammar presentation and as a starting point for using new grammar in students' linguistic production. For example, the use of a novel to provide textual grounding in an advanced grammar course was proposed by both Scott (2004) and Zyzik (2008). For Scott, *La Vagabonde*, an early 20th-century French novel by Colette, served as a vehicle for students to analyze why certain structures were used to express particular meanings in the text. Further, Scott advocated the use of cloze exercises (i.e., passages wherein every so many words are omitted) to sensitize students to aesthetic dimensions of the novel and have them predict lexical and stylistic choices prior to reading. Zyzik, building on work by Larsen-Freeman (2003), foregrounded the goal of teaching grammar as "a communicative tool in which form, meaning, and use are clearly integrated" (p. 434) and illustrated how extensive reading of a book-length narrative, *La Casa en Mango Street* (Cisneros, 1994), could be used as meaningful input for learning more advanced-level Spanish grammar. A unique course format combining large lecture and small discussion sessions moved students from introduction to grammatical structures, to

contextualizing structures through reading, to communicative tasks related to the readings and grammar structures targeted.

The question of how literature can be integrated into an advanced grammar and stylistics course to develop students' analytical and critical-thinking skills alongside their linguistic capacities was explored in two publications by Paesani (2006b, 2009). In both, the author demonstrated how *Exercices de style* (Queneau, 1947), a short literary text written in 99 different styles, served as a springboard for teaching stylistic and grammatical content that students later used for the basis of a writing portfolio. In her earlier publication (2006b), Paesani provided an example of how excerpts from the text could anchor inductive grammar presentations and provide models for student writing. The author's later proposal (2009) focused on close study of stylistic features and the development of skills in literary analysis.

A final publication related to merging literary-cultural content in advanced grammar courses by Mojica-Díaz and Sánchez-López (2010) built on research in SLA, cognitive linguistics, and advanced FL learning. The authors argued for grammar study grounded in discursive and contextual analysis wherein students are invited to hypothesize on structures and their meanings. As an example, Mojica-Díaz and Sánchez-López described how analysis of the preterit and imperfect in Spanish could be accomplished through short stories, songs, journalistic articles, and movie/book reviews.

The last two publications aiming to merge language and content in advanced-level language classes focused on phonetics and pronunciation courses (Etienne & Sax, 2006; Paesani, 2006a). Each proposal emphasized language variation in oral and written texts to introduce students to varied speakers and settings not traditionally encountered within the FL classroom. Etienne and Sax focused on spoken stylistic variation, or the ability to adjust speech to the formality of setting, through excerpts

from the French film *Une Fille Seule* (Lucot, 1979). They described a task-based pedagogical sequence that facilitated students' recognition of stylistic variation and provided them with opportunities for controlled production. Similarly, Paesani demonstrated how film and novel versions of *Zazie dans le Métro* (Malle, 1960; Queneau, 1959) could be utilized to sensitize students to *français populaire*, a variety of French often associated with socially marginalized groups but usable by any speaker in an appropriate discourse context. She provided a process-oriented model to show how texts could be viewed or read to heighten students' awareness of standard and nonstandard French prior to rewriting a scene from the film in a different textual genre.

Studies of Linguistic Development and Perceptions of FL Learning in Advanced Literature, Culture, and Language Courses

In addition to publications presenting varied strategies and approaches that integrate attention to linguistic development and literary-cultural content in advanced-level courses, several studies have investigated students' linguistic development and perceptions of FL learning in the advanced curriculum. The majority of these studies were carried out in literature courses, whereas just two (Bueno, 2002, 2006) were conducted in a non-literature course.

The nature of classroom discourse and the development of increased oral proficiency in advanced-level literature courses were explored in two studies (Donato & Brooks, 2004; Mantero, 2002). In the first, Mantero sought to determine the relationship between students' cognitive processes and language acquisition in an Introduction to Hispanic Literature course. After studying the frequency of utterances, dialogue, and discourse over nine weeks, the author concluded that classroom talk was mainly "teacher-centered, student supported dialogue that did not take advantage of the majority of opportunities for extending

classroom talk into the discourse level” (p. 437). In a second study, Donato and Brooks investigated classroom discourse in a Spanish literature course to determine whether class discussions played a role in the development of Advanced speaking functions (as defined by the ACTFL guidelines). Similar to Mantero, they found that classroom discussions were dominated by teacher talk and that students did not have opportunities for elaborated responses. Donato and Brooks concluded that instructors should become aware of Advanced-level speaking functions and explicitly provide opportunities for students to use them in a variety of discussion activities.

A third study on the development of oral proficiency by Bueno (2006) examined the learning experiences of four students in an advanced Spanish composition and conversation course. In it, the author explored how oral development was impacted by instructional strategies and whether film was a useful tool for facilitating students’ ability to express themselves. Findings pointed to the promise of resources including streamed video, asynchronous chat, and video journals as well as the need to address design issues of control and manipulation of these resources.

Whereas studies by Mantero (2002) and Donato and Brooks (2004) revealed the need for advanced FL courses to facilitate the development of higher-level speaking functions through textual analysis, other studies (Bueno, 2002; Polio & Zyzik, 2009) suggested that this sentiment may not be shared by instructors and students. In relation to a composition and conversation course, Bueno determined through a post-course survey that less than half of students rated being able to read and write texts as very significant, and less than one third rated cultural understanding as very significant. Findings from Polio and Zyzik’s study of student and instructor perceptions of course goals revealed that only one of three instructors posited language-focused goals for a literature course, whereas more than half of students classified language learning

as a primary or secondary goal. Common to both instructors and students was the sentiment that speaking was the least improved element at the end of the literature course.

The development of FL writing abilities was the subject of several studies emerging from the Georgetown University German Department’s curriculum development project. The first, by Laimkina (2008), examined whether semantically oriented instruction increased advanced literature students’ ability to expand use of the dative case and whether written production became more native-like in functionality and accuracy over a semester. Results indicated that learners increased accuracy of use of dative constructions demonstrated a shift in declarative knowledge about semantic uses of the dative, and showed decreased reliance on alternative means of expression, underscoring the value of meaning-based instruction informed by cognitive linguistics. Two other studies by Ryshina-Pankova focused on the emergence of coherence and cohesion devices (2006) and grammatical metaphor (2010) in student writing. Both studies were grounded in a systemic functional linguistics perspective and based on student-generated written book reviews from three levels of the advanced curriculum. In her 2006 study, the author focused on theme selection and textual moves. Results demonstrated that the creation of coherent, cohesive texts depended in part on complex themes and that a correlation existed between an increased use of complex themes in written language and higher levels of language acquisition. In her later study, Ryshina-Pankova investigated the frequency and uses of grammatical metaphor as a coherence/cohesion device in student writing.³ Results showed a gradual increase in use of grammatical metaphor across levels and that grammatical metaphor was used as a device for cohesion, coherence, and constructing evaluation and argumentation. Based on these findings, Ryshina-Pankova advocated student engagement in textual interpretation and creation alongside explicit instruction showing connections

between context, texts, and linguistic features.

A final study by Zyzik and Polio (2008) investigated the types and frequency of incidental focus on form, or techniques to draw students' attention to language forms as the need arises, and literature instructors' perceptions of its use in the classroom. The authors found that overall, instructors responded to approximately half of student errors, typically in the form of recasts. Conversely, few instances of negotiation were demonstrated and only one example of explicit correction occurred. Building on their findings, Zyzik and Polio suggested the inclusion of more form-focused activities and specific linguistic support in advanced literature courses.

Implementing Curricular Solutions

As illustrated in the introduction to this review, collegiate FL programs are in crisis, and concerns about existing configurations of language and literary-cultural studies curricula contribute to this crisis. Swaffar (2003) pointed to two "pernicious assumptions" (p. 20) related to the FL crisis: developing linguistic competencies in introductory and intermediate courses and then ignoring language development at advanced levels, and constructing curricula with an eye toward individual faculty rather than to the department as a whole. This idea of curriculum by default (Byrnes, 1998), or the collection of individual courses without any sense of curricular cohesion, underscores the belief held by many faculty that courses are independently owned intellectual property. As such, curricula are constructed by putting these individual pieces together without sacrificing intellectual freedom but also without considering the larger curricular context. Swaffar and Arens (2005) argued that curriculum by default is compounded by a tendency to use teaching practices that separate form from meaning and communication from content and context.

To adequately merge language and content and overcome pernicious assumptions about collegiate FL programs, Byrnes (2008a) argued that attention to four areas is required: (1) developing principled and comprehensive ways of linking language learning with literary-cultural content, (2) adopting an approach amenable to and adjustable within diverse educational settings for different learners and languages, (3) adopting an approach translatable into different curricular progressions that recognize the particularities of specific educational contexts, and (4) making that approach transparent for instructors and learners so that they may easily participate in meaning making in an FL. In this section, we explore research related to three overlapping yet distinct curricular approaches for merging language and literary-cultural content: Standards-based, literacy-based, and genre-based approaches.

Standards-Based Approaches

The Standards (National Standards, 2006) document proposed five content standards (Communication, Cultures, Comparisons, Connections, Communities) intended to guide FL curriculum development and provide a framework for exploring the products, practices, and perspectives of a given target culture. Originally developed for use at the K–12 level, the Standards have received limited attention in collegiate contexts, particularly with respect to advanced-level curriculum and instruction (see, however, Scott, 2010). Some scholars have even questioned whether the Standards are an appropriate framework for collegiate contexts (e.g., Allen, 2009b; Byrnes, 2002). Nonetheless, the two Standards-based approaches outlined below show that this framework can be successfully applied at the postsecondary level. Both present an integrative approach to merging language and literary content, one through the 3R model (Ketchum, 2006; McEwan, 2010) and the other through a heuristic rereading of the Standards (Arens, 2008, 2010a).

The 3R model (recognize, research, relate) was predicated on the idea that the culture goals of the Standards provide new direction for research in interactive reading models, as sufficient background knowledge can help students comprehend the relationships between the practices and perspectives of the nonnative product (Ketchum, 2006). The model therefore focused on using content schemata to assist in reading target language texts and to integrate language, literature, and culture at all curricular levels. Building on this work, McEwan (2010) expanded the 3R model to use as “a method for analyzing literature and culture that addresses the needs of the *Standards* while responding to the call by postsecondary language instructors for greater precision in linguistic and literary analysis” (p. 146; italics in original). To achieve these goals, students recognize linguistic and literary elements in a text that reflect the target culture, research a specific topic to explore underlying cultural perspectives in the text, and relate this newly acquired information to the linguistic and literary elements of the text. As such, language and literary-cultural content are integrated and closely tied to textual meaning.

A second curricular approach (Arens, 2008, 2010a) provides a novel rereading of the Standards that integrates language, literary-cultural content, and genre across the curriculum. Arens (2008) posited the Standards as a heuristic for “interactions among the many aspects of the post-secondary curriculum,” (p. 35) and for developing advanced literacies beyond conversational language skills or the marginalization of everyday culture. She proposed a rewriting of “the language Standards to address genres in a cultural framework, redefining genres as language functions within culture, which individuals use in knowledge-producing and communicating acts” (pp. 36–37). Arens (2010a) offered another rewriting, or as she preferred, rereading of the Standards that referred “to culture literacies and strategic sociocultural competence rather

than to language” (p. 161). The focus on cultural literacy in Arens’s rereading of the Standards presents an integrative approach that clearly merges language and content.

Literacy-Based Approaches

As illustrated throughout this review, a common goal for advanced-level FL teaching and learning is development of students’ literacy: Several authors proposed various solutions for developing students’ cultural literacy (Arens, 2010a; Gross, 2007; Urlaub, 2012), whereas others spoke of literacy as an instructional outcome (Byrnes & Kord, 2002). In this subsection, we consider literacy as both a goal of FL curricula and a pedagogical framework for implementing that goal; both involve students’ interaction with a variety of oral and written target language texts. According to Kern (2002), “[l]iteracy is about ways of creating and interpreting meaning through texts—which is more than the ability to inscribe and decode written language” (p. 21). Because advanced language learning requires familiarization with new frames of interpretation, new genres, and new ways of thinking in and about the FL, literacy is an appropriate organizing principle for designing curricula “that problematize the linguistic, cognitive, and social relationships that link readers, writers, texts, and culture” (Kern, 2004, p. 2). Kern described the design of a literacy-oriented curriculum as involving what to teach (i.e., texts as information systems that reflect culture), how to teach it, and why. He then proposed nine elements of a literacy-based curriculum and illustrated his literacy-based pedagogy through two examples implemented at advanced levels, storytelling and projects.

Literacy-based pedagogy is the basis of two publications by Redmann, who presented two tools for implementing this approach across the undergraduate curriculum, with a specific focus on advanced-level courses: interactive reading journals (2005a) and *Stationenlernen* (2005b). In interactive reading journals, students

activate background knowledge and experiences, develop their ability to summarize using key words from the text, reflect on the what and why of a text, and use journal entries as the basis for classroom discussion. The journals require students to interact with texts using multiple language competencies, to participate in a classroom community of learners, and to engage critically with texts. In *Stationenlernen* activities, students work in small groups and rotate round the classroom to different stations with a variety of text-oriented tasks such as writing a dialogue for a gap in the text's plot, finding evidence of personal reactions to the text, or rewriting a dramatic scene. Redmann (2005b) argued that *Stationenlernen* contribute to literacy development as they encourage a deeper understanding of the text, transformation of the text into something new, and engagement in activities requiring multiple language competencies.

A second literacy-based model, applied literacy in second language education (ALL2E), responded to the following question: "How can instruction and discourse in [second language classrooms] be framed in order to provide opportunities for language learning and cognitive development for its participants?" (Mantero, 2006, p. 99). In developing the model, Mantero focused specifically on literature-based classrooms and the role of grammar and formal evaluation within them. He argued that ALL2E allows students to actively construct texts through discourse and interactions with other students; as such, "an understanding and command of grammar emerges through dialogic interaction about and with the text" (p. 108), rather than according to prescriptive rules.

Other literacy-based curricular solutions are grounded in the concept of genre (Swaffar, 2004; Swaffar & Arens, 2005). Swaffar and Arens outlined a literacy-based pedagogy centered around tools such as the reading matrix and the précis and defined learning outcomes for a genre-based FL curriculum. Throughout the book, the authors proposed development of coherent

curricula that are anchored in texts, focused on meaning making, and implemented to develop multiple language competencies. Swaffar focused specifically on using "the précis as a template for pedagogical tasks that integrate comprehension and production practice that can enable learners to identify the messages, obligatory textual moves, and language features of various genres" (p. 19) in the context of advanced-level classes. She and Swaffar and Arens both claimed that the précis facilitates linguistic development within the context of discursive practices, allows learners to uncover textual message systems and link them to language features, and links existing knowledge to a text's content-form patterns.

A literacy orientation creates an intellectual foundation upon which language and literary-cultural content may be merged at all curricular levels and with which faculty from a department's various subdisciplines can identify. Indeed, "the goal of literacy lies at the core of ... any curriculum designed to teach foreign language by structuring courses that enable students to discover how the content of a culture is mediated through language" (Swaffar, 2003, p. 23). We now turn to a review of research that maintains literacy as the goal of FL study, but which proposes to organize curricula around the construct of genre and the theoretical framework of systemic functional linguistics.

Genre-Based Approaches

The research reviewed in this subsection is a result of the long-term curriculum development project *Developing Multiple Literacies* (German Department, 2000) implemented in the Georgetown University German Department (GUGD), whose focus is on developing students' academic literacy across a four-year sequence. The GUGD curriculum focuses on the notions of literacy together with a genre-oriented, socio-cognitive approach to advanced FL learning. As such, it "enables instruction

to emphasize that language is a symbolic, that is, a social resource, a system of highly conventionalized and nonetheless diverse meaning-making possibilities that are available to the language user within a discourse community” (p. 67). Byrnes (2008a) further argued that any curricular approach must answer the most significant questions FL programs face in a globalized society:

Can we find principles for assuring that the culture or content of a second cultural area and the second language are learned simultaneously and with reference to one another, and can we imagine that intricate linkage in a manner that would, within a reasonable length of time, enable learners to develop levels of ability in that language that would approach a competent L2 literacy, perhaps even a competent L2 cultural literacy? (p. 103)

The theoretical framework of systemic functional linguistics, selection and sequencing of texts according to the notions of primary (private) and secondary (public) discourses (Gee, 2002) and grammatical metaphor (Halliday, 1993), and the use of genre to mark curricular progressions have been proposed as coherent solutions to these questions. It is these theoretical notions that are reflected across the GUGD curriculum and the research reviewed here.

Examples of how the GUGD curriculum can be implemented across a four-year sequence following a genre-based approach are one focus of this research. Maxim (2005) proposed an approach to implementing an integrated undergraduate FL curriculum consisting of five steps: (1) formulating shared departmental goals, (2) establishing a close linkage between language and content at all levels, (3) determining a clear principle for organizing and sequencing content, (4) adopting a consistent pedagogy for engaging the content, and (5) implementing a systematic approach for assessing the degree to which the curriculum meets its stated goals at all levels of instruction. Crane (2006) built on this approach, focus-

ing in particular on how genre can help FL curriculum designers sequence advanced-level content and create instructional materials to facilitate increased development of FL competencies. She looked at how structurally and linguistically related genres (e.g., the recount and the personal narrative) can be sequenced across multiple levels of a curriculum so that educators see links between language and content “that are otherwise difficult to detect when linguistic units, functional categories or communicative situations alone act as the guiding constructs for curriculum design” (p. 229). A final approach to the articulation of genre across the GUGD curriculum (Rinner & Weigert, 2006) focused on the published interview, which has particular language features appropriate for implementation in advanced-level courses. By exploring one or similar genres across courses in one level, horizontal and vertical articulation are enhanced. Moreover, students see the diversity of the genre and receive preparation to deal with more linguistically sophisticated genres at higher levels.

Specific applications of the genre approach at advanced levels of the GUGD curriculum have focused on the study of grammar (Maxim, 2009a) and writing tasks (Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010). Maxim argued for a view of grammar in which form and meaning are merged to discover a text’s communicative purposes along a narrative-expository continuum, claiming that “[i]t is ironic that at the place in the curriculum where there is so much context—namely, in the content-oriented courses of the upper level—there is so little systematic attention to form” (p. 173). He proposed a genre-based pedagogy for implementing texts in the curriculum that leads students to understand the purpose, function, context, and linguistic resources associated with a text. The instructional sequence, illustrated through an upper-level course entitled “Berlin Stories,” leads students to construct their own version of the genres studied in writing.

Writing was the principal focus of a monograph by Byrnes and colleagues

(2010) that presented a plan for developing writing ability across the four-year GUGD curriculum to foster advanced FL development. The authors argued that writing development is a vehicle for the simultaneous development of language and content knowledge and a valid indicator of progress toward “advancedness.” Not only is the monograph unique in its focus on writing as a window into development of advanced language competencies, but it also presents a cross-curricular longitudinal study of the emergence of FL writing abilities as evidence of the “realization of the kind of multiple literacies to which the GUGD aspires” (p. 7).

Directions for Future Research

The purpose of this review was to investigate the relationship between language, literature, and culture and the ways in which this relationship is represented—if at all—in collegiate FL curricula and instruction at the advanced level. One important result of this review is evidence of the degree to which the language-content divide still exists. In commenting on this divide and, specifically, the highly theorized, language deficient literary-cultural side versus the oral-functional language teaching side, Byrnes and colleagues (2010) made the following observation:

Unless such positions can be counterbalanced with conceptual, programmatic, pedagogical, and most important, assessment practices that reverse them, even well-meaning exhortations about the need for deep reforms cannot achieve the desired integration of language, culture, and curricular thinking. (p. 14)

Indeed, the three overarching themes around which this review was organized are the conceptualization of literature and culture, the integration of language and literary-cultural content in instruction at the course level, and curricular solutions to advanced-level language-content instruc-

tion. Overall, we found that the research reflects a strong emphasis on proposals that simultaneously develop learners’ linguistic competence and engage them with literary-cultural texts. The research further points to two major trends regarding these proposals: curriculum and instruction grounded in the Standards or in the concepts of literacy and genre. These trends help respond to critiques regarding how a holistic, integrated curriculum as proposed in the MLA report (2007) might be realized in pedagogical and programmatic terms. For example, Byrnes (2010) stated that although the MLA report “wrestles with how to relate language and content or culture learning,” it did not match its vision of cultural learning “by an equally appealing—and workable—notion of completely integrated and concurrent language learning” (p. 316). Pfeiffer (2008) further argued that the report did not specifically foreground “the sustained and consistent linkage of content areas with appropriate language forms in the FL” (p. 296). The research reviewed herein suggests that scholars are beginning to move in a direction that responds to these concerns.

In spite of this positive trend, several gaps in the research surveyed serve as points of departure for future research. Although the research reviewed promotes integration of language and literary-cultural content at the advanced undergraduate level, the specific place of that content in a holistic collegiate FL curriculum has not been solidified, as evidenced by the differing conceptions of literature and culture presented above. Possible questions to frame future research in this area include: Are literature and culture as objects of study conceived of differently by different program members? And, if so, how do these differing concepts of literature and culture affect advanced undergraduate FL instruction?

Moreover, few alternatives for curricular solutions exist in the research; although several scholars propose solutions based in the Standards, most curricular solutions are grounded in literacy development implemented through genre-based approaches.

Research has not yet explored a number of questions related to curricular solutions, including: How can proposed curricular solutions such as Standards- or literacy-based frameworks be applied to special student populations (e.g., heritage language learners)? What curricular solutions are appropriate for programs using online or hybrid (combined online and classroom-based) models of instruction? What is the impact of departmental (e.g., governance structures) or institutional culture (e.g., public versus private) on the design and implementation of curricular solutions? Without more diverse models for effectively mapping language and content across the curriculum, FL departments may be less likely to find program-appropriate solutions to overcoming bifurcation, and they may continue to face issues regarding the effective articulation of courses across levels.

Another gap in the research pertains to the contexts in which proposals for merging language into literary-cultural content courses occur. Most proposals reviewed here focus on linguistic development in culture/civilization, film, and introductory literature courses. Therefore, future research might investigate linguistic development in other literature courses (e.g., those focusing on a particular century, genre, or theme) and the pedagogical approaches most suitable for maximizing advanced linguistic development within them. Questions framing this research might build on those investigated in previous empirical work (e.g., Donato & Brooks, 2004; Polio & Zyzik, 2009; Zyzik & Polio, 2008), such as: Does explicit attention to linguistic development enhance learning of literary-cultural content? Do student and instructor perceptions change when explicit attention to linguistic development forms part of advanced literature and culture courses?

The absence of scholarship in this area may be related to a final gap in the research surveyed: namely, what it means to be an instructor of language versus an instructor of literary-cultural content. Because many faculty members see these two roles

as different, their approach to teaching the two may also be distinct. Empirical support for this notion can be seen in Mills's (2011) investigation of 10 graduate student instructors pursuing a Ph.D. in French literature. The author found that participants felt more confident teaching lower-level language courses than advanced-level literature courses, due in part to their belief that strategies for teaching language would not apply to teaching literature and to their view that the teaching of texts at lower versus advanced levels is distinctly different. This gap in pedagogical preparedness is also reflected in the MLA report (2007), which made only superficial mention of graduate student professional development and its link to proposed curricular reforms. Yet if the future professoriate is to function effectively in holistic, integrated FL curricula, instructor professional development must seek to integrate attention to linguistic development with literary-cultural content at all levels of the undergraduate program. Future research in this area might investigate questions such as: What are best practices in instructor preparation for integrating language and literary-cultural content? What theoretical models are most suitable to frame such instructor preparation practices?

Finally, as already noted by Kern and Schultz (2005), current research on integrating language and literary-cultural content in the advanced undergraduate FL curriculum reflects only a minor focus on empirical studies. Moreover, of the nine studies reviewed herein, only two focused on merging content into advanced language courses (Bueno, 2002, 2006), and of those, both were based solely on survey data. Thus, we recommend that future empirical research investigate questions such as the following: What is the impact of specific pedagogical approaches for integrating language and literary-cultural content? What is the relationship between particular curricular solutions and students' linguistic development? How does the use of new technologies and digital media affect

students' access to literary-cultural content and influence their advanced FL learning?

Conclusion

In spite of these shortcomings, published research points toward increased emphasis on relating language, literature, and culture to one another in advanced-level undergraduate FL curricula through principled pedagogical and curricular approaches. We therefore echo Magnan's (2003) optimistic question regarding the longstanding bifurcation of collegiate FL programs:

Could it be that, after five decades of schism in many language departments—particularly between literary and language studies—we now rely on multiple perspectives about text that bring the subfields of our departments closer together and make their interaction potentially more fruitful than during our separate histories in the eras of audiolingualism and even communicative language teaching? (p. 9)

The research reviewed herein suggests that the answer to this question may be “yes.” Nonetheless, only through continued diligence, communication, and scholarly engagement will we fully realize the pedagogical practices and holistic curricula required to bridge the language-content divide and increase the intellectual relevance of collegiate FL programs.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Richard Donato, Eileen Glisan, and Miguel Mantero for their helpful feedback during the process of drafting this article.

Notes

1. The journals surveyed were: *ADFL Bulletin*, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *CALICO Journal*, *Foreign Language Annals*, *The French Review*, *German Quarterly*, *Hispania*, *Italica*, *Language Teaching*, *Modern Language*

Journal, and *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. In addition, we searched all the volumes of the AAUSC's *Issues in Language Program Direction* series from 2001 on, and we included the following recent monographs and edited books on advanced-level teaching and learning: Byrnes (2006); Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris (2010); Ortega & Byrnes (2008); and Swaffar and Arens (2005).

2. The concepts of literacy and genre are discussed in more detail below as curricular solutions to the language-content divide. We do note, however, that although literacy is presented here as one component of conceptualizing literature, the concept of literacy is defined broadly to entail various types of oral and written texts.
3. Grammatical metaphor is a feature of linguistic mastery “whereby processes (typically realized by verbs), attributes (typically realized by adjectives), or whole propositions (typically realized by sentences) are encoded as nouns” (Ryshina-Pankova, 2010, p. 181). This process of nominalization represents a shift in learners' language development and thus differs significantly from the more literary sense of metaphor.

References

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1999). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines—Speaking*. Yonkers, NY: ACTFL.
- Allen, H. W. (2009a). A multiple literacies approach to the advanced French writing course. *The French Review*, 83, 368–387.
- Allen, H. W. (2009b). In search of relevance: The *Standards* and the undergraduate foreign language curriculum. In V. M. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the Standards in collegiate foreign language education* (pp. 38–52). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Arens, K. (2008). Genres and the Standards: Teaching the 5 Cs through texts. *German Quarterly*, 81, 35–48.
- Arens, K. (2010a). Teaching culture: The *Standards* as an optic on curriculum development.

In V. M. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and practices of the Standards in college foreign language education* (pp. 160–180). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Arens, K. (2010b). The field of culture: The Standards as a model for teaching culture. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 321–324.

Arens, K. (2012). After the MLA report: Rethinking the links between literature and literacy, research, and teaching in foreign language departments. In G. S. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 216–228). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Barnes-Karol, G. (2002). Literature across the curriculum: One view of Spanish from an undergraduate liberal arts perspective. *ADFL Bulletin*, 33, 13–19.

Berg, W., & Martin-Berg, L. K. (2002). A stylistic approach to foreign language acquisition and literary analysis. In V. M. Scott & H. Tucker (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 173–191). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Berman, R. (2002). Foreign languages and foreign cultures. *ADFL Bulletin*, 33, 5–7.

Bueno, K. A. (2002). Creating community and making connections in the third-year Spanish course: A content-based approach. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 333–342.

Bueno, K. A. (2006). Stepping out of the comfort zone: Profiles of third-year Spanish students' attempts to develop their speaking skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 451–470.

Bueno, K. A. (2009). Got film? Is it a readily accessible window to the target language and culture for your students? *Foreign Language Annals*, 42, 318–339.

Byram, M. (2010). Linguistic and cultural education for Bildung and citizenship. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 317–321.

Byram, M., & Feng, A. (2004). Culture and language learning: Teaching, research, and scholarship. *Language Teaching*, 37, 149–168.

Byrnes, H. (1998). Constructing curricula in collegiate foreign language departments. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages: Perspectives in research and scholarship* (pp. 262–295). New York: Modern Language Association.

Byrnes, H. (2002). Language and culture: Shall the twain ever meet in foreign language departments? *ADFL Bulletin*, 33, 25–32.

Byrnes, H. (Ed.). (2006). *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*. London/New York: Continuum.

Byrnes, H. (2008a). Articulating a foreign language sequence through content: A look at the culture standards. *Language Teaching*, 41, 103–118.

Byrnes, H. (2008b). Perspectives. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 284–287.

Byrnes, H. (2010). Perspectives. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 315–317.

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. 35–73). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., & Norris, J. (2010). Realizing advanced foreign language writing development in collegiate education: Curricular design, pedagogy, assessment. *Modern Language Journal*, 94 [Supplement], 1–221.

Cisneros, S. (1994). *La casa en Mango Street*. New York: Vintage.

Crane, C. (2006). Modelling a genre-based foreign language curriculum: Staging advanced L2 learning. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 227–245). London/New York: Continuum.

Donato, R., & Brooks, F. C. (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.

Erickson, L. (2009). Skills and content: New designs for the survey course. *The French Review*, 82, 946–961.

Etienne, C., & Sax, K. (2006). Teaching stylistic variation through film. *The French Review*, 79, 934–951.

Etienne, C., & Vanbaelen, S. (2006). Moi et l'autre: identité et diversité dans un cours sur le film francophone. *The French Review*, 80, 1026–1043.

Finn, T. P. (2003). Incorporating the comédie musicale in the college French classroom. *The French Review*, 77, 302–309.

Frantzen, D. (2002). Rethinking foreign language literature: Towards an integration of

- literature and language at all levels. In V. M. Scott & H. Tucker (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 109–130). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2007). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2006*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2010). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2009*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Gee, J. P. (2002). Literacies, identities, and discourses. In M. J. Schleppegrell & M. C. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power* (pp. 159–175). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- German Department, Georgetown University. (2000). *Developing multiple literacies. A curriculum renewal project of the German Department at Georgetown University, 1997–2000*. Retrieved March 7, 2011, from <http://www1.georgetown.edu/departments/german/programs/undergraduate/curriculum/>
- Gramling, D., & Warner, C. (2012). Toward a contact pragmatics of literature: Habitus, text, and the advanced second-language classroom. In G. S. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 57–75). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Grim, F. (2010). Giving authentic opportunities to foreign language learners: A look at a French service-learning project. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, 605–623.
- Gross, J. (2007). Making reel to real contact: Film in the French cultural course. *The French Review*, 80, 782–803.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1993). Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 93–116.
- Jrade, C. L. (2009). Assessing the present foreign language major and offering strategies to improve it. *ADFL Bulletin*, 41, 83–87.
- Kern, R. G. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kern, R. G. (2002). Reconciling the language-literature split through literacy. *ADFL Bulletin*, 33, 20–24.
- Kern, R. G. (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: Heinle & Heinle.
- Kern, R., & Schultz, J. M. (2005). Beyond orality: Investigating literacy and the literary in second and foreign language instruction. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 381–392.
- Ketchum, E. M. (2006). The cultural baggage of second language reading: An approach to understanding the practices and perspectives of a nonnative product. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 22–42.
- Kraemer, A. (2008). Happily ever after: Integrating language and literature through technology? *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 41, 61–71.
- Krueger, C. (2001). Form, content, and critical distance: The role of “creative personalization” in language and content courses. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34, 18–25.
- Laimkina, O. (2008). Teaching grammatical meaning to advanced learners: A cognitive-semantic perspective. In L. Ortega & H. Byrnes (Eds.), *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities* (pp. 161–181). New York: Routledge.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Lucot, R. (Director). (1979). *Une fille seule* [Motion picture]. France: Antenne 2.
- Magnan, S. S. (2003). Rediscovering the text: Multiple stories for language departments. *ADFL Bulletin*, 35, 9–15.
- Malle, L. (Director). (1960). *Zazie dans le Métro* [Motion picture]. France: Nouvelles éditions de films.
- 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). Articulating foreign language writing development at the collegiate level: A curriculum-based approach. In C. M. Barrette & K. Paesani (Eds.), *Language program articulation: Developing a theoretical foundation* (pp. 78–93). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Maxim, H. H. (2009a). 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: Heinle & Heinle.
- Maxim, H. H. (2009b). An essay on the role of language in collegiate foreign language programmatic reform. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 42, 123–129.
- McEwan, E. K. (2010). 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. 144–159). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- McGee, L. G. (2001). Building community and posting projects: Creating “student pages” in web-based and web-enhanced courses. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34, 534–549.
- McLean, A. M., & Savage, A. D. (2001). Surveying the survey course: A practical guide. *The French Review*, 74, 758–769.
- 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.
- Modern Language Association Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). *Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world*. Profession, 234–245.
- Mojica-Díaz, C. C., & Sánchez-López, L. (2010). Constructivist grammatical learning: A proposal for advanced grammatical analysis for college foreign language students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, 470–487.
- Montrul, S. (2010). Current issues in heritage language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 3–23.
- Nance, K. A. (2002). “Authentic and surprising news of themselves”: Engaging students’ preexisting competencies in the introductory literature course. *ADFL Bulletin*, 34, 30–34.
- Nance, K. A. (2010). *Teaching literature in the languages: Expanding the literary circle through student engagement*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (2006). *Standards for foreign language in the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.
- Ortega, L., & Byrnes, H. (Eds.). (2008). *The longitudinal study of advanced L2 capacities*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Paesani, K. (2006a). A process-oriented approach to Zazie dans le métro. *The French Review*, 79, 762–779.
- Paesani, K. (2006b). Exercices de style: Developing multiple competencies through a writing portfolio. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 618–639.
- Paesani, K. (2009). Exploring the stylistic content of Exercices de style. *The French Review*, 82, 1268–1280.
- Paesani, K. (2011). Research in language-literature instruction: Meeting the call for change? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 161–181.
- Paran, A. (2008). The role of literature in instructed foreign language learning and teaching: An evidence-based survey. *Language Teaching*, 41, 465–496.
- Péron, M. (2010). Writing history in the voice of an other: Debysers Immeuble at the advanced level. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, 190–215.
- Pfeiffer, P. C. (2008). The discipline of foreign language studies and reforming foreign language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 296–298.
- 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.
- Porter, C. (2009). The MLA recommendations: Can we get there from here? *ADFL Bulletin*, 41, 16–23.
- Queneau, R. (1947). *Exercices de style*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Queneau, R. (1959). *Zazie dans le métro*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Redmann, J. (2005a). An interactive reading journal for all levels of the foreign language curriculum. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 484–492.
- Redmann, J. (2005b). Stationenlernen: A student-centered approach to working with foreign language texts. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 38, 135–142.
- Reeser, T. W. (2003). Teaching French cultural analysis: A dialogic approach. *The French Review*, 76, 772–785.
- Rinner, S., & Weigert, A. (2006). From sports to the EU community: Integrating curricula through genre-based content courses. In H.

- Byrnes, H. D., Weger-Guntharp, & K. Sprang (Eds.), *Educating for advanced foreign language capacities: Constructs, curriculum, instruction, assessment* (pp. 136–151). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Russo, E.-M. (2006). Post-war humor in the upper-division German literature classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 39, 55–68.
- Ryshina-Pankova, M. V. (2006). Creating textual worlds in advanced learner writing: The role of complex theme. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 164–183). London/New York: Continuum.
- Ryshina-Pankova, M. V. (2010). Toward mastering the discourse of reasoning: Use of grammatical metaphor at advanced levels of foreign language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 181–197.
- Sconduto, L. A. (2008). Bringing French culture/civilization to life in the French classroom. *The French Review*, 81, 720–733.
- Scott, V. M. (2001). An applied linguist in the literature classroom. *The French Review*, 74, 538–549.
- Scott, V. M. (2004). Cloze windows and aesthetic discoveries: Opening visions for teaching literature. *The French Review*, 78, 278–286.
- Scott, V. M. (Ed.). (2010). *Principles and practices of the Standards in college foreign language education*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Steinhart, M. M. (2006). Breaching the artificial barrier between communicative competence and content. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 258–262.
- Stephens, J. (2001). Teaching culture and improving language skills through a cinematic lens: A course on Spanish film in the undergraduate Spanish curriculum. *ADFL Bulletin*, 33, 22–25.
- Stoller, F. L. (2004). Content-based instruction: Perspectives on curriculum planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 261–283.
- Swaffar, J. (2003). Foreign languages: A discipline in crisis. *ADFL Bulletin*, 35, 20–24.
- Swaffar, J. (2004). A template for advanced learner tasks: Staging genre reading and cultural literacy through the précis. In H. Byrnes & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 19–46). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Swaffar, J. (2006). Terminology and its discontents: Some caveats about communicative competence. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 246–249.
- Swaffar, J., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum: An approach through multiple literacies*. New York: The Modern Language Association.
- Távora. (Director). (1998). *Yerma* [Motion picture]. Spain: Artimagen Producciones.
- Thompson, C. (2008). Preparing students for writing and talking about literature. *ADFL Bulletin*, 40, 20–23.
- Thorne, S. L., & Black, R. W. (2007). Language and literacy development in computer-mediated contexts and communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27, 133–160.
- Urlaub, P. (2012). Understanding comprehension: Hermeneutics, literature, and culture in collegiate foreign language education. In G. S. Levine & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 43–56). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Villanueva, D. (2005). Conversation, composition, cultural investigations: Max Frisch's *Fragebogen* in the L2 classroom. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 38, 1–8.
- von Garnier, K. (Director). (1998). *Bandits* [Motion picture]. Germany: Bavaria Film.
- 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*, 42, 115–122.
- Weber-Fève, S. (2009). Integrating language and literature: Teaching textual analysis with input and output activities in 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.
- Zinn, G. (2004). Bridging the gap between upper-division writing and German studies courses with Katja von Garnier's *Bandits*. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 37, 117–131.
- Zyzik, E. (2008). A novel format for teaching Spanish grammar: Lessons from the lecture hall. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 434–453.
- Zyzik, E., & Polio, C. (2008). Incidental focus on form in university Spanish literature courses. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 53–70.

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