

AAUSC Issues in Language Program Direction 2011

Educating the Future Foreign Language Professoriate for the 21st Century

Heather Willis Allen
Hiram H. Maxim
Editors



Australia • Brazil • Japan • Korea • Mexico • Singapore • Spain • United Kingdom • United States



HEINLE
CENGAGE Learning®

**AAUSC Issues in Language
Program Direction 2011:
Educating the Future Foreign
Language Professoriate for
the 21st Century**
Heather Willis Allen,
Hiram H. Maxim
Editors

Publisher: Beth Kramer

Editorial Assistant: Laura
Kramer

Media Editor: Morgen Murphy

Marketing Program Manager:
Caitlin Green

Manufacturing Planner: Betsy
Donaghey

Rights Acquisition Specialist:
Mandy Groszko

Design and Production Services:
PreMediaGlobal

© 2013 Heinle, Cengage Learning

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this work covered by the copyright herein may be reproduced, transmitted, stored, or used in any form or by any means graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including but not limited to photocopying, recording, scanning, digitizing, taping, Web distribution, information networks, or information storage and retrieval systems, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

For product information and
technology assistance, contact us at **Cengage Learning
Customer & Sales Support, 1-800-354-9706**

For permission to use material from this text or product,
submit all requests online at **www.cengage.com/permissions**.

Further permissions questions can be emailed to
permissionrequest@cengage.com.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011938980

ISBN-13: 978-1-133-31278-9

ISBN-10: 1-133-31278-0

Heinle

20 Channel Center Street
Boston, MA 02210
USA

Cengage Learning is a leading provider of customized learning solutions with office locations around the globe, including Singapore, the United Kingdom, Australia, Mexico, Brazil and Japan. Locate your local office at **international.cengage.com/region**

Cengage Learning products are represented in Canada by
Nelson Education, Ltd.

For your course and learning solutions, visit
www.cengage.com.

Purchase any of our products at your local college store or at our
preferred online store **www.cengagebrain.com**.

Printed in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 15 14 13 12 11

Chapter 5

Preparing Graduate Student Teachers for Advanced Content-Based Instruction: Exploring Content Through Grammatical Metaphor

Marianna Ryshina-Pankova, Georgetown University

Introduction

In their overview of research on the professional development of graduate student teachers in collegiate foreign language departments, Allen and Negueruela-Azarola (2010) identify an important theme salient in numerous publications of the last two decades: the “imperative to extend graduate students’ professional development opportunities beyond first-year training and to better integrate teaching with scholarship” (p. 9). The two facets of this need are the two sides of the same coin. Teaching at the upper levels of the curriculum presupposes engagement with literary, historic, and cultural content, and thus can and should be connected to one’s field of knowledge and expertise.

The importance of this double imperative for future foreign language (FL) professors has been recognized in the profession (Arens, 1993; Barnett & Cook, 1993; Swaffar, 1991) and cannot be underestimated. First of all, knowing how to integrate scholarship and teaching or content and language instruction is instrumental for fulfilling the twofold task of research and pedagogical practices required of the college faculty. At the same time, integration of language teaching with content and one’s research is a condition for establishing the intellectual worth of foreign language departments in collegiate settings and their value in bringing about humanistic inquiry, the two aspects critical for the institutional survival of the discipline in the face of declining enrollments and limited financial support on the part of administrators. Thus, preparing future professors to implement and teach in a language- and content-integrated curriculum can have a major impact on the profession as a whole. In particular, such reorientation of graduate teacher education is consistent with the changes in the collegiate foreign language curriculum and governance structure called for by the Report of the MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages (2007):

The kind of curricular reform we suggest will situate language study in cultural, historical, geographic, and cross-cultural frames within the context of humanistic learning. We expect that more students will continue language study if courses incorporate cultural inquiry at all levels and if advanced courses address more subject areas (p. 4)... It is clear that a redesigned curriculum is a key step

in creating an integrated departmental administrative structure in which all members contribute to defining and carrying out a shared educational mission (p. 6).

In order for such an integrated and equally governed curriculum to be implemented in the future, graduate teachers today need to be educated about specific ways of transcending the language-content division and learn, particularly at the advanced level, “to address more subject areas while continuing to explicitly advance language competence” (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages, 2008, p. 290).

In this chapter, I report on the approach to prepare graduate instructors to teach at the upper levels of the literacy-oriented, content- and text-based FL curriculum of the German Department at Georgetown University. I begin with a description of the literacy approach to FL teaching and learning developed and practiced in the department as a means of integrating language and content instruction across an entire undergraduate instructional sequence. This context serves as an important framework for the training of graduate student teachers, the focus of the section that follows. After presenting various practices aimed at fostering comprehensive teacher education, I point out the challenges in developing discourse analytical abilities in graduate student instructors necessary for teaching in the integrated departmental curriculum. Emphasizing the necessity of training graduate students to discern the realization of relationship between meaning and linguistic expression in different text types and genres, I then take a closer look at the characteristics of texts typical of formal and public communicative contexts used in the upper-level courses of the program. Specifically, I single out the construct of grammatical metaphor because of its significance for advanced literacy and report on ways of exploring it with graduate students as a tool indispensable in teaching an advanced content-based course on the issues important in contemporary German society.

The final section of the chapter presents a successful materials development project with a focus on grammatical metaphor prepared by two graduate students as an end-of-the semester task in the methods course. In the project, grammatical metaphor is chosen as one of the features that can help instructors not only demonstrate the differences between two genres, but also reveal ideological positions represented in these two texts. The paper ends with brief illustrations of how an understanding of grammatical metaphor gained in a methods course relates to graduate students’ actual teaching and development as scholars.

Curricular Context: Content from the Beginning, Language to the End

The Georgetown University German program, a result of the curricular reform “Developing Multiple Literacies” initiated more than a decade ago, has been now described in various publications (Byrnes, 2001; Byrnes, Crane, Maxim, & Sprang, 2006; Byrnes, & Sprang, 2004; Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Crane, 2006; Eigler, 2001).¹ However, it is important to mention its most important

features for the purpose of delineating a context that supports the graduate students as they learn how to integrate language into content instruction and scholarship into teaching.

The curriculum consists of five levels and is built as a sequence of courses from Level 1 to Level 3 followed by nonsequenced courses at Levels 4 and 5. The program can be characterized by two principles relevant for the current discussion on preparing graduate students to teach advanced content-based courses: 1) a primary focus on meaning and content enabled through the centrality of texts at all levels of the curriculum and 2) a carefully planned progression toward advanced literacy that presupposes a long-term learner engagement and is formulated in terms of both content and language acquisitional goals.

To address the first principle, the curriculum is constructed on the assumption of a profound connection between language and various fields of knowledge. In its most important tenet, it follows Halliday's line of thinking that language is not simply an instrument for thinking and knowledge construction, but "the essential condition of knowing, the process by which experience becomes knowledge" (1993, p. 94, original emphasis). In other words, the curriculum assumes that language learning is contingent on exploration of cultural, historical and disciplinary discourses and, from the opposite end, these various discourses cannot be acquired without learning the language that construes them.

Drawing on systemic-functional and genre theory (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Martin, 1984, 1985, 1997, 1998), the curriculum overcomes the traditional separation into language- and content-based courses by virtue of being constructed around the concepts of genre and genre-based tasks (Byrnes & Sprang 2004; Byrnes, Crane, Maxim, & Sprang, 2006). As "a staged, goal-oriented social process" with a schematic structure (Martin, 1984, p. 25), genre enables one to create links between extralinguistic social context, thematic focus, and language use at various levels of the language system, from lexis and grammar to organizational structure. Tasks that are based on the texts used in the curriculum also incorporate the content-language link by asking learners to situate themselves in particular social contexts and re-create the typical generic structures as they aim to achieve certain communicative goals specified by the task.

The relationship between genre and task as curricular building blocks can be illustrated by an example from a topical unit in the Level 2 course. In this course, entitled "Experiencing the German Speaking World," students learn about Viennese art and architecture by reading and discussing an architectural manifesto (as one text among others) written by the Austrian architect Hundertwasser. As they engage in the analysis of this text about architecture as a manifesto genre, they focus on the topic of buildings and design, thereby practicing the thematically relevant vocabulary, and at the same time learn about rhetorical features central for the manifesto genre: argumentative generic structure (thesis, evidence for the thesis, implications) and expressions of argumentation (e.g., use of rhetorical questions or discourse markers of logic like *allerdings*/"however") and appeal (e.g., use of imperatives) in German. The matching task that students are asked to produce is a manifesto about a building that they would like to criticize, be it their own house or a construction on the university campus. The task offers them an

opportunity to engage with the topic of architecture, apply the generic structure of the argumentative genre to a new communicative context, and at the same time use the newly learned lexicogrammatical structures.

The second key feature that characterizes the curriculum is a principled sequencing of texts, tasks, language, and content acquisitional goals across levels that affords long-term development of FL learners toward advanced literacy. Outlining the developmental trajectories and progressions in the curriculum is also enabled by the constructs of genre and task. The gradual move toward advanced literacy is conceptualized as a transition from primary discourse genres that dominate one's personal life and are used among family and friends toward secondary discourse genres of public life that prevail in communication between nonintimates in professional and institutional settings (Gee, 1998). The genres and genre-based tasks used in the curriculum follow this progression in a gradual fashion, with primary discourses (e.g., conversations, personal narratives) dominating Levels 1 and 2 and secondary discourses (e.g., précis, public speeches) prevailing at more advanced levels.²

The progression from primary to secondary discourses can also be described as a movement from language that is interactive and oral and *accompanies* some activity (e.g., ordering a meal in a restaurant) toward language that is more reflective and written and *constitutes* social activity (e.g., writing a journal article). In Halliday's terms (1993), this is a move from dynamic and congruent conceptualization of reality that foregrounds actions and actors to noncongruent and synoptic reflection on reality by means of objectification. Lexicogrammatically, this shift is realized as a transition from verb-dominated expression to noun-dominated language use. This move becomes possible by means of grammatical metaphor in which actions are no longer congruently expressed as verbs but are incongruently construed as nouns or nominalizations and can then be further interpreted and evaluated (see a more detailed discussion in the section on grammatical metaphor). In terms of macro-genres used in the curriculum, this transition can also be seen as a gradual move from engagement with narratives toward exploration of explanations and expositions. As has been demonstrated by research in L1 (Coffin, 1997, 2006; Derewianka, 2003; Halliday, 1993; Painter, 2003) and L2 development (Byrnes, 2009; Colombi, 2006; Ryshina-Pankova, 2010; Schleppegrell, 2004a, 2004b) to be briefly reviewed in the next sections, this particular shift from narration to exposition enabled by the grammatical metaphor is key for understanding advancedness in language use and as such is a process that graduate teachers should learn about, both at the conceptual level and in its relevance for pedagogy.

Educating Graduate Students as Teachers: A Comprehensive Model

It is in the context of engagement with the articulated content-based curriculum that graduate student teachers are educated and socialized into the profession. The curriculum acts as a core around which graduate students in

close collaboration with departments' faculty members develop, using Lave and Wenger's (1991) terminology, from peripheral observers and interpreters of theoretical insights to full participants in the profession as teachers, researchers, materials developers, and curriculum designers. In this comprehensive model of graduate teacher development, there is of course also a place for a methods course³ that introduces students to various theories of language, L2 language learning and teaching methodologies, and an additional advanced second language acquisition (SLA) course that deepens their understanding of interlanguage development and ways of fostering it. While providing a broad theoretical foundation in the issues pertaining to language learning and teaching, these courses are also closely tied to curricular and pedagogic work conducted in the department. In them, students have an opportunity for extensive observation of classes at various levels, are familiarized with the departmental curricular and pedagogic documents that are shared among faculty, and are introduced to some of the questions and problematic areas in the program on which they can improve. Thus, the curriculum becomes a shared intellectual enterprise that creates structures of participation for graduate students and helps them connect theory with practical experience facilitating learning as a process of engagement in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

This engagement is further accomplished through various activities that graduate teachers are involved in when they start teaching, usually in the second year of their graduate studies. Graduate teachers participate in biweekly level meetings planned by the director of curriculum or the faculty level coordinator,⁴ where they have an opportunity to discuss and learn about various approaches to particular texts and tasks. Furthermore, graduate teachers have a chance to reflect on and improve their teaching as they discuss classroom observation visits by the director of curriculum, their faculty advisor or other faculty, and a written report based on them. Additionally, graduate students participate in formal all-departmental workshops planned by the director of curriculum and held twice annually on topics relevant to the further enhancement of the curriculum. Learning and generation of pedagogical knowledge as well as development of teacher identity by graduate students in the department are thus not a matter of one's graduate teacher mental processes, but occur, as postulated by the proponents of situated learning, as a result of "various conversations of which they are a part" (McDermott, 1993, p. 292).

In these joint conversations, graduate students play different roles that become more complex in the course of their development. Graduate instructors refine their linguistic and pedagogical abilities as they teach through the entire curricular sequence, including the most advanced upper level, where they are given an opportunity to construct their own course in their area of interest and expertise. In preparation for their own teaching, especially at the advanced levels, graduate instructors observe a course taught by more experienced faculty throughout an entire semester and participate in discussions about different activities in the course as well as in coteaching. Furthermore, graduate students play an active part in curriculum maintenance and improvement projects. They can also be assigned a supervisory role of level coordinator. Students interested in

the SLA track within the Ph.D. program take on the role of teacher-researchers, whose research findings contribute to the renewal of the curriculum (Crane, Liamkina, & Ryshina-Pankova, 2004; Weigert, 2004).

One of the major hurdles that graduate teachers struggle with as a result of this involvement in curriculum construction and teaching and that is especially relevant for this paper is the challenge of realizing the potential of genre-based instruction for integrating content and language teaching. The difficulty of this undertaking has to do with the ability to find connections in each particular text between social situations, episodic or staged textual structure, and lexicogrammar and present them to the students in order to demonstrate how meaning making is conditioned by the social context and at the same time how reality is construed by language. The intricacy here lies not only in researching the details of the context of the text, but also—and this is the biggest obstacle—in the task of identifying those linguistic features from the whole array of those that appear in the text that are salient or constitutive for producing meanings typical of that context. In other words, finding an aspect of language to concentrate on as one teaches a particular theme or topic is not much of a problem. What is difficult is to find precisely those linguistic aspects that are constitutive of the genre in question and demonstrate to the students, as they learn about a particular content theme, how situationally valid meaning making depends on the use of these linguistic features.

Systemic-functional and genre theory (Coffin, 2006; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; Martin 1984, 1985, 1997, 1998; Martin & Rose, 2008) that informs various aspects of the curriculum can be instrumental in identification of these features. For example, for the historical recount genre, it is a system of tenses, with the simple past tense (*Präteritum*) being predominant, as well as time adverbials that are key to felicitous referral to the chronology of the events in the past; for German written recipes it is infinitive-imperatives (e.g., *Tomaten schneiden*/cut tomatoes, *Käse zerstreuen*/sprinkle cheese) that are used to express instructions; for the political appeal genre (*Aufruf*), it is the use of imperatives, personal pronouns, clear organizational structure, and emotionally colored vocabulary that are instrumental for creating a convincing argument and a persuasive call for action.

One of the major directions that the department as a whole and the director of curriculum in particular take is in training graduate teachers to discern the nexus between linguistic expression, semantics, and socially determined communicative goals of the genre, on the one hand, and to apply this knowledge in pedagogy and curriculum construction, on the other hand. These connections are the main focus of the discourse analytical practice that graduate students in the department are exposed to in various activities and conversations that they participate in throughout their education, but specifically in the introductory methods course that they take in the first semester of their graduate study. In the next two sections, I will illustrate ways of developing graduate teachers' ability to link content with language instruction by focusing on the role of the linguistic construct grammatical metaphor that is central for understanding and promoting advanced language use.

Grammatical Metaphor and Advanced Literacy: From Congruent to Synoptic Meaning Making

As the curricular trajectory toward advanced literacy is charted along the continuum from personal, action-dominated, and predominantly narrative genres toward secondary, public, reflection-based, and expository ones, learners, in their engagement with the texts and tasks closer to the end of the progression, find themselves under pressure to achieve new communicative goals as they engage with the new types of texts and assignments based on them. The discourse with which learners are now confronted no longer concerns the happenings in their private lives or personal lives of others. Instead, it deals with the account and evaluation of issues of public and historical significance. Understanding and constructing such discourse requires them to use various culture or issue-specific terminologies and express relationships of classifying, comparing, and evaluating between these terms. Furthermore, as these discourses no longer involve intimate or familiar participants, they present learners with a challenge of managing relationships in communication in a formal and objective way typical of public or institutional settings. Finally, because much of this communication is increasingly conducted in a written mode, learners need to find strategies to structure their discourse rhetorically.

To fulfill the demands associated with the new type of discourse, learners need to restructure their language system. This reorganization can be described in terms of a move from a dynamic representation of experience as a process to a synoptic representation of reality as text, as an object for evaluation and interpretation (Halliday, 1993). This move toward a different conceptualization of reality is enabled through a particular transformation in grammar that advanced learners need to master, namely, through the use of grammatical metaphor. The shift toward an objectification process and the concept of grammatical metaphor that was studied initially in L1 contexts by systemic-functional linguists (Derewianka, 2003; Halliday, 1993; Ravelli 2004) can be explained by means of the following example:

Last week, the German government committee **designated** three institutions as elite universities. The **designation** of certain universities as centers of **excellence** for particular fields sets off a national discussion on the nature of **excellence**.

In this excerpt, the process of designating is realized as a verb *designate*. Expressing processes through verbs is a typical or congruent way of representing actions. In the second sentence, however, the process of designating is expressed through the noun, *designation*. Because nouns typically refer to things and static entities and not to actions, expressing processes through nouns results in an incongruent representation. Furthermore, the quality of the education in some universities would be congruently or typically expressed through an adjective, *excellent*. Yet, in the second sentence, the property of being excellent is expressed as a “thing” through a noun *excellence* (in *centers of excellence*). This movement from process or quality to thing creates entities that acquire the new semantics of static objects, at the same time retaining connection to the meaning of the original elements: of the process *designate* and of the quality *excellent*. The result

of this fusion is referred to in systemic-functional theory (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) as *grammatical metaphor*. While lexical metaphors are usually understood in terms of using one semantic entity for another semantic entity, in a grammatical metaphor the process of using one entity (a thing) for another (e.g., a process, a property, a logical relation) occurs in grammar (i.e., a grammatical class of nouns is used instead of verbs, adjectives, or conjunctions).

Turning processes or properties into nouns called nominalizations is the most productive example of grammatical metaphor. In functional terms, it allows for expansion of what one can achieve with language both in terms of ideational or content-related meanings and in terms of text organizational meanings. Ideationally, nominalized elements can be pre- and postmodified, and further reflected upon. In the excerpt cited above, the entity *designation* is explicated through the following extended noun phrases *of certain universities as centers of excellence for particular fields* and is further evaluated in terms of a cause–effect relationship: The act of designation leads to a discussion of what this designation of excellence means. Textually, the nominalization not only summarizes previous text but also shifts the discourse to a different episodic stage: in our example, from the focus on the event to the textual stage where the event is evaluated and discussed.

The significance of grammatical metaphor for literate language use in academic and professional settings has been demonstrated by an extensive body of research on L1 learner discourse (Coffin, 1997; Derewianka, 2003; Drury, 1991; Halliday, 1993; Martin, 2002; Painter, 1999, 2003; Ravelli, 2004) and in ESL (Drury, 1991; Jones, 1991; Schleppegrell, 2004a, 2004b, 2006), heritage learner (Colombi, 2006), and recently FL (Byrnes, 2009; Chen & Foley 2004; Ryshina-Pankova, 2010) contexts. Coffin (1997, 2006), for example, detailed how the ability to use grammatical metaphor can be critical for moving away from representing history as a linear narrative to understanding it causatively and producing academically valued argumentation and interpretation required at secondary and tertiary educational levels. Schleppegrell (2004a) focused on the role of grammatical metaphor in writing scientific genres and showed how it contributes to technicality, clear structuring of the text, and presentation of the writer's point of view as objective. Colombi (2006) illustrated the significance of grammatical metaphor in constructing written interpretations of history and literature by Spanish heritage learners. In the FL context, Byrnes (2009) and Ryshina-Pankova (2010) demonstrated an increase in grammatical metaphor as a crucial feature of advanced foreign language use. Byrnes described the function of grammatical metaphor in creating formality, abstractness, and textual coherence, and Ryshina-Pankova showed how it contributes to argumentative persuasiveness of texts. In short, the use of grammatical metaphor is central for accomplishing the shift required in the advanced literacy contexts toward more abstract and analytical construal of reality through language.

Grammatical Metaphor: A Tool for Language and Content Integration in Pedagogy

In this section, I will demonstrate how graduate student teachers in the methods course are introduced to the concept of grammatical metaphor as it functions to express specific types of content in advanced level expository texts and thus are

able to see it as an important instrument for understanding and integrating content and language in upper-level instruction.

In the methods course entitled “Fundamentals of German Language Instruction,” the discussion about grammatical metaphor begins as graduate students are learning about the advanced Level 4 courses. To become familiar with this level, graduate students observe classes, review curricular documents, write up observation reports, and discuss their experiences in class. The overall goal of Level 4 courses, and specifically of the course “Text in Context” that all German majors and those wishing to study abroad are required to take, is to help learners make a move in all language modalities from dynamically oriented, verb-dominated narrative genres toward synoptically oriented, noun-dominated expository genres that are most valued in academic discourse.

In the course “Text in Context,” teaching toward academic literacy occurs in the framework of three thematic areas that also reflect this progression from narrativity to exposition: 1) from a more narrative-based unit *Zivilcourage und Widerstand im Nazi-Regime und heute* (“Civil Courage and Opposition in Nazi-Regime and Today”) to 2) *Hochschulreform* (“Higher Education Reform”) and 3) *Mitten in Europa: Deutschland und die Europäische Union* (“In the Middle of Europe: Germany and the European Union,” in which expository and argumentative texts and tasks prevail. The first unit presents the topic through different types of narratives: a novel, memoirs of a witness, and a film. It ends, however, with more argumentative rather than narrating articles that interpret the phenomenon of opposition in the Nazi Germany. In their production tasks, students start with narrative exercises but end the topic by writing an expository essay on the meaning of opposition. In the second theme, students learn about the German reforms of higher education through various expository texts that lay out and explain these changes. They are then asked to analyze these texts and write a formal précis based on one of them. In the final unit, students continue the exploration of formal argumentative texts and complete the course by writing a public speech on the topic of multiculturalism in Europe and the United States.

One of the major questions that graduate students pose about this level is how an instructor can maintain a focus on thematic discussion that concerns complex social issues like educational reform, while at the same time attending to linguistic expression and enabling the above-described shift toward advanced academic literacy essential for a cognitively sophisticated engagement with complex content. Specifically, this question is about what kind of linguistic features one can focus on and how these can be tied to the discussion of content. At this point, graduate students are introduced to one such linguistic structure, grammatical metaphor, and its most productive realization, nominalizations. With the help of the materials that are described below it is demonstrated to them that this concept is a felicitous choice for a pedagogical focus at this level for two reasons: 1) because it is at the heart of the shift toward synoptic meaning making and 2) because it enables engagement with both content and text.

First, graduate students are familiarized with the goals, materials, and assignments of the second theme (*Hochschulreform* (“Higher Education Reform”) of the “Text in Context” course. They then look at one of the articles in this unit that discusses the consequences of the reform and serves as the basis for writing a précis. The article entitled *Erst pauken, dann Party* (“First Cram,

Then Party” (Wiarda, 2004) comes from the German highbrow newspaper *Die Zeit* and describes the new trend in the German higher education scene: students getting younger (*Verjüngung*) as they start and finish the university. The text is an example of an expository explanation genre (Coffin, 2006) that consists of the following generic stages: It presents a phenomenon, lays out its causes and consequences, and ends with an evaluation of the trend. Taking on the role of language learners, graduate students use this generic meta-knowledge about the text as a scaffold that helps them divide it into parts that would correspond to the stages of the genre. In the process of presenting their textual divisions, they are engaged in a discussion of the content, but also the language of the article as they justify their decisions. For example, they can use both meaning-based (what the section is generally about) and form-based (specific language feature that actually realizes the meaning) justifications to argue that the section that discusses the consequences of the trend starts with the following sentence from the article:

In Erfurt ist doch die neue Studienkultur schon heute sichtbar, was bislang nur einigen Bildungswissenschaftlern bewusst war: Das sinkende Alter der Studenten, verbunden mit den neuen, gestuften Studienabschlüssen, wird die in Jahrzehnten gewachsene Studentenkultur der Bundesrepublik mit ihrem Hang zur Gemächlichkeit nachhaltig verändern./In Erfurt, the new student culture is obvious already today, of which only some education experts have been aware up till now: the sinking age of students combined with the new staged graduation system will permanently change the decades-long student culture of the Federal Republic with its tendency toward leisureliness.

Here, the semantics of consequences is expressed both by means of announcing *the change* the younger age of students will bring with it (*das sinkende Alter der Studenten...wird die Studentenkultur...verändern*“the sinking age of students...will permanently change the...student culture”) and by means of using the grammar of prognosis—the future tense (*wird...verändern*) that is consistently employed throughout the consequence section.

The next step in our text/topic discussion is to look in detail at what individual generic stages of the text mean and how they mean it. Specifically, graduate teachers work with the stage that lists the reasons for the trend and are asked to identify the causes of the decrease in the students’ age (*Verjüngung*). What’s significant about the formulation of these causes in the text is that four out of the six identified causes are expressed synoptically as nouns (*Gebühren*“tuition fees”) or nominalizations (*Verkürzung von Wehr- und Zivildienst*“reduction of military and civilian service,” *Neigung...eine Lehre zu absolvieren*“inclination to complete an apprenticeship,” *Harmonisierung der Abschlüsse*“harmonization of the degrees”). This particular section of the text where complex processes in the society are condensed into long and complicated German nouns presents a challenge for language learners even at the advanced levels of acquisition. Two exercises that follow the initial identification of nominalizations are suggested to graduate teachers as a way to further clarify for learners the meaning and formation of

nominalizations. As a first step, learners are asked to express the first two explanations for the decrease in university students' age as nominalizations:

1. *Die meisten Bundesländer werden bis 2010 die Regelschulzeit bis zum Abitur auf zwölf Jahre zurückgeführt haben*/Most federal states *will have reduced* the standard number of school years till Abitur to twelve. → possible nominalization: *Verkürzung der Regelschulzeit*/reduction of the standard school years

2. *Immer mehr Landesregierungen schieben zudem die Einschulung nach vorn*/More and more state governments shift the beginning of schooling to an earlier age → possible nominalization: *Verschiebung der Einschulung nach vorn*/shift of the beginning of schooling to an earlier age

In contrast to the process of compressing information into incongruent grammatical metaphor forms, the second step that learners can take as they continue exploration of the concept is to unpack those causes that appear as grammatical metaphors by using verbal structures:

Harmonisierung der Abschlüsse/Harmonization of the graduation degrees→Die Studienabschlüsse in Deutschland **werden** mit denen in den anderen europäischen Ländern **harmonisiert**/Graduation degrees in Germany **are harmonized** with those in other European countries.

Here, while the nominalized form *Harmonisierung*/"harmonization" is turned back into a congruent form *harmonisieren*/"harmonize," the entire sentence structure needs to change from the attributive one that puts an emphasis on evaluation *Viel grundlegender wird sich die europaweite Harmonisierung der Abschlüsse auswirken*/"Much more crucial will be the impact of the Europe-wide harmonization of the graduation degrees" to the one emphasizing just action (*harmonisieren*/harmonize).⁵ In this process, learners have an opportunity to clarify the cause *harmonization* (before they are ready to evaluate it) by describing the process and adding necessary details to it (for example, the fact that harmonization occurs across different countries in Europe).

This type of exercise is different from a mechanical drill practice of turning nouns into verbs and the other way round, as there is a meaning rationale to the processes of packing (turning into incongruent grammatical metaphors) and unpacking (turning into congruent forms). From a meaning perspective, what precisely do synoptic formulations enable the writer of the article or learners to do? Ideationally or in terms of content, by formulating the causes as nouns, it becomes possible to objectify them and present them rhetorically as a series of succinctly presented facts or factors that one can attend to and remember. Moreover, these causes as things can be further described and evaluated, both prenominally and postnominally, so that the reader learns about various details that accompany the causes. For example, one of the factors *deutlich nachlassende Neigung der Abiturienten, vor dem Studium eine Lehre zu absolvieren*/"a clearly weakening tendency of college applicants to complete an apprenticeship before starting a university" is evaluated prenominally in terms of its intensity and is described postnominally through an infinitive clause. Furthermore, nominalizations as points in the

explanation become participants in the relational clauses where they are evaluated further as in *viel grundlegender wird sich die europaweite Harmonisierung der Abschlüsse auswirken*/"much more crucial will be the impact of the Europe-wide harmonization of the graduation degrees." Here the factor of harmonization is graded in terms of its importance as a cause for the trend in question.

Nominalizations also enter into particular logical relations and act as factors that trigger a certain causative process: *auch die Verkürzung von Wehr- und Zivildienst um insgesamt ein halbes Jahr seit der Wiedervereinigung beschleunigt den Start ins Studium*/"also, the reduction of military and community service by all in all half a year accelerates the beginning of college studies." In this sentence, the two objectified processes, *Verkürzung*/"reduction" and *Start ins Studium*/"beginning of college studies." are causatively connected by the verb *beschleunigen*/"accelerate," thereby attuning learners to such causative constructions and helping them to discover ways to realize cause besides the already familiar *weil*/"because" structure.

Textually, nominalizations can help foreground specific information (e.g., the causes of the getting younger effect) by entering into a particular organizational pattern. In this case, one can observe an additive structure where causes appear as a list of things. Indicative of the additive organization are such discourse markers of addition as *zudem*/"moreover," *auch*/"also" and *noch dazu*/"additionally."

To conclude, identifying and using nominalized forms as well as unpacking them into congruent ones is far from purely formal transformation practice and is important precisely for the purposes of content-related classroom discussion. While incongruent formulations in the form of nominalized causes, as in this genre, help create an outline of points that explain the phenomenon, learners use congruent forms in a discussion that aims to clarify and explain what the causes mean. Whereas congruent forms are important for a dialogue in class, the incongruent grammatical metaphors are indispensable in writing, as in the précis genre, for example. The following excerpt from a précis written by one of the students in the "Text in Context" course illustrates how learners use nominalizations (bold-faced) to make their summaries based on the article in question logical and concise:

*Der letzte **Grund für die Verjüngung** der Studenten an den deutschen Universitäten, den der Autor als den wichtigsten bezeichnet, ist **die Harmonisierung der Abschlüsse** in Europa. Mit Harmonisierung meint der Autor, dass alle Studenten in Europa jetzt dieselben Studienstrukturen eingehen: in Bachelor oder Master Programmen. An dem Beispiel von der Universität Erfurt erklärt er, dass die neuen Bedingungen, die diese Programme mitbringen, zwingen die Professoren, ihre Studenten besser zu betreuen und die Studenten, ihr Studium rechtzeitig abzuschliessen und nicht auf Dauer zu verlängern./The last **reason for the rejuvenation of the students** at the German universities that the author mentions as the most important is the **harmonization of graduation degrees** in Europe. Under harmonization the author alludes to the fact that all students in Europe now enter the same program of*

study structures: in bachelor and master programs. Using the example of the University of Erfurt, he explains that the new conditions that these programs bring force professors to *mentor* their students better and students to finish their studies on time and not to perpetually extend them.

In this excerpt, incongruent forms in the form of nominalizations are used to summarize the causes of the phenomenon laid out in the article, whereas the congruent structures as verbs are used to explicate the abstractly expressed causes. For example, *Harmonisierung der Abschlüsse*/"harmonization of graduation degrees" is explained dynamically as *alle Studenten jetzt dieselben Studienstrukturen eingehen*/"all students enter the same program of study structures" and *Leistungskontrolle*/"control of achievements" used in the article is unfolded as *die Professoren betreuen ihre Studenten besser*/"professors mentor their students better."

From the example above, it becomes evident that the ability to use both paradigms, the dynamic and congruent and the synoptic and incongruent, does not only concern the oral/written dichotomy. It is in fact much more about creating different levels of reasoning, from abstract to concrete back to abstract, in the hierarchy of meanings in a particular genre. Mastering both, abstract and detailed reasoning, is, indeed, at the heart of developing academic literacy.

Graduate Teachers' Materials Development Project: An Example

For the final assignment in the "Fundamentals" class, graduate students have to complete a project in which they develop teaching materials and tasks for a particular level of the program that draw on their theoretical knowledge, their reflections on the curriculum, and their class observations. In this section, I will report on one of those projects completed by two students in the fall of 2009. The description of one aspect of this final assignment aims to demonstrate how graduate students adopt the notion of grammatical metaphor and use it as a framework for content- and language-integrated didacticization of the texts selected for the final paper.

The two graduate students working on the project (Osinski & Stall, 2009) focused on the Holocaust and specifically the event of *Kristallnacht*/"Pogrom Night" and placed the unit at curricular Level 4. In the selection of the materials for the unit, graduate students aimed, on the one hand, to follow the major curricular progression from primary and dynamic to secondary and synoptic discourses and, on the other hand, planned to introduce learners to the contrastive perspectives on the event: a personal and an official public recount.

To this end, their focus in the unit entitled *Kristallnacht durch verschiedene Perspektiven*/"Pogrom Night through Different Perspectives" was on two contrastive renderings of the event: one represented by an excerpt from a letter written by a Jewish victim and eyewitness to the events and the other embodied by a newspaper article printed days after the event took place.⁶ While the letter provides a

personal and emotional recount of historically significant information and emphasizes the damage done to the Jewish homes, shops, and people deliberately planned by the Nazi government, the newspaper article written in German for the German–American public of Cincinnati conveys an official German position on the events.

In order to demonstrate to the learners how different perspectives are construed through language, the graduate student didacticization uses the synoptic/dynamic dichotomy or the contrast between the prevalence of verbs versus nouns and nominalizations in discourse that renders the events of the November pogroms:

Our main focus will be on nominalizations, which play a prominent role in the article. If students are not able to guess the function of nominalizations, we will ask them to compare descriptions of destruction from the letter. Hopefully, they will notice that those are constructed primarily through verbs, whereas in the article they are constructed through nouns.

Specifically, it is suggested that learners identify the major actions in the recounted events in the article and in the letter and write them out as they appear in these texts into a table that would look similar to Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

The table enables learners to see precisely how the Cincinnati newspaper presents the official perspective of the Nazis and the letter conveys the individual voice of the Jewish victim. It is through verbs (Table 5.1) that the article conveys vividly and concretely the actions that led to the death of the German diplomat von Rath, which served as a trigger for the *Kristallnacht*. At the same time, in the article it is by means of grammatical metaphor that specific processes are turned into abstract nominalizations, which downplay or simply conceal the violence toward Jews and the destruction of the Jewish homes: *Demonstrationen und anti-semitische Massnahmen*/"demonstrations and anti-Semitic measures," *spontane Vergeltungsakten*/"spontaneous retribution acts."

Learners can be asked to contrast this rendering with the dynamic representation of the actions of the same event in the letter excerpt. Striking parallels (see Table 5.2) can be identified: Potentially positive *Protestdemonstrationen*/"protest demonstrations" used in the article correspond to the condemnatory *die Horden haben gewütet*/"the hordes raged" in the letter, or the neutral *Vergeltungsmassnahmen*/"retribution measures" in the official news source can be compared to the appalling description of what these really entailed in personal correspondence—*sie drangen in unsere Zimmer und dann Fenster*

Table 5.1: Perspectives on the Events of **Pogrom Night**: Actions That Led to Pogroms

***Cincinnati Freie Presse*: Actions that led to pogroms**

von Rath starb/von Rath died

ein junger polnischer Jude war...eingedrungen, hatte zwei Schüsse abgefeuert/a young Polish Jew had broken in, fired two shots

Table 5.2: Perspectives on the Events of *Pogrom Night*: Synoptic vs. Dynamic Representation

<i>Cincinnati Freie Presse</i>	Letter excerpt
Demonstrationen gegen die Juden / <i>demonstrations against the Jews</i> Protestdemonstrationen vor dem französischen Reisebüro <i>protest demonstrations in front of the French travel agency</i>	Die Horden haben gewüthtet / <i>the hordes raged</i>
antisemitische Maßnahmen / <i>antisemitic measures</i> spontane Vergeltungsakten / <i>spontaneous retributive actions</i> Vergeltungsmaßnahmen / <i>retribution measures</i>	vier von den Kerls kamen mit Äxten und schweren Hämnen / <i>four of the fellows came with axes and heavy hammers</i> sie drangen in unsere Zimmer und dann Fenster eingeschlagen, die Möbel umgeworfen und draufgehauen, warfen alles zum Fenster hinaus / <i>they invaded our rooms and broke the windows, knocked down and destroyed the furniture, threw everything from the window</i>
zahlreiche Straßendemonstrationen brachten Straßengedränge / <i>numerous street demonstrations brought street crowds</i> die deutsche Bevölkerung / <i>German population</i>	zehn Minuten später kam eine Bande / <i>ten minutes later came a mob</i> Viertelstunde später kam die dritte Bande, vier große kräftige Halunken / <i>a quarter of an hour later came the third gang, four big strong rascals</i>

eingeschlagen, die Möbel umgeworfen und draufgehauen, warfen alles zum Fenster hinaus/"they invaded our rooms and broke the windows, knocked down and destroyed the furniture, threw everything from the window." Another factor that plays a significant role in the construction of different perspectives on the events can be observed in the expression of agency behind the events. While nominalizations present the agency as abstract and neutral (*deutsche Bevölkerung*/"German population," *Protestdemonstrationen*/"protest demonstrations," *Straßengedränge*/"street crowds" etc.), actions in the letter expressed by verbs require an explicit mention of subjects. These are referred to predominantly negatively as *Horden*/"hordes," *Bande*/"gang," *Halunken*/"rascals." The graduate teacher project draws attention to this contrast between describing pogroms synoptically and verbally:

Thus, they [nominalizations] create a distance from the action, working to somewhat conceal the actions behind the noun, as they do successfully in this article, thus decreasing emphasis on the actual destruction to instead highlight the death of van Rath and the embitterment of the German people.

In this project, the two graduate student teachers were able to demonstrate successfully how the analysis and discussion of the use of grammatical metaphors as nominalizations in the two texts can attune learners to the role of these constructions in production of ideological positions in political and

historical discourse. Ultimately, their project presents another example of how a focus on the form and function of grammatical metaphor can become an important instrument for integrating language, content, and critical literacy learning.

While this particular project was not implemented in teaching in the context of our program (as that would require a major change of the existing Level 4 course), graduate students continue to apply their knowledge about the forms and functions of grammatical metaphor in teaching other advanced courses in the curriculum. For example, in the Level 3 course on the history of Germany after 1945, graduate student teachers work with nominalizations to demonstrate to the learners how historical events can be condensed into entities that form a succinct chronological time line. Specifically, graduate student teachers demonstrate to the learners the contrast, a source of typical mistakes even for advanced learners of German, between interclausal and conjunctive and intraclausal and prepositional expressions of time, as in the following excerpts:

Bevor die Mauer fiel, durften die Ostdeutschen nicht frei reisen./
Before the Wall fell, the East Germans could not travel freely.

Vor dem Mauerfall konnten die Ostdeutschen nicht frei reisen./
Before the fall of the Wall, the East Germans could not travel freely.

At Level 4, graduate student teachers discuss with learners the functions of grammatical metaphor in summarizing paragraphs for a successful précis, one of the central writing tasks at this level. Furthermore, the role of grammatical metaphor in constructing ideologies has been a focus in the meetings with graduate students teaching the first unit of the Level 4 course (“Civil Courage and Opposition in Nazi-Regime and Today”). The discussion centered, for example, on the function of grammatical metaphor for constructing ideologically significant terminology in the Nazi Germany where Jews were often persecuted depending on the type of category they were assigned to:

jüdisch Versippter/related to Jews

jüdischer Mischling ersten Grades/one-half Jew, with two sides of Jewish grandparents

jüdischer Mischling zweiten Grades/one-quarter Jew, with one side of Jewish grandparents

But what is even more rewarding to see is how the concept of grammatical metaphor is employed by graduate student teachers as early as Level 1. A recent observation of a graduate student instructor revealed how she was using grammatical metaphors to organize her students’ exploration of a theme in terms of links between abstract and concrete levels of meanings and between various subtle cultural understandings of simple everyday terms. In discussing the recently introduced topic of professions (Chapter 5 in the Level 1 course), she used the

following categories formulated as nominalizations *Verdienst*/"earnings" and *Ansehen*/"prestige":

Welche Berufe haben hohen Verdienst, niedrigen Verdienst? In Deutschland, in den USA?/Which professions have high earnings/low earnings? In Germany, in the USA?

Welche Berufe haben hohes Ansehen, niedriges Ansehen? In Deutschland, in den USA?/Which professions have high prestige/low prestige? In Germany, in the USA?

As her students named various professions and answered the questions using verbs (e.g., *Ärzte verdienen viel*/"Doctors earn a lot"), the instructor listed the professions under the appropriate category. Using the nominalized categories as a scaffold to connect the concrete meanings, lexical items for profession, to the larger and more abstract aspects helped the teacher to elicit a meaning-oriented conversation around this simple theme. Even more importantly, this approach enabled her to extend learners' meaning-making potential in that they reflected about the significance of these professions within the American and German cultures, especially when this initial brainstorming was further supported by presentation of the statistics on the attitudes toward various professions in Germany.

An understanding of grammatical metaphor and an ability to see its meaning-making functions in various texts is not only instrumental for providing explicit instruction on this feature to the learners but also has an impact on the quality of teachers' classroom talk. While investigation of the actual uses of grammatical metaphor in instructor's discourse deserves a separate study, a quotation from one of the graduate student authors of the cited project on grammatical metaphor points to this other implication of familiarizing graduate students with the concept:

The awareness of the importance of grammatical metaphor has shaped my own speaking and writing in the classroom, which serve as models for my students' production of language.

As conversations with graduate student teachers reveal, this linguistic meta-consciousness about what advanced language use comprises is further transferred by them to other areas of their education beyond teaching, namely to the written and spoken tasks required of them in their graduate seminars.

Conclusion

Teaching a foreign language as a means for learning and communicating about content lies at the heart of curricular reform in K–16 foreign language education. Such a reform necessitates, as a result, a major change in teacher education. This change involves development of a new knowledge base and engagement in teaching practice that strives toward integration of content and language. In this chapter, I have emphasized the role of a holistic approach to graduate teacher education that goes much beyond traditional method courses and is rather envisioned as participation in various departmental activities. In the description of these

activities, I pointed out the central role of the carefully articulated undergraduate curriculum that serves as a core project in which graduate instructors take part, in terms of learning about different acquisition levels and instructional foci and contributing to materials development, didacticization, and teaching.

Whereas an opportunity to gain professional experience in an integrated curriculum may not present itself for all beginning teachers, graduate students as well as their mentors can still potentially benefit from the approach to expanding future teachers' education proposed in the study. The most crucial feature of this approach implementable in any context has to do with demonstrating to the graduate student instructors and materials developers the critical importance of language in the construction of meaning. In line with the recurrent call for placing the study of language as a semiotic tool in the center of foreign language teacher education (see for example, Blyth, 1997; Fox, 1992; Katz & Blyth, 2007; Katz & Watzinger-Tharp, 2008; Kinginger, 1995; Lantolf, 2009; Maxim, 2009), I argue here that introducing future language instructors to various discourse analytical techniques that help identify meaning-form connections typical of certain communicative contexts is an important part of preparing them for the integrated instruction and curriculum construction.

Precisely how graduate students can be attuned to the meaning potential of some language structures salient in certain genres has been demonstrated by the discussion of grammatical metaphor. The conducted analysis of the form and function of grammatical metaphor could be useful for teacher educators in other settings. Since grammatical metaphor has been shown to be prominent in academic and professional discourses and indispensable for the ability to engage in cognitively sophisticated literacy practices in other languages as well (see for example, Colombi, 2006; Gibbons & Lascar, 1998 for Spanish; Huang, 2002 for Chinese; Caffarel, 2006 for French), finding texts where this feature plays a crucial role in the construction of meaning and using them to introduce the notion to graduate teachers should be possible. The importance of explicitly teaching graduate student instructors about grammatical metaphor also stems from an observation that this is a feature that poses challenges particularly to nonnative speaking teachers partly because it is rarely if ever thematized in foreign-language classrooms. In this respect, addressing grammatical metaphor in a teacher preparation course can be beneficial yet for another reason: It helps nonnative students improve their own language use in literacy settings and thus advance not only their teaching expertise, but also their scholarship as well as professionalization in general.

Familiarizing graduate students with the role of language in the construction of ideational content and interpersonal relationships in texts is only the first step in teaching them to conceptualize integrated instruction. The second step is to provide them with an opportunity to conduct similar explorations on their own. The project cited in this chapter illustrates how graduate students independently selected content themes and texts that are suited for learning about these themes and how they were able to put their knowledge about language phenomena, specifically grammatical metaphor, to work in a new context. Moreover, their project demonstrated that they were able to uncover additional functions of grammatical metaphor, namely, its instrumentalization for ideological purposes especially

relevant for the discussion of the selected theme, and to operationalize the construct for content and language learning in instruction.

While exploration of how this particular project played out in actual teaching was not undertaken by the study, guiding students as they implement their projects in actual teaching is the next step mentors can take as they develop instructors' understanding of how to integrate the teaching of language and content. It is, perhaps, through experience with such mini-projects that reorientation toward integrated curriculum can gradually take root in contemporary foreign language departments.

Notes

1. See <http://www1.georgetown.edu/departments/german/curriculumproject/curriculumproject/> for more information on the curricular reform project.
2. See <http://www1.georgetown.edu/departments/german/curriculumproject/curriculumproject/> for more information on genre sequencing.
3. See http://www1.georgetown.edu/departments/german/programs/graduate_program/tadevelopment/ for the syllabus of the course.
4. Director of curriculum is a term used at GUGD in contrast to the term LPD that is common in other contexts. The main responsibilities of the director of curriculum lie in assuring curricular and pedagogical coherence of the undergraduate program, particularly at Levels 1 to 3, and include overseeing, coordinating, and providing the necessary administrative support related to teaching for graduate student instructors and for faculty level coordinators. The level coordinator is a faculty member who teaches at a particular curricular level and is responsible for coordinating all work pertaining to teaching at that level. This work specifically involves conducting meetings with graduate student instructors at the beginning, end, and throughout an academic term and making adjustments for the future teaching of a given course.
5. In line with the systemic-functional theory, the nominalization *Harmonisierung* is a participant in the **relational** process, whereas the congruent *harmonisieren* is a **material** process. It is typical for nominalizations to appear in relational clauses as this enables writers to further evaluate and interpret various processes and trends that take place in a society.
6. The letter excerpt comes from the book *Novemberpogrom 1938: Die Augenzeugenberichte der Wiener Library, London* edited by Ben Barkow. The article entitled "Antijüdische Massnahmen im Reich, anlässlich des Todes Ernst von Raths" appeared in the *Cincinnati Freie Presse* on November 12, 1938.

References

- Developing multiple literacies: A curriculum renewal project of the German Department at Georgetown University. Retrieved July 7, 2010, from <http://www1.georgetown.edu/departments/german/curriculumproject/curriculumproject/>
- Allen, H. W., & Negueruela-Azarola, E. (2010). The professional development of future professors of foreign languages: Looking back, looking forward. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(3), 377–395.

- Arens, K. (1993). Applied scholarship in foreign languages: A program of study in professional development. In D. P. Benseler (Ed.), *The dynamics of language program direction*. (pp. 33–64). Boston: Heinle.
- Barnett, M. A., & Cook, R. F. (1992). The seamless web: Developing teaching assistants as professionals. In J. C. Walz (Ed.), *Development and supervision of teaching assistants in foreign languages* (pp. 85–111). Boston: Heinle.
- Blyth, C. (1997). A constructivist approach to grammar: Teaching teachers to teach aspect. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 50–66.
- Byrnes, H. (2001). Reconsidering graduate students' education as teachers: It takes a department! *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 512–530.
- Byrnes, H. (2005). Toward a comprehensive conceptualization of teaching assistant education: Contents, commitments, structures. In D. J. Tedick, *Second language teacher education. International perspectives* (pp. 135–155). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Byrnes, H. (2009). Emergent L2 German writing ability in a curricular context: A longitudinal study of grammatical metaphor. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(1), 50–66.
- Byrnes, H., & Sprang, K. (2004). Fostering advanced L2 literacy: A genre-based, cognitive approach. In H. Byrnes, & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 47–85). Boston: Heinle.
- Byrnes, H., Crane, C., Maxim, H., & Sprang, K. (2006). Taking text to task: Issues and choices in curriculum construction. *ITL: International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 152, 85–110.
- Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., & Norris, J. M. (2010). Realizing advanced foreign language writing development in collegiate education: Curricular design, pedagogy, assessment. *Modern Language Journal*, 94 (Supplement).
- Caffarel, A. (2006). *A systemic-functional grammar of French: From grammar to discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Chen, Y., & Foley, A. (2004). Problems with the metaphorical reconstrual of meaning in Chinese EFL learners' expositions. In L. Ravelli, & R. Ellis (Eds.), *Analysing academic writing: Contextualized frameworks* (pp. 190–209). London: Continuum.
- Coffin, C. (1997). Constructing and giving value to the past: An investigation into secondary school history. In F. Christie, & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school* (pp. 196–230). London: Cassell.
- Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Colombi, C. (2006). Grammatical metaphor: Academic language development in Latino students in Spanish. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning. The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 147–163). London: Continuum.
- 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: Continuum.
- Crane, C., Liangkina, O., & Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2004). Fostering advanced-level language abilities in foreign language graduate programs: Applications of genre theory. In H. Byrnes, & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 151–177). Boston: Heinle.
- Derewianka, B. (2003). Grammatical metaphor in the transition to adolescence. In A. M. Simon-Vandenberg, M. Taverniers, & L. Ravelli (Eds.), *Grammatical metaphor. Views from systemic-functional linguistics* (pp. 185–219). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Drury, H. (1991). The use of systemic linguistics to describe student summaries at university level. In E. Ventola (Ed.), *Functional and systemic linguistics. Approaches and uses* (pp. 431–457). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eigler, F. (2001). Designing a third-year German course. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 34, 107–118.

- Fox, C. A. (1992). Toward a revised model of TA Training. In J. C. Walz, *Development of supervision of teaching assistants in foreign languages* (pp. 191–207). Boston: Heinle.
- Gee, J. P. (1998). What is literacy? In V. Zamel, & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures* (pp. 51–59). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gibbons, J., & Lascar, E. (1998). Operationalising academic language proficiency in bilingualism research. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 19(1), 40–50.
- Halliday, M. (1993). Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education*, 5(2), 93–116.
- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Huang, G. (2002). Education and linguistics. Hallidayan linguistics in China. *World Englishes*, 21(2), 281–290.
- Jones, J. (1991). Grammatical metaphor and technicality in academic writing—an exploration of ESL (English as a second language) and NS (native speaker) student texts. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Literacy in social processes: Papers from the inaugural Australian Systemic Linguistics Conference, held at Deakin University, January 1990* (pp. 178–198). Northern Territory University, Australia: Centre for Studies of Language in Education.
- Katz, S. L., & Blyth, C. S. (2007). *Teaching French grammar in context: Theory and practice*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Katz, S., & Watzinger-Tharp, J. (2008). TAs and grammar teaching: Beliefs, knowledge, and education. In J. H. Siskin, *From thought to action: Exploring beliefs and outcomes in the foreign language program* (pp. 188–212). Boston: Heinle.
- Kinginger, C. (1995). Toward a reflective practice of TA education. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study* (pp. 123–142). Boston: Heinle.
- Lantolf, J. (2009). Knowledge of language in foreign language teacher education. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 270–274.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning. Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1984). Language, register and genre. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Children writing: Reader* (pp. 21–30). Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1985). Process and text: Two aspects of human semiosis. In J. D. Benson, & W. S. Greaves (Eds.), *Systemic perspectives on discourse* (pp. 248–74). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Martin, J. R. (1997). Analysing genre: Functional parameters. In F. Christie, & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genre and institutions. Social processes in the workplace and school* (pp. 3–39). London: Cassell.
- Martin, J. R. (1998). Linguistics and the consumer: The practice of theory. *Linguistics and Education*, 9(4), 411–48.
- Martin, J. R. (2002). Writing history: Construing time and value in discourses of the past. In M. J. Schleppegrell, & M. C. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power* (pp. 87–118). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Martin, J., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre relations: Mapping culture*. London: Equinox.
- Maxim, H. H. (2009). An essay on the role of language in collegiate foreign language programmatic reform. *Unterrichtspraxis*, 42, 123–129.
- McDermott, R. P. (1993). The acquisition of a child by a learning disability. In S. Chaiklin, & J. Lave (Eds.), *Understanding Practice: Perspectives on activity and context* (pp. 269–305). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 1–11.

- MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2008). Transforming college and university foreign language departments. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(2), 287–292.
- Osinski, C., & Stall, A. (2009). Kristallnacht durch verschiedene Perspektiven. Unpublished final project for GERM 545, Fundamentals of German Language Instruction.
- Painter, C. (1999). *Learning through language in early childhood*. London: Continuum.
- Painter, C. (2003). The use of metaphorical mode of meaning in early language development. In A. M. Simon-Vandenberg, M. Taverniers, & L. Ravelli (Eds.), *Grammatical metaphor: Views from systemic functional linguistics* (pp. 151–167). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Ravelli, L. J. (2004). Signalling the organization of written texts: Hyper-themes in management and history essays. In L. J. Ravelli, & R. A. Ellis (Eds.), *Analysing academic writing: Contextualized frameworks* (pp. 104–130). London: Continuum.
- Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2010). Toward mastering the discourses of reasoning: Use of grammatical metaphor at advanced levels of foreign language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 181–197.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004a). Technical writing in a second language: The role of grammatical metaphor. In L. J. Ravelli, & R. A. Ellis (Eds.), *Analysing academic writing: Contextualized frameworks* (pp. 172–189). London: Continuum.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004b). *The language of schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2006). The linguistic features of advanced language use: The grammar of exposition. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning. The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 134–146). London: Continuum.
- Swaffar, J. (1991). Articulating learning in high school and college programs: Holistic theory in the foreign language curriculum. In S. S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges in the 1990s for college foreign language programs* (pp. 27–54). Boston: Heinle.
- Weigert, A. (2004). What's business got to do with it?: The unexplored potential of business language courses for advanced foreign language learning. In H. Byrnes, & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 131–150). Boston: Heinle.
- Wiarda, Jan-Martin. (2004, May 6). Erst pauken, dann Party/First Cram, Then Party. *Die Zeit*, 20.