

UC Berkeley

L2 Journal

Title

Textual Borrowing and Perspective-Taking: A Genre-Based Approach to L2 Writing

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8mr5c433>

Journal

L2 Journal, 10(2)

Authors

Allen, Heather Willis
Goodspeed, Lauren

Publication Date

2018

DOI

10.5070/L210235331

Copyright Information

Copyright 2018 by the author(s). This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Textual Borrowing and Perspective-Taking: A Genre-Based Approach to L2 Writing

HEATHER WILLIS ALLEN

University of Wisconsin-Madison
E-mail: hwallen@wisc.edu

LAUREN GOODSPEED

University of Wisconsin-Madison
E-mail: lgoodspeed@wisc.edu

This qualitative study explored the impact of reading on writing in a collegiate French culture course that emphasized genre-based writing pedagogy. In particular, the study focused on how 19 advanced collegiate learners of French used model text resources in writing a letter-manifesto and what their perceptions were of participation in genre-based writing instruction. Based on this study's findings, the authors make an argument for how genre-based pedagogy can facilitate advanced literacy development in a FL. They also highlight challenges of this pedagogy and directions for future research and implementation in collegiate FL programs.

INTRODUCTION

Collegiate foreign language (FL) education in the United States in the 21st century is a dynamic environment. While post-9/11 critical language initiatives were a boon to some FL programs, the 2015 Modern Language Association (MLA) report revealed a trend of decreasing enrollments in 11 of the top 15 languages between 2009 and 2013, influenced in part by the global economic crisis triggered in 2008. These decreases occur as collegiate FL departments struggle to articulate and defend the intellectual benefits of advanced language study on campus and beyond, and against frequent challenges from the political arena regarding the value of diversity and global interconnectedness—elements often associated with FL study (Redden, 2017).

In light of these trends, the fact that most students abandon FL study upon completion of university-mandated requirements is not entirely surprising. The MLA (2015) reported that for French, German, Japanese, and Spanish there was just one enrollment in an advanced undergraduate course for every five introductory-level enrollments in 2013, whereas the ratio was 1:4 in 2009. Urlaub (2014) noted that collegiate FL departments face ever-increasing difficulty to “inspire beginning language learners to continue their studies in the upper-level curriculum and crown their efforts with a baccalaureate in a foreign language” (p. 123). This struggle to retain FL enrollments beyond institutional requirements results in part from the much-discussed language-literature divide in many programs. In lower-level courses, instruction is typically anchored in principles of communicative language teaching and focused on functional language use, while advanced courses tend to emphasize

literary-cultural content. As the pedagogical approach is often determined by individual instructors, a lack of consistency may exist across courses (Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy, 2016). The resulting incoherence can be detrimental to student learning and can prevent FL units from demonstrating their intellectual relevance to the larger university mission (Paesani & Allen, 2012).

Addressing the language-literature divide, the 2007 MLA Report advocated a “more coherent curriculum in which language, culture, and literature are taught as a continuous whole” through textual learning as a means of fostering translingual and transcultural competence (p. 3). Despite its bold vision for transforming collegiate FL programs’ intellectual aims, the Report has been criticized for its lack of clarity as to *how* students will reach those aims (Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010). Perhaps for this reason, the language-literature divide persists in many collegiate FL programs (see Lomicka & Lord, in press) and various approaches have been explored to create a more coherent curriculum, including Standards-, literacy-, and genre-based instruction (Paesani & Allen, 2012). Among these, genre-based pedagogy—the focus of the current publication—entails selecting and sequencing instructional content so learners are systematically led to understand the purpose, function, context, and linguistic resources associated with texts (Maxim, 2009a).

This article reports on a qualitative investigation of implementing genre-based pedagogy in an advanced collegiate French course. Although this approach has been investigated by several researchers in collegiate German programs (e.g., Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Crane, 2016; Warren & Winkler, 2016), publications exploring genre-based pedagogies in post-secondary FLs other than German remain primarily descriptive (e.g., Allen, 2009; Kumagai & Iwasaki, 2016; Sommer, 2016). Moreover, research on this approach in collegiate FL programs tends to focus on learning outcomes rather than on learner perspectives on this pedagogy. It is our view that research should further investigate both the process of collegiate FL learner participation in genre-based pedagogy—that is, what learners actually *do* as they engage in this approach and how they relate to it—and its learning outcomes.

Our study addressed two questions: 1) How do advanced collegiate learners of French use model text resources as they participate in genre-based writing? and 2) What are their perceptions of participation in genre-based writing? These questions aimed to explore the dynamic interplay of learners’ movement between reading and writing in genre-based pedagogy through their written French texts, and their views on the impact of this approach for their development as writers of French. Based on analysis of learner artifacts and pedagogical examples, we make an argument for how genre-based pedagogy can facilitate advanced FL literacy development. We also highlight challenges encountered in implementing this approach and suggest directions for future research and curricular design.

Our study was conducted in a third-year French course, typically referred to as a “bridge course” at the fault line between language- and literature/culture-oriented courses. A perennial challenge encountered in such courses is the long-standing belief that collegiate FL students arrive at this level possessing sufficient linguistic capacities to participate fully in discussions and produce sophisticated texts independently, with no further need for instructional attention to issues of advanced language use. However, numerous studies (e.g., Darhower, 2014; Donato & Brooks, 2004; Polio & Zyzik, 2009) have demonstrated that classroom discourse patterns and instructional prioritization of content over form in upper-level FL courses inhibit the development of advanced proficiency and that learners need increased opportunities to attend to linguistic matters to use language in advanced ways. The pedagogical grounding for our study takes into account insights gleaned from these studies—namely, that all levels of FL study should balance emphasis on form and content

and should include explicit instruction in appropriate language use.

In the following section, we discuss how a literacy-based approach can address the language-content divide that often occurs in so-called “bridge” courses. Specifically, we explain how a focus on genre-based pedagogy can provide learners with important resources for FL writing at this level. We then introduce some theories that inform genre-based pedagogy and discuss the role of intertextuality in helping learners move between reading and writing. Lastly, we review research on textual borrowing in FL instructional contexts, the site of our study.¹

ADDRESSING THE LANGUAGE-LITERATURE DIVIDE THROUGH LITERACY- AND GENRE-BASED PEDAGOGIES

As previously stated, literacy-based instruction is one approach that has been explored to address the language-literature divide in collegiate FL programs. Models of literacy and language teaching in FL education build on reconceptualizations from New Literacy Studies within education research. Beginning in the 1990s, New Literacy Studies redefined *literacy*, moving beyond the idea that it relates to ‘basic’ competency in reading and writing to encompass the dynamic communicative practices of late 20th century society and the impact of globalization, the Internet, and mass media (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015). Accordingly, developing FL literacy depends on learners’ engagement in *literacy events*, in which they make meaning through using, interpreting, and creating texts (Kern, 2000, p. 17). To engage successfully in literacy events, learners must be guided to understand and use appropriate textual features to make meaning in the FL; draw on cognitive strategies to construct meaning and overcome learning challenges in FL use; and build awareness of cultural products, practices, and perspectives to interpret and create FL texts. According to Kearney (2012), building awareness of cultural perspectives is particularly critical to FL literacy development, as *perspective-taking* allows learners to shift their point of view and “gain awareness of the existence of different meaning-making resources and become more adept in interpretation of language-, culture-, and context-specific meanings” (p. 61). In Kearney’s study, perspective-taking involved third-year collegiate French learners writing memoirs of a character they invented after studying events and history from World War II. This use of writing highlights one of its key characteristics for FL literacy development, namely that it “allows learners’ language use to go beyond purely ‘functional’ communication,” offering the possibility of “creat[ing] imagined worlds of their own design” (Kern, 2000, p. 172).

Learning to write in a literacy-based approach involves coming to understand what is considered appropriate in a given context and what makes writing effective and interesting (Hall, 2001). Thus, this approach recognizes the necessity of focusing not just on linguistic features but also on knowledge of reader expectations and cultural preferences, on how to carry out a writing task, and on knowledge of the purposes and conventions of a given text type (Hyland, 2011). Literacy-based writing instruction places special emphasis on genre and the idea that making meaning in writing goes beyond individual self-expression. Learners are sensitized to the idea that creative freedom exists within constraints related to textual genre (Maxim, 2005). *Genre* (Martin, 2009), is a staged, goal-oriented social process. Genres are staged because they required multiple “moves” to be realized; they are goal-oriented because

¹ We chose to review literature on genre-based pedagogy that was most similar to our own focus and context. For a complete review of empirical studies on how L1 and L2 writers develop genre knowledge, see Tardy (2006).

they have a purpose; and they are social processes because they involve both readers and writers. This definition of genre highlights the social nature of writing, a key aspect of literacy-based instruction. Indeed, Swaffar and Arens (2005) emphasize the social situatedness of writing when they describe genre as “an oral or written rhetorical practice that structures culturally embedded communicative situations in a highly predictable fashion, thereby creating horizons of expectation for its community of users” (p. 99). Both of these definitions underscore how genres are patterned in certain ways within specific cultural contexts that members of those communities anticipate, use, and adapt. The goal of genre-based writing instruction, therefore, is to develop learners’ abilities to understand and manipulate the obligatory—or required—and optional “moves” that contribute to that horizon of expectations for readers in a given context.

While theories of genre point to a clear end goal for writing instruction, the question of *how* to enact genre pedagogy is more complicated. Pedagogies for genre-based writing have been theorized and studied through two main schools: English for Academic Purposes (ESP) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). While both approaches aim to sensitize learners to the patterned nature of genres, ESP focuses more on how genres are used within specific discourse communities and SFL emphasizes how language is used to realize genres (Hyland, 2007). While conceptualizations of genre in ESP and its pedagogical emphases have seen considerable uptake in L2 English teaching contexts (Hyland, 2016), SFL has been promoted as an ideal approach to genre in FL teaching contexts due its focus on language (Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010). Within SFL-informed genre approaches, writing instruction has been conceptualized as a cycle comprising three stages. The cycle begins with a deconstruction stage wherein learners become sensitized to how a genre is realized, followed by joint construction where teachers and learners collaboratively re-construct the genre based on features uncovered during deconstruction. Lastly, an independent construction phase occurs wherein learners produce the genre (Rothery, 1996). It should be noted, however, that these stages are flexible in that the relative amount of attention given to each may vary depending upon learners’ prior knowledge and classroom priorities.

Because genre-based pedagogy involves building learner awareness of the moves associated with specific text types and how these moves are realized linguistically and stylistically, the relationship between reading and writing plays a crucial role in learning activities. When moving between reading and writing, learners are asked to draw on the conventionalized language and forms of a particular text type. *Intertextuality* is the notion that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another” (Kristeva, 1986, p. 37). In other words, writers rely on prior knowledge of language use in texts to create new ones—they do not invent new language for every communicative situation. While communication relies on convention to create a horizon of expectation (Swaffar & Arens, 2005), writers also infuse their texts with a certain level of individuality. According to Bakhtin (1981), all speech acts involve negotiation of both centralizing forces, which allow for mutual understanding, and decentralizing forces, which allow for individual expression. It is those centralizing forces, or textual conventions, that are a focus of explicit instruction in genre-based pedagogy. Maxim (2009b) explained the aim of such instruction, stating, “[t]he better our understanding of specific genres, the more freedom we have to use them” (p. 102). Indeed, as learners develop better awareness of how genres are constructed and used, they become more able to use, manipulate, and even subvert text types for their own purposes. The uptake, then, of conventionalized forms and language is a type of intertextuality not only expected but encouraged in genre-based pedagogy.

Some research on genre-based FL pedagogy has investigated how writers remix and redesign previously encountered texts using the concept of *textual borrowing*, or appropriation of model text features at the discourse, sentence, and word levels for use in learners' own writing (Maxim, 2009b). This understanding of textual borrowing, which mirrors our own, highlights the role of model texts in providing learners with meaning-making resources for their own writing. Textual borrowing has been investigated most often in English L2 learning contexts and has been problematized in relation to plagiarism (e.g., Currie, 1998; Pennycook, 1996). In collegiate FL instruction, two studies (Maxim 2009b; Warren & Winkler, 2016) have explored textual borrowing in a curriculum focused on genre and literacy development. Maxim examined how six advanced German learners' textual borrowing practices evolved over a semester using data from four writing tasks and interviews. Quantitative analysis of learner borrowings revealed considerable variation between and within writing tasks. Qualitative analysis helped to explain this variation through task differences and revealed learners' positive perceptions of textual borrowing as part of genre-based pedagogy. Warren and Winkler compared learners' writing practices in three course sections of Elementary German. Instructors in two experimental sections used explicit instructional techniques to didacticize one key feature—evaluation—of a model text recounting a travel experience, while in the control section, that feature was not addressed explicitly. Analysis of learner texts revealed that explicit focus on evaluation was related to learners' increased language production in German including longer stretches of discourse in comparison with learners in the control section. The authors concluded that genre-based pedagogy boosted student confidence and willingness to communicate and helped them to “begin to develop a metaliteracy for approaching texts and language learning ... cultivat[ing] awareness of metalinguistic aspects of language use and learning, of language's communicative function, and its situatedness” (p. 52). The present study intended to extend research on textual borrowing in collegiate FL contexts by expanding the focus on learners' perspectives of and experiences with this pedagogy.

INSTRUCTIONAL CONTEXT, DATA COLLECTION, AND ANALYSIS

The aims of the present study were to explore how 19 advanced collegiate learners of French used model text resources as they participated in genre-based writing (RQ1) and to examine their perceptions of genre-based writing (RQ2). To better situate the data collection and analysis, we first provide a description of the instructional context. This description includes a presentation of the course's goals and organization as well as an explanation of the role and implementation of genre-based writing in the course. We subsequently describe data collection and analysis procedures.

Instructional Context

This study took place during Spring 2016 in a fifth-semester collegiate French course entitled “Advanced French Language and Culture” at a large public Midwestern university. Course learning objectives focused on development of knowledge of contemporary French culture, cultural and cross-cultural analysis skills, interpretive and presentational communicative abilities, and development of lexico-grammatical knowledge in French on cultural myths, regional identities, and contemporary social issues in France.

Of the 22 learners in the course, 19 participated in the study. Among the participants, 12

identified as female, 6 as male, and 1 chose not to respond. Nearly half were first-year students and just over two-thirds had begun French study in middle or high school, many of whom completed Advanced Placement French courses. Four participants were completing a French minor; two were completing a French major. Both researchers were intimately familiar with the study context: one designed the course and served as instructor while the other helped plan and implement genre-based writing instruction and observed class sessions several times throughout the semester.

Course content was organized around three thematic modules related to the question “*Qu’est-ce qu’être français aujourd’hui?*” [What does it mean to be French today?]. In Module One, learners examined definitions of culture as well as French cultural symbols, stereotypes, and myths. Module Two focused on the links between geography and identity through the study of regional identities, recent territorial reform in France, and conceptions of Parisian and provincial life. Module Three introduced students to several contemporary social issues in France including immigration, politics, religion, and the educational system.

In each module, learners engaged in a cycle of reading and viewing texts accompanied by online discussion forum homework and in-class discussion activities. These activities developed students’ conceptual and sociocultural understandings of the course’s themes and their ability to communicate about them in French. A genre-based writing project served as the culminating activity for each module and represented a combined 30 percent of students’ final grade. Genre-based writing projects were chosen as a major assessment piece due to the way they link language and culturally based social practices. The projects required learners to synthesize cultural knowledge gained over the course of the module, to analyze the features of one to two model texts, and to apply cultural and genre knowledge to create their own text. The persuasive letter that served as a model text for Module Three, hereafter referred to as a letter-manifesto, was a six-page excerpt of Nicolas Sarkozy’s (2007) “[Lettre aux éducateurs](#),” written by the then-President of France to convince teachers and the public of the imperative for major educational reform. In contrast with the two previous projects where learners read two examples of the targeted genre, learners were only provided with one model text due to time constraints. Although the use of one textual model for the letter-manifesto is a limitation of implementing genre pedagogy for this module, learners were exposed to three other examples of persuasive writing prior to reading the model text. For their own text, learners were instructed to address a current French government official in relation to one of four social issues; to describe their perspective and its connection to their position; to suggest possible solutions to the issue described; and to conclude with a call to action (see Appendix A). Learners also completed a self-reflection wherein they described the stylistic techniques used in their letters, the impact of analyzing the model text on their letter, and the aspects of writing with which they felt most satisfied compared to those which they found most challenging.

The instructional sequence was based on four stages (see Table 1) adapted from Rothery (1996) for genre-based writing instruction. We use the term “stage” here in accordance with pedagogies developed from genre theory. It is not our intention, however, to imply that this pedagogy is formulaic or static. Rather, these stages represent a general arc for designing instruction.

Table 1
Pedagogical Sequence for Genre-based Writing

Stage	Activities
1	Immersing learners in textual content & context, establishing comprehension of text's main ideas & supporting details
2	Facilitating learner awareness of specific linguistic & schematic resources in model text(s) & of how form-meaning connections are made
3	Pre-writing—identifying specific linguistic & schematic resources from the model text to use in creating a new text
4	Creating a new text, Revising/Editing, Reflecting

In Stage 1, learners read the model text at home and completed activities to establish comprehension of the text's main ideas. For Stage 2, learners examined the text's major moves and collaboratively analyzed its rhetorical features. An instructional conversation, aided by a projection of the model text wherein Sarkozy's letter-manifesto was broken into its main sections, was used to sensitize learners to its organization and rhetorical techniques (i.e., the purposes of personal pronouns throughout the text, the use of repetition for emphasis, and the call to action at the text's end). Learners also hypothesized reasons for using these techniques and their effect on the reader. This discussion sensitized learners to how language is used to create reader-writer relationships in persuasive writing, expanding on their knowledge from previous genre-based projects.² Stage 3 activities, completed at home, involved identifying the social issue learners wanted to focus on, researching which French government official they should address, developing a *semantic field*³ for their topic, and choosing features from Sarkozy's letter to use in their text. While the term "textual borrowing" was never explicitly introduced to learners, they were instructed to use the Sarkozy letter as a model and identify elements of it for use in their own text (see Appendices B and C for prompts and Stage 2 and 3 materials). Finally, in Stage 4, learners wrote their letter-manifesto before critically reflecting on their work.

² The construction of reader-writer relationships was also a focus of discussion in the Module One and Module Two genre-based projects. In Module One, learners wrote a descriptive narrative about an important cultural symbol and a portion of the discussion centered on how the author used imagery and evoked the five senses to give the reader an all-encompassing impression of a cultural experience. In Module Two, an important feature of the discussion of a film critique centered on how the author built credibility by expressing opinions as facts in avoiding the first person.

³ Because learners were allowed to write their letter-manifestos on topics other than the one in the model text, they needed to build up additional linguistic resources and cultural content to discuss their chosen topic. To provide assistance in this regard, the instructor supplied a list of additional texts related to each topic, which learners independently mined for lexicon and grammar crucial to making meaning in their texts (Byrnes, Crane, Maxim, & Sprang, 2006).

Data Collection

This study aimed to explore FL learners' use of resources from model texts in their own writing (RQ1) and to better understand the perceptions learners had of genre-based writing (RQ2). Data sources included participants' pre-writing documents, letter-manifesto texts, and self-reflections on participating in genre-based writing and the resulting text (see Appendix A for reflection prompt). Participants' texts were the primary data source for RQ1 with the pre-writing documents serving as a means of validation. Basing the initial coding scheme on learner-created lists of textual features helped to reduce researcher bias in analysis. Participants' self-reflections were the principal data source for RQ2.

The Module Three writing project was selected for analysis for two reasons. First, among the three writing projects completed during the semester, the final one allowed the most flexibility in topic selection, perspective-taking, and intended audience. Second, by the final project, learners were familiar with instructor expectations for their participation in genre-based writing through feedback on previous work and were presumably more familiar with the model text's role as a resource for textual borrowing in the creation of a new text.

Data Analysis

The authors took a qualitative approach to data analysis. Data coding and analysis were facilitated by the use of qualitative coding software.⁴ To begin analysis, the researchers derived a list of rhetorical features from participants' pre-writing documents in which learners specified model text features they intended to borrow. The researchers used this aggregated list of features to identify participants' textual borrowings by coding learners' texts for presence of these features when they exhibited commonalities with the model text. The original code list was refined and expanded as the researchers discovered additional borrowings between the model text and participants' texts that participants had not explicitly identified in pre-writing documents. The original code list derived from participants' pre-writing documents included call to action, making a concession, directly addressing the reader, expressing desires, posing a hypothetical question, referring to the collective, and using repetition. We expanded these codes during analysis when learner texts clearly echoed the model, adding codes for employing a rhetoric of responsibility, expressing urgency, explicitly introducing the topic, identifying actors for change, and replicating the visual format. Self-reflections were first coded for content related to genre-based writing (i.e., value of model text analysis, satisfaction, and dissatisfaction or difficulty) to examine how learners perceived the pedagogical practice as well as their texts. The authors reviewed each content category for emergent themes and performed lexical queries to understand what aspects of genre-based writing participants viewed more or less favorably.

Analysis of all data was verified using multiple strategies. First, grounding the textual feature codes in participants' identification of features to borrow helped to mitigate researcher bias. Second, a recursive, dialogic process allowed the researchers to reach consensus on the definitions of the codes and their application to segments of participants' texts. Throughout analysis, the researchers frequently reviewed codes and discussed and documented code definitions. Lastly, both researchers independently coded all participants' texts before discussing and revising the coding scheme, reaching an intercoder agreement of

⁴ Both researchers used MaxQDA to code study documents.

87.22 percent. Coding of self-reflections was verified dialogically, as the researchers coded these artifacts together.

FINDINGS

In the following pages, we present findings on 19 advanced collegiate French learners' use of model text features for creating a letter-manifesto (RQ1) and perceptions of participation in genre-based writing (RQ2). Learner data appears exactly as written by participants, and translations are provided for excerpts originally written in French. Among the 19 participants, seven chose to focus their letter-manifesto on the need for educational reform in France (the topic treated in the model text), whereas six focused on immigration, five on terrorism, and one on religion. The perspectives adopted by participants were varied and included those of: an ally for others impacted by the letter's topic (five); a middle or high school student (four); a government official (three); a parent (three); and a university student (three).⁵ While all students shared a common writing task, they explored a variety of perspectives through their letters. In the next section, we summarize how participants used model text features in their letter-manifestos.

Research Question One: How Did Learners Use Model Text Features as They Participated in Genre-Based Writing?

Analysis of the participants' letter-manifestos revealed evidence of both commonalities and differences in how they used model text features. On average, their texts contained 8 of the 14 textual features (range: 4-12) identified by the researchers. As suggested by the variation in the number of model text features incorporated into participants' texts, certain textual features were borrowed more than others (see Table 2). Most participants used stylistic techniques (e.g., direct address, repetition, and rhetorical questions). For example, as seen in Sarkozy's letter wherein he addressed the reader directly 33 times using the pronoun "vous" [you] and 15 times using "votre/vos" [your], 17 participants incorporated the same style of direct address in their texts. The model text also used repetition four times to begin sentences with expressions including "je souhaite que" [It is my wish that], "je pense" [I think], "si je souhaite" [If I want], and "chacun d'entre nous" [each of you]. Likewise, 17 participants employed similar types of repetition. Fourteen participants' texts included rhetorical questions that paralleled the uses of this stylistic technique in the model text, in which Sarkozy asked, "*Que voulons-nous que deviennent nos enfants?*" [What do we want our children to become?].

⁵ In the case of one participant's text, the perspective was undefined.

Table 2
Frequency of Borrowing of Model Text Features

Textual feature	Number of participants who borrowed the feature ($N = 19$)
Incorporating direct address (S)	17
Repeating key words or phrases (S)	17
Referencing the collective (S/R)	17
Posing a rhetorical question (S)	14
Expressing personal beliefs on the topic (R)	13
Making a call to action (R)	12
Employing a rhetoric of responsibility (R)	11
Expressing urgency of action (R)	11
Referring to the past (R)	10
Explicitly introducing the topic of the text (R)	10
Acknowledging challenges (R)	9
Expressing desires for instantiating change (R)	9
Identifying actors for instantiating change (R)	8
Replicating the visual format of model text (O)	6

Note. S = Stylistic technique; R = Rhetorical technique; O = Organizational technique

In general, stylistic techniques were taken up by more learners than rhetorical techniques. One exception was referencing the collective, coded twice for its dual function as both stylistic and rhetorical (i.e., invoking a sense of common purpose among community members) and was noted in 17 participants' texts. For example, Paula wrote, "*L'avenir de notre pays est dans les mains de nos enfants. Donc, c'est notre responsabilité d'assurer que nos élèves ont des défis à l'école*" [The future of our country is in the hands of our children. Therefore, it is our responsibility to ensure that our children are challenged in school]. The final coding category of textual features related to how participants' letter-manifestos were formatted visually; just six participants imitated the model text's conventions related to its salutation, paragraph-level organization of content, and closing. Participant texts that only partially paralleled the model text's formatting conventions were not coded as reflecting this feature.

Table 3
Call to Action Macro-Feature in the Model Text

Call to Action: Model text	Codings
<p>Chacun d’entre vous, je le sais, mesure l’importance du défi que nous avons à relever. Chacun d’entre vous comprend que la révolution du savoir qui s’accomplit sous nos yeux ne nous laisse plus le temps pour repenser le sens même du mot éducation. Chacun d’entre vous est conscient que ... le monde a besoin d’une nouvelle Renaissance, qui n’advient que grâce à l’éducation. À nous de reprendre le fil qui court depuis l’humanisme de la Renaissance jusqu’à l’école de Jules Ferry [...]. Le temps de la refondation est venu. C’est à cette refondation que je vous invite. Nous la conduirons ensemble. Nous avons déjà trop tardé. (President Sarkozy, Education)</p>	<p>Direct Address Collective Repetition Collective Urgency Direct Address Collective</p>
<p><i>Each one of you, I know, understands the weight of the challenge that lies before us. Each one of you understands that the knowledge revolution happening before our eyes no longer allows us time to even reconsider the meaning of the word education. Each one of you is aware that ... the world needs a new Renaissance that can only come to pass through education. It’s up to us to take up the thread that runs from the humanism of the Renaissance through the school of Jules Ferry. The time for reform has come. It’s to this reform that I invite you. We will lead it together. We have already waited too long.</i></p>	

Table 4

Participant Borrowings of Model Text's Call to Action

Participant borrowings (in bold)	Codings
<p>C'est vous et c'est nous qui doivent faire quelque chose pour confronter ces problèmes d'immigration et d'intégration dans notre pays aujourd'hui. L'implication et la création des lois sont vos responsabilités, mais c'est nous, les citoyens, qui doivent changer l'esprit du pays. C'est à nous de créer une différence, et je vous invite à vous lever, de ne rester pas silencieux pendant cette période essentielle. (Addison, Immigration)</p> <p><i>It is you and it is we who must do something to confront these immigration and integration problems in our country today. Creating and applying laws is your responsibility, but it is we, the citizens, who must change the mindset of the country. It's up to us to make a difference, and I invite you to stand up, to not remain silent in this crucial moment.</i></p>	<p>Direct Address, Collective Collective Direct Address</p>
<p>Maintenant est l'heure pour le changement. Il n'y a pas eu le sens de la sécurité depuis trop longtemps et il est le temps de travailler ensemble de former un nouveau pays plus fort. Avec l'aide des professeurs, des parents et des membres de la société, nous pouvons protéger le bien de la France pour l'avenir. (Nicole, Terrorism)</p> <p><i>Now is the time for change. There has not been a sense of security for too long and it's time to work together to create a new, stronger country. With the help of teachers, parents, and members of society, we can protect the well being of France for the future.</i></p>	<p>Urgency Collective</p>
<p>C'est le moment pour la réforme. C'est le moment pour la France d'être un exemple. Madame, s'il vous plaît aider à faire de la France un pays accueillant pour tous. (Danielle, Immigration)</p> <p><i>It's time for change. It's time for France to be an example. Madam, please help make France a welcoming country for all.</i></p>	<p>Urgency, Repetition Direct Address</p>

As we reviewed the coding of participants' textual borrowings, we noted a constellation of features used by several students whose letter-manifestos included a call to action. These features seemed to function as micro-features of a macro-level call to action feature, which included referencing the collective and expressing urgency (each present in seven of the 12 texts), direct address (six texts), and repetition (four texts). Table 3 displays the model text's call to action; Table 4 contains three participants' realizations of the call to action. For both tables, codes show the micro-features associated with the call to action macro-feature and how textual borrowing occurred.

Analysis of who borrowed which features from the model text revealed several noteworthy phenomena. First, the seven participants who wrote about education borrowed fewer features on average ($M = 7.43$) than the 12 participants who wrote about immigration, terrorism, or religion ($M = 9.17$). A difference also existed in the average number of textual features borrowed based on the perspective represented in the participants' texts. The 15 students who wrote from an adult perspective borrowed an average of nine textual features (range: 6-12, $Mdn = 9.5$) whereas the four students who wrote from the perspective of a middle school or high school student borrowed an average of six features (range: 4-9, $Mdn = 5$). This apparent relationship between the frequency of textual borrowing and the participant's perspective is revisited in the Discussion section.

Research Question Two: What Were Learners' Perceptions of Participating in Genre-Based Writing?

Analysis of participants' self-reflections provided evidence of their perceptions of both genre-based pedagogy and their own writing. Overall, participants exhibited positive attitudes towards genre-based pedagogy and more statements of satisfaction than dissatisfaction with their writing. Table 5 summarizes participant perspectives on genre-based writing based on self-reflections.

Table 5
Participant Perceptions of Genre-based Writing

Themes	Number of participants who mentioned this theme ($N = 19$)
<u>Value of analyzing a model text</u>	
helps to understand conventions	9
helps to understand textual organization or text type required for the project	7
<u>Expressions of satisfaction</u>	
with textual content	8
with expression in French	7
with the perspective represented in their text	6

with the tone used in their text	5
<u>Expressions of dissatisfaction</u>	
with grammatical forms or attempts to self-correct	8
with the content of their text	6
with the perspective represented in their text	3

In their self-reflections, 18 participants described reading and analyzing the model text as a helpful contribution to their understanding of the text type or facilitating their writing.¹ For example, Noah wrote:

Analyzing the Sarkozy letter helped me a lot. It made me realize what needed to be put in a ... letter as well as how it is organized. I wrote out my outline based on what was said during [the] lecture on how his letter was organized and what it contained, and it made writing my own letter a lot easier. Also, it helped me implement the repetition to see how he did so I could use it as an example in my writing.

According to Noah, analyzing the model text was valuable for both understanding the moves of this genre and for seeing how a particular stylistic technique was used in the text. In total, nine participants commented that working with the Sarkozy text helped them understand conventions of the letter-manifesto genre, while seven mentioned the utility of analysis for understanding the text's organization and project requirements. Nick, for instance, reflected on how the workshop helped him understand not only the structure of a manifesto-letter, but also its main rhetorical devices: "without [the model text], I would have had no idea what structure, style, or rhetorical devices to use."

In relation to participants' perceptions of their own writing, they appeared to be more satisfied than dissatisfied with their texts. Analysis revealed 28 codings for satisfaction and 26 for dissatisfaction or challenges. Although learners were asked to comment on sources of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction, the slightly larger focus on positives over negatives points to learners' overall satisfaction. Eight participants were most satisfied with their letter's content, while seven were satisfied with their ability to express themselves in French, themes we will later discuss in more detail. Six participants described satisfaction related to perspective-taking, for example, the "confidence displayed by my character" (Nicole) and the "part of my letter where I am talking about my character's experience on social media" (Yvette). Five participants discussed satisfaction with their letter's tone or ways in which their text aimed to incite a reaction from the reader. The focus on the reader came through in Nicole's remark that in her letter, "the point gets across that the topic is a very serious and urgent one" and in Keith's satisfaction with "the emotional message behind [his] argument." Ten participants commented on being satisfied with these holistic aspects of writing such as tone, style, and organization, while eight participants discussed wanting to improve these elements.

Despite participants' reported satisfaction with their texts' content and their expression in

¹ The only participant who did not describe the model text as helpful made no mention of the model text in her reflection.

French, these were also areas where some felt the least satisfied. Six described dissatisfaction with their textual content and eight with their expression in French. Among these, four discussed both strengths and weaknesses of their letter's content or their expression in French, noting both satisfaction and dissatisfaction related to the same topics. Further analysis revealed differences in what learners felt satisfied with and what challenged them. Kacey, for example, was satisfied with her text's content about education, written from the perspective of a middle-school student, stating that she "did pretty well emphasizing that discrimination is what's causing these classmates to do so poorly as compared to their French counterparts." Whitney, however, discovered that content was her primary challenge as she created a text on terrorism from the perspective of a concerned parent:

I found formulating my ideas more difficult than I expected—like any of the other topics, the solution for reform is not clear-cut or black and white. I tried to emphasize these ideas as best I could, but I'm not sure if I was as specific as I could be.

These remarks are representative of the most common differences between participants who expressed both satisfaction and dissatisfaction regarding textual content. Whereas Kacey picked out certain aspects of her text's content that she judged satisfactory, Whitney expressed a challenge common to several participants: proposing solutions for very complex social issues. This aspect of the task required significant cultural knowledge, thus many learners struggled to generate ideas related to specific solutions for reform.

In the same way that some participants expressed satisfaction and dissatisfaction in how they communicated textual content, three reflections included mixed feelings about participants' ability to express themselves in French. For example, Brynn commented:

I am happy to see how my writing has grown throughout my time in the French department ... I really enjoyed writing on a more complex topic even though my writing skills are not fully developed enough to speak as freely on the topic as I would like.

Learners like Brynn felt satisfied with their ability to write a letter-manifesto in French and saw how their French expression developed over the semester. Yet Brynn's comments also point to an ongoing struggle to communicate in French. While their ability to express themselves in written French was a source of pride for some participants, eight voiced concerns about grammatical accuracy or their ability to self-correct their writing. Among those, most were non-specific linguistic challenges, simply referring to "mistakes" or "errors," while three participants mentioned preposition use, verb conjugations, and syntax patterns. The fact that almost half of the participants' self-reflections included some mention of ongoing difficulty in manipulating French grammar or inability to self-correct suggests that despite their status as advanced learners of French, they viewed themselves as learners whose linguistic abilities were still developing and, at times, constraining their attempts to communicate in French.

A final area of dissatisfaction in three participants' reflections concerned difficulty navigating perspective and determining appropriate textual content accordingly. For example, both Nancy and Addison referenced difficulty in exploring the perspective that they selected for their text given their real-life identities. As Nancy wrote:

I wanted the Islamophobia to be a personal issue for my character, but I didn't want to

write from the point of view of a Muslim since, as an American Christian, I don't think I could portray the intricacies of a French Muslim's situation.

Similarly, Addison explained that infusing her text—written from the point of view of a daughter of immigrants—with specific suggestions for reform was challenging given that “I myself do not have these experiences.” These participants' reflections evidence awareness of challenges associated with taking on the perspective of a person from a different culture who is grappling with a serious social issue and with attempting to convey complexity in a FL. Findings related to both research questions are discussed along with pedagogical implications in the following section.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated genre-based writing instruction in an advanced collegiate French course. Our findings illustrate ways that learners used model text resources as they completed a genre-based writing project and provide perspectives on learner participation in genre-based writing. In this section, we synthesize and interpret our findings and articulate implications for collegiate FL programs. Finally, we summarize limitations of the current study and directions for future research on genre-based writing.

In relation to RQ1, considerable uptake of model text features or textual borrowing was observed in the 19 participants' letter-manifestos. On average, participants incorporated eight of the 14 model text features included in pre-writing activities. This amount of uptake provides evidence that genre-based instruction introduced learners to stylistic, rhetorical and organizational tools for meaning making that they used to create a text in a genre that learners had likely not been asked to produce in previous French courses. Moreover, the diversity of topics and perspectives chosen by participants, the textual features that they borrowed, and their use of those features is a compelling finding. The number of features borrowed by participants ranged from 2-12, a rather wide range. In the call to action, borrowing of both stylistic and rhetorical techniques from the model text occurred across the participant group; however, learners generally did not use the same words and phrases as the model text despite the fact that those were often appropriate choices. This finding echoes Maxim's (2009b) study of advanced German learners, in that his participants “did not feel bound to the source text for a specific formulation even in those instances when the text's formulation was arguably more effective” (p. 116). Instead, our participants emulated model text techniques but personalized the language to fit their goals in making a call to action.

The diversity of expression and textual content seen in participants' letter-manifestos counters the primary criticism of this pedagogy—that “genres can be easily reduced to static formal recipes, taught in prescriptive fashion” (Kern, 2000, p. 183). Instead, our findings demonstrate that learners' texts combined intertextuality, or weaving in model text conventions and resources, with individual expression as learners infused their texts with creative perspectives, ideas, and expression.

Returning to the call to action and its uptake in participants' writing, the researchers were somewhat surprised that learners who incorporated this feature were in the minority given its explicit emphasis in instruction. Despite in-class discussion and task sheet instruction to include a call to action in their texts, seven participants did not incorporate one that featured borrowings from the model text. However, even among the 12 participants' texts that did

include a call to action emulating the model text, the four micro-features related to the call to action (i.e., direct address, referencing the collective, urgency, and repetition) were not systematically used. What we understood as a required move of the targeted genre was, perhaps, not perceived as such by students. In retrospect, the call to action feature was not sufficiently didacticized in class. Although it was pointed out and discussed with students in the workshop, more guidance would have been helpful to identify the call to action “move” and build understanding of how it is constructed through a series of “sub-moves.” An improved instructional sequence would include an instructional conversation to explicitly break down the call to action feature and use additional activities to provide students with opportunities to practice writing a short call to action in class and to receive informal feedback on their work.

Two intriguing secondary findings pertained to patterns in the amount of borrowing that occurred based on the topic chosen and perspective taken by participants. First, those participants who wrote about education in their text borrowed an average of seven features whereas those who wrote about a different topic than the model text borrowed nine. We hypothesize that brainstorming content ideas and the semantic field for non-education topics required more time and cognitive resources than for education topics. Participants who selected non-education topics may have leaned more heavily on borrowable textual features than those who spent less energy researching how to express ideas on their topic. This finding is encouraging in regard to implementation of genre-based pedagogy in advanced collegiate FL courses: It appears that at this curricular level and *with appropriate scaffolding* FL learners are able to borrow stylistic and rhetorical features from a model text even when that text differs from their own in terms of topic and semantic field. In other words, a model text can serve as a communicative framework for written expression in the FL while allowing students to infuse their texts with unique perspective and content. That said, we would recommend some constraining of students’ topic choices to ensure that model text features remain relevant and borrowable.

Another noteworthy secondary finding relates to textual borrowing and the perspective from which participants chose to write their texts. Whereas participants who wrote as a middle- or high-school student borrowed an average of six textual features, those who wrote as an adult ally, government official, parent, or university student borrowed an average of nine. Our hypothesis is that the participants who wrote from a non-adult perspective were not simply “under borrowing” or making meaning less appropriately than those who wrote from an adult perspective. Rather, although this element was not explicitly addressed in pre-writing workshops, they may have reasoned that an adolescent or pre-adolescent would gravitate towards different stylistic or rhetorical techniques and thus intentionally limited borrowing of certain features. This finding leads to a critical instructional implication: those seeking to implement genre-based pedagogy in FL courses would be well served to provide guidance to learners in their decisions about perspective and the writer-reader relationship that will undergird a text. If the perspective selected is quite different from that which is represented in the model text, learners may encounter challenges identifying borrowable textual features appropriate for their communicative needs.

In relation to RQ2, participants’ reflections on participation in genre-based writing provided evidence of positive perceptions of this pedagogy and its impact on their writing in French. No evidence was seen in our participants’ reflections that genre-based pedagogy felt constraining or oppressive, a potential critique of this approach in the past (Cope &

Kalantzis, 1993; Kern, 2000).² Instead, 18 participants' self-reflections pointed to the usefulness of analyzing the model text for creating a letter-manifesto in French. These included understanding stylistic conventions, rhetorical conventions, and textual organization as well as helping students effectively weave these conventions into their own texts. It appeared that participating in these activities raised participants' awareness of the multidimensional nature of writing—that good writing entails more than lexico-grammatical accuracy. That nine participants referenced the value of analysis activities for building understanding of textual conventions of a letter-manifesto suggests an understanding that an effective text engages the reader and uses language creatively to accomplish its communicative purposes. This finding is not inconsequential given that previous research has shown that developing FL writers often have trouble thinking about writing beyond the lexico-grammatical level due to the cognitive load of composing in the FL (Schoonen, Snellings, Stevenson, & van Gelderen, 2009).

Research on factors that influence FL learners' writing development has revealed that beyond individual learner characteristics, instructional context is a formative element. As Manchón (2009) explained, “[it shapes] their metacognitive knowledge about composing and textual conventions, their conception of writing, motives for writing, and, consequently, their approach to writing” (p. 11). Although the current study was limited to analyzing genre-based writing in *one* module of an advanced collegiate French course, participants' reflections do suggest that the course's pedagogy positively influenced their approach to writing and perceptions of their genre-based writing project.

Despite 18 participants' statements about the positive impact of pre-writing activities on their text, their self-reflections also pointed to areas for improvement in instruction that preceded writing of the texts—a point discussed in relation to RQ1. Several participants' reflections referenced difficulty in coming up with well-reasoned solutions for the social issue addressed in their letter-manifesto, an aspect of the project that required additional research and reading other texts in French to build topic knowledge. In addition, three participants' reflections referenced difficulty navigating perspective and reconciling perceived tension between the participant's own L1 identity and the perspective adopted within their letter. These findings validate Kearney's observation that “[i]nviting exploration of voices and perspectives in the FL classroom places students in a potentially uncomfortable position” (2012, p. 76). Although most participants' reflections did not relate perspective-taking to having difficulty or feeling challenged, we feel that explicit discussion of how perspective-taking relates to textual content should be woven into pre-writing activities.

A future revised instructional sequence would include a second pre-writing workshop with activities to provide learners guidance in developing semantic fields and relating them to the stylistic, rhetorical, and organizational conventions of the genre. Opportunities for reflection on how a chosen perspective might relate to linguistic and stylistic choices and how those choices might parallel or differ from those used in the model text would also be incorporated. These reflections on perspective would be both individual and collaborative, giving learners the chance to grapple with the challenges associated with their adopted perspective and its relation to planning textual content and to work in small groups to consider others' views of the perspective–content connection. Finally, a revised self-reflection prompt would ask, “what benefits and challenges do you associate with writing a

² The only constraint that surfaced in the coding of participants' post-writing reflections was the word limit imposed by the course instructor; three participants felt that they were not able to sufficiently elaborate on their topic given this constraint.

letter-manifesto from your chosen perspective?”

In addition to making positive statements about genre-based instruction and its impact on their persuasive writing in French, participants' reflections also provided evidence that they felt more satisfied than dissatisfied with the text produced through genre pedagogy during the course's final module. Elements that they deemed satisfactory included linguistic expression in French (seven participants), their communication of textual content about a social issue (eight), the perspective selected (six), and tone (five). In total, 10 participants described satisfaction with textual elements such as tone, style, or organization. Again, this is an encouraging finding given that accuracy is not a sufficient criterion for effective and engaging writing, an idea that participants seemed to grasp in terms of what they found noteworthy to discuss as satisfactory elements of their texts. Finally, eight participants expressed dissatisfaction with their expression in French, most often referencing general difficulties with grammar. Given that these perceptions of inadequacy occurred within an instructional context that offered robust writing support, our interpretation is that they provide support for Maxim's statement:

upper-level courses ... need to be rethought to include systematic, explicit emphasis on language acquisition [C]entral to an integrated curriculum is that learners attend to the complex meaning-form relationships that characterize the different topics at each stage of language learning. (2005, p. 83)

Because the current study was limited to the analysis of written artifacts from a single project, its results should be interpreted with caution. Specifically, the self-reflections analyzed for RQ2 were written as part of learners' required participation in the course, thus, learners knew that this commentary would be read by their instructor. Future research should expand on this study by taking a longitudinal approach to investigating genre-based writing in collegiate FL contexts and incorporating other types of narrative data such as learner interviews and stimulated recall sessions. Interviews and stimulated recall could be used to more thoroughly explore why and how learners make textual borrowing and perspective-taking choices, elements beyond the scope of the current study.

CONCLUSION

We began our article by describing the challenges of decreasing enrollments and bifurcated curricula that plague many collegiate FL programs today. As FL educators, we know that data-driven evidence is necessary to address these challenges and increase student engagement in FL learning, particularly in collegiate courses beyond institutional language requirements. Therefore, it was our intent to extend research that investigates pedagogies facilitating development of advanced FL literacy and that address the division of language and content in undergraduate FL curricula. Moreover, it was our aim to explore how collegiate FL learners orient themselves to genre-based writing pedagogy and perceive the value of this approach for their development as writers. Our study's findings demonstrate that genre-based pedagogy and, in particular, pre-writing activities (e.g., model text analysis, targeting features for borrowing, and perspective-taking exercises) were a useful means of engaging learners in critical thinking regarding the FL texts that they produce. In addition, beyond its immediate utility in the writing project, participants' self-reflections suggest that genre-based pedagogy positively influenced their views of what effective FL writing entails.

Further, analysis revealed that genre-based pedagogy did not lead to replication or pastiche wherein learners copied the model text's style and form in writing their own letter-manifesto; rather, learners integrated borrowed model text features with their own unique perspectives and choices about content and tone. Based on these findings, we argue that genre-based writing pedagogy holds much potential to move learners toward advanced FL literacy and to provide collegiate FL programs with a pedagogical construct relevant for teaching language, literature, and culture across the curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We wish to thank the two editors of this volume and two anonymous reviewers for their excellent suggestions for revision of earlier versions of this article. Any further errors or oversights are entirely our own.

REFERENCES

- Allen, H. W. (2009). A literacy-based approach to the advanced French writing course. *The French Review*, 83(2), 368–387.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed.). Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.
- Byrnes, H., Crane, C., Maxim, H. H., & Sprang, K. A. (2006). Taking text to task: Issues and choices in curriculum construction. *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 152, 85–109.
- Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., & Norris, J. M. (2010). Realizing advanced foreign language writing development in collegiate education: Curricular design, pedagogy, assessment [Monograph]. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (1993). Introduction: How a genre approach to literacy can transform the way writing is taught. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing* (pp. 1–21). London, England: The Falmer Press.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2015). *A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Learning by design*. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crane, C. (2016). Understanding and evaluating L2 personal letter writing: A systemic functional linguistics analysis of student texts in German. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 49, 122–139.
- Currie, P. (1998). Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 1–18.
- Darhower, M. (2014). Literary discussions and advanced-superior speaking functions in the undergraduate language program. *Hispania*, 97(3), 396–412.
- Donato, R., & Brooks, F. B. (2004). Literary discussions and advanced speaking functions: Researching the (dis)connection. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(2), 183–199.
- Hall, J. K. (2001). *Methods for teaching foreign languages: Creating a community of learners in the classroom*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148–164.
- Hyland, K. (2011). Learning to write: Issues in theory, research, and pedagogy. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (pp. 17–35). Pennsylvania, PA: John Benjamins.
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kearney, E. (2012). Perspective-taking and meaning-making through engagement with cultural narratives: Bringing history and life in a foreign language classroom. *L2 Journal*, 4, 58–82.
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, dialogue and novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva reader* (pp. 35–61). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Kumagai, Y., & Iwasaki, N. (2016). Reading words to read worlds: A genre-based critical multiliteracies curriculum in intermediate/advanced Japanese language education. In Y. Kumagai, A. López-Sánchez,

- & S. Wu (Eds.), *Multiliteracies in world language education* (pp. 107–131). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lomicka, L., & Lord, G. (in press). Ten years after the MLA Report: What has changed in foreign language departments? *ADFL Bulletin*.
- Manchón, R. (Ed.). (2009). *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(1), 10–21.
- 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, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Maxim, H. H. (2009a). Developing advanced formal language abilities along a genre-based continuum. In S. L. Katz & J. Watzinger-Tharp (Eds.), *Conceptions of L2 grammar: Theoretical approaches and their application in the L2 classroom* (pp. 172–188). Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage.
- Maxim, H. H. (2009b). “It’s made to match”: Linking L2 reading and writing through textual borrowing. In C. Brantmeier (Ed.), *Crossing languages and research methods: Analyses of adult foreign language reading* (pp. 97–122). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Modern Language Association. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 234–245.
- Modern Language Association. (2015). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, fall 2013*. New York, NY: Modern Language Association. Retrieved from http://www.mla.org/pdf/2009_enrollment_survey.pdf
- Paesani, K., & Allen, H. W. (2012). Beyond the language-content divide: A review of research on advanced foreign language teaching and learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45, S54–S74.
- Paesani, K., Allen, H. W., & Dupuy, B. (2016). *A multiliteracies framework for collegiate foreign language teaching*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others’ words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 201–230.
- Polio, C., & Zyzik, E. (2009). Don Quixote meets “ser” and “estar”: Multiple perspectives on language learning in Spanish literature classes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(4), 550–569.
- Redden, E. (2017). No certificate of global citizenship. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/10/amid-turn-toward-nationalism-global-educators-consider-their-work>
- Rothery, J. (1996). Making changes: Developing an educational linguistics. In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in society* (pp. 86–123). London, England: Longman.
- 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.
- Sarkozy, N. (2007). Lettre aux éducateurs. *Journaux Officiels*.
- Schoonen, R., Snellings, P., Stevenson, M., & van Gelderen A. (2009). Toward a blueprint of the foreign language writer: The linguistic and cognitive demands of foreign language writing. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning, teaching, and researching writing in foreign language contexts* (pp. 77–101). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Sommer, B. (2016). Designing an advanced writing course of Portuguese as a foreign language within a genre-based approach. *Divergencias. Revista de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios*, 14(1), 3–14.
- Swaffar, J. K., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum: An approach through multiple literacies*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Tardy, C. M. (2006). Researching first and second language genre learning: A comparative review and a look ahead. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 79–101.
- Urlaub, P. (2014). Departmental contexts and foreign language majors. *ADFL Bulletin*, 43, 123–134.
- Warren, M., & Winkler, C. (2016). Developing multiliteracies through genre in the beginner German classroom. In Y. Kumagai, A. López-Sánchez, & S. Wu (Eds.), *Multiliteracies in world language education* (pp. 29–57). New York, NY: Routledge.

APPENDIX A: MODULE THREE WRITING TASK SHEET—ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Portfolio 3 Letter-Manifesto

Write a letter-manifesto on one of the themes treated in the 3rd module of our course (immigration/discrimination, religion/secularism, terrorism/national security, or education/equal opportunity) to a Minister in the current government (choose whomever you deem to be the most appropriate). In your letter, explain your perspective on this theme while elaborating your ideas in a systematic manner. Also describe your identity (real or invented) and how your identity relates to your opinions. You should also propose reforms or actions that you feel are necessary or urgent and close the letter with a call to action. The model text for this Portfolio is Sarkozy's "Lettre aux Éducateurs" (2007).

Specifications:

- Length: 450-550 words
- Please write in standard French and respect the format of a formal letter
- Self-reflection (in English or in French) for this Portfolio: What ideas did you try to emphasize in your letter and what writing techniques did you use to emphasize them? In what ways did analyzing the Sarkozy letter and the pre-writing activities facilitate writing your letter? What elements of your text are you most satisfied with and why? What parts of creating your text were the most challenging and which elements of your text remain problematic?
- Criteria for evaluation: *Task Completion* (pre-writing activity, full draft, self-reflection); *Content* (originality of ideas, rich description); *Style* (appropriateness for the textual model studied); *Clarity* of written expression (lexico-grammatical)

APPENDIX B: MODULE THREE AT HOME ACTIVITIES—ENGLISH TRANSLATION

I. Analyze how Sarkozy communicates his ideas in his letter to educators (2007). Re-read the letter and look for communicative techniques and language used by Sarkozy to communicate his ideas.

<u>PAGE OBJECTIVE / TECHNIQUE</u>	<u>LANGUAGE USED / EXAMPLE</u>
1 Introduce the subject of his letter <i>wish</i>	« Je souhaite vous parler de ... » (<i>I to talk to you about...</i>)
1 Insist on the fact that he is speaking directly to the reader	
1 Pose a hypothetical question	
1 Highlight past/outdated practices	
2 Mark a transition	
2 Pose a hypothetical question	
2	« Éduquer c'est difficile » (<i>Educating</i>)

- is difficult*)
- 3 Using repetition to underscore his priorities
- 3-4 Using « Je » (*I*) to express his opinions (3 examples)
- 5 Insist on the fact that he is speaking directly to the reader
- 6 « Je sais à quel point le merveilleux ... » (*I know to what extent the wonderful...*)
- 6 Using repetition to underscore his priorities
- 6 Call to action

II. Identify the topic of your letter and the recipient. In your letter, you need to talk about one of the following themes:

- immigration/discrimination
- religion/secularism
- terrorism/national security
- education/equal opportunity

Which *main* theme have you chosen?

Which *secondary* themes are you thinking about treating?

Next, use this webpage to identify the recipient of your letter among these choices

<http://www.gouvernement.fr/composition-du-gouvernement>

- Mme. la Ministre de l'Éducation Nationale, de L'Enseignement Supérieur, et de la Recherche
- M. le Ministre de la Défense
- M. le Ministre de l'Intérieur
- Mme. la Ministre du Travail, de l'Emploi, de la Formation Professionnelle et du Dialogue Social
- Mme. la Ministre du Logement et de l'Habitat Durable

My choice:

III. Start looking for vocabulary for your letter. Consult the following documents to help you brainstorm a vocabulary list to use in your letter. To begin, make a simple list of base words and expressions related to your subject (25-40).

- immigration/discrimination

<http://discours.vie-publique.fr/notices/153001987.html>

- religion/secularism

<http://www.gouvernement.fr/une-laicite-pensee-pour-apaier-et-rassembler-3452>

- terrorism/national security

<http://www.defense.gouv.fr/ministre/prises-de-parole-du-ministre/prises-de-parole-de-m-jean-yves-le-drian/discours-de-jean-yves-le-drian-qui-est-l-ennemi-assises-nationales-de-la-recherche-strategique>

- education/equal opportunity

<http://www.passeport-avenir.com/egalite-des-chances-najat-vallaud-belkacem-passeport-avenir/>

APPENDIX C: MODULE THREE IN-CLASS ACTIVITIES—ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Module 3 Writing Workshop

Letter-manifesto

I. Organization of Sarkozy's letter. Take notes during the short presentation on how Sarkozy organized his ideas in his letter. Above all, think about identifying organizational strategies that could be useful for writing your own letter.

II. Class discussion – Analysis of objectives and techniques used in Sarkozy's letter. Work in pairs and compare your responses to activity I (Appendix B) that you completed for this session. In addition to comparing your responses, make hypotheses about Sarkozy's motivations in using each technique (in other words, try to respond to the question of WHY he used certain techniques in this text).

III. Brainstorming: Organization of your letter. Make a list of different parts of your letter in order to identify how to organize your ideas. (It will be necessary for you to change this list [perhaps multiple times] as you continue to develop your ideas.)

PARTS OF MY LETTER

VOCABULARY

IV. Find words to express your ideas: Now that you have identified different parts of your letter, try to link words and expressions (related to the topics you are treating) to each part of your letter. Use the list on page 2 to note these words/expressions.

V. Sarkozy's techniques: What linguistic or stylistic techniques used by Sarkozy will you incorporate in your letter? Make a list here. Later, don't forget to check this list to be sure you have incorporated them into your letter.