

Teaching texts as genres in the second language classroom

CERCLL Workshop
June 2-3, 2016

Hiram H. Maxim
German Studies Department, Emory University

Workshop Schedule

Day 1: Thursday, June 2nd

9:00am – 9:30am	Introductions: Institutional context; primary instructional and administrative roles; expectations & goals
9:30am – 9:45am	Overview of workshop
9:45am – 10:15am	Background and impetus for L2 text-based work
10:15am – 10:30am	Open discussion
10:30am – 10:45am	Break
10:45am – 11:15am	The construct of genre and genre analysis
11:15am – 11:45am	Work with sample text
11:45am – 12:00pm	Open discussion
12:00pm – 1:00pm	LUNCH
1:00pm – 1:30pm	Genre as a text selection and sequencing principle
1:30pm – 2:15pm	Sequencing sample texts
2:15pm – 2:30pm	Issues in text selection
2:30pm – 2:45pm	Break
2:45pm – 3:15pm	Text selection within a thematic unit
3:15pm – 3:30pm	Open discussion
3:30pm – 4:00pm	Looking ahead: Genre-based pedagogy

Day 2: Friday, June 3rd

9:00am – 9:30am	Review
9:30am – 10:15am	Genre-based pedagogy
10:15am – 10:45am	Sample text didacticization
10:45am – 11:00am	Break
11:00am – 11:30am	Genre-based tasks and assessment
11:30am – 12:00pm	Work with texts
12:00pm – 1:00pm	LUNCH
1:00pm – 1:30pm	Open discussion about own texts and program
1:30pm – 2:30pm	Work with texts
2:30pm – 2:45pm	Break
2:45pm – 3:30pm	Presentation of pedagogical treatment of text
3:30pm – 4:00pm	Looking back and looking forward: Next steps for text-based instruction

Key terms, Day 1:

Background and impetus for L2 text-based work:

- curriculum
- curricular bifurcation
- curricular integration
- articulation
- literacy

The construct of genre and genre analysis:

- genre
- generic moves - schematic structure
- field, - participants, processes, circumstances
- tenor – evaluational lexicogrammar
- mode – theme/rheme

Genre as a text selection and sequencing principle

- primary discourses
- secondary discourses
- macro-genre – recording, explaining, arguing
- grammatical metaphor (congruent vs. synoptic language)

Key terms, Day 2:

Genre-based pedagogy:

- scaffolding
- modeling
- zone of proximal development
- matrix

Genre-based assessment

- genre-based task
- task appropriateness

Worksheet for Genre Analysis

A. Communicative goals and their realization in generic stages/moves

- a. What are the communicative goals of the text?
- b. Who wrote it? Who is the audience?
- c. What are the stages/moves in the text that help realize the communicative goals? How would you divide the text? Why?

B. Field: Participants, Processes, Circumstances

- a. Who are the Participants? Specific, generic or abstract?
- b. What kind of processes are they involved in? Underline all the processes (verbs). What types are they? Are there any patterns?
→ 6 Main Process Types
 - Material: Processes of doing
 - Mental: Processes of thinking and feeling (perception, cognition, desideration, emotion)
 - Relational: Processes of being and relating (attributes and identities)
 - Behavioral: Processes of physiological and psychological behavior
 - Verbal: Processes of verbal action
 - Existential: Processes of being and existing
- c. What are the circumstances? Underline adverbs and prepositional phrases. What types appear most often?
→ Types of Circumstances: Extent (Duration; Distance); Cause; Location (Time; Place); Manner (Means; Quality; Comparison); Role; Accompaniment

C. Tenor: Relationship between discourse participants; between the author and the audience

- a. How are participants referred to?
- b. What perspective(s) is (are) represented?
- c. Which mood is present (i.e., indicative, imperative, subjunctive, interrogative)?
- d. Is there an expression of attitude and emotion, judgment and appreciation? How are they linguistically realized?

D. Mode: Coherence and Cohesion

- a. How is the text structured? What linguistic resources are used to make connections across textual stages and within them?
- b. What elements take the theme position (first position) in the clause?
- c. What is the clause structure? Simple clauses, complex clauses, complex nominal groups, nominalizations?

Table 8.1 A summary of the major linguistic changes in control of written language in children's writing from early childhood to late adolescence

Early childhood: 6-8 years	Late childhood-early adolescence: 9-12 years	Mid-adolescence: 13-15 years	Late adolescence: 16-18 years +
<p>Experiential resources: Processes are realized in simple verbal groups. Participants are realized in simple nominal groups (may include embedded clauses). Circumstantial information is realized in prepositional phrases, primarily of time and place.</p>	<p>Experiential resources: Processes are more varied, expressed in expanding verbal group structures. Participants are realized in much expanded nominal groups, involving both pre- and post-modification of Headword. Circumstantial information is realized in a growing range of prepositional phrases and some adverbs.</p>	<p>Experiential resources: The full range of Process types appears, and they are realized in a developing variety of lexical verbs, as lexis generally expands. Participants are realized in dense nominal groups involving increasing abstractions and/or technicality. Circumstances are often abstract, realizing a growing range of meanings.</p>	<p>Experiential resources: A full range of Process types is present, including often abstract material Processes, causative Processes and identifying Processes, used to interpret texts and/or human behaviour in English, historical events or movements in history, and phenomena of the natural world in science. Participants are realized in dense nominal groups, creating abstractions of many kinds, and sometimes involving nominal groups in apposition. Circumstantial information is expressed in a full range of prepositional phrases, often containing extended nominal group structures, and in adverbs, which are varied.</p>

(Continued)

Table 8.1—Cont'd

Early childhood: 6-8 years	Late childhood-early adolescence: 9-12 years	Mid-adolescence: 13-15 years	Late adolescence: 16-18 years +
<p>Clause types and logical relations: Sentences may consist of single clauses or combine clauses of equal status. The commonest unequal or dependent clauses present are of time. Occasional uses of dependent non-finite clauses of purpose.</p>	<p>Clause types and logical relations: Equal clauses remain, but an expanding range of dependent clauses appears - reason, purpose, condition, concession, manner. Non-finite instances appear a little more often. Also some clauses of projection. An overall growing capacity for grammatical intricacy in using and linking different clause types.</p>	<p>Clause types and logical relations: Considerable range of clauses, singular, equal and unequal in different combinations. Some loss of otherwise independent clauses because grammatical metaphor compresses them. Non-finite clauses are now quite frequent. Clause types and interdependencies differ, depending on field and genre.</p>	<p>Clause types and logical relations: A full range of clause types is available, and clauses are deployed in strategic ways, sometimes using singular clauses for their effect, and sometimes using several interdependent clauses, displaying grammatical intricacy. However, texts at this stage are often not grammatically very intricate, as their complexity is created by dense lexis and grammatical metaphor, whose effect is to bury otherwise independent clauses and their relations. Overall, clause types are deployed in strategically skilled ways.</p>
<p>Grammatical metaphor emerges as nominalization.</p>	<p>Lexical and grammatical metaphors are more common. Grammatical metaphor is used purposefully.</p>	<p>There are frequent uses of grammatical and lexical metaphor.</p>	

<p>Interpersonal resources: Tendency to use first person. Attitudinal expression (when present) mainly simple adjectives, occasionally with adverbs of intensity, and sometimes simple Processes of affect. Limited awareness of audience.</p>	<p>Interpersonal resources: Tendency to greater use of third person. Occasional use of modal verbs. Attitudinal expression in adverbs, as well as adjectives and a greater range of adverbs of intensity. Attitudinal expression is more evident than in earlier years, though not in science. In English and history, a more marked awareness of audience and some recognition of personal voice and engaging with others.</p>	<p>Interpersonal resources: A more regular use of third person; first person is retained for some fields and genres. Modal adverbs and verbs are used selectively, depending on field and genre. An extensive range of lexis to express attitude is also available, also used selectively, as attitude has no great role in science. In history and English, a greater engagement with audience and some awareness of differing perspectives.</p>	<p>Interpersonal resources: There is a confident use of first or third person (depending on field and genre); a broad range of lexis is potentially available to express attitude. Modality is used judiciously, depending on field. Attitudinal and experiential values are often 'fused' in English and history. Science is attitudinally restrained. Dialogic engagement with a wider discourse community is evident, especially in English and history.</p>
<p>Textual resources: Simple repetitive topical Themes, which are often realized in first person pronoun. Sometimes uncertain use of Reference to build internal links.</p>	<p>Textual resources: Developing use of Given and New Information to create topical Theme choices; marked Themes are expressed in Circumstances or dependent clauses, some of which are enclosed dependent clauses. Better control of Reference.</p>	<p>Textual resources: Good control of Given and New Information to create topical Theme choices; greater use of dependent clauses in marked Theme position, some enclosed; growing capacity to create macroThemes and hyperThemes to direct overall organization of texts as they become longer.</p>	<p>Textual resources: Good control of thematic development; frequent use of marked Theme choices to signal new phases in texts; good capacity in developing and sustaining overall textual organization, using macroThemes and hyperThemes.</p>

Works Cited

- Byrnes, H. (1998). Constructing curricula in collegiate foreign language departments. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages: Perspectives in research and scholarship* (pp. 262–295). New York: MLA.
- Byrnes, H. (2002). The cultural turn in foreign language departments: Challenge and opportunity. *Profession* 2002, 114-129.
- Byrnes, H., & Maxim, H. H. (Eds.). (2004). *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs*. Boston: Heinle.
- Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., & Norris, J. M. (2010). Realizing Advanced L2 Writing Development in Collegiate FL Education: Curricular Design, Pedagogy, and Assessment. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(Monograph).
- Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2008). *School discourse. Learning to write across the years of schooling*. London: Continuum.
- Coffin, C. (2006). *Historical discourse. The language of time, cause, and evaluation*. London: Continuum.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4, 164–195.
- Eggs, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.
- 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.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1993). Towards a language-based theory of learning. *Linguistics and Education*, 5(2), 93–116.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). *The language of science*. (J. Webster, Ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 1–26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (1984). Language, register and genre. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Children Writing: Reader* (pp. 21–29). Geelong Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Martin, J. R. (2002). A universe of meaning - How many practices? In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom. Multiple perspectives* (pp. 269–278). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 10–21.
- Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2006). Educating for advanced foreign language capacities. Exploring the meaning-making resources of languages systemic-functionally. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning. The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 31-57). London: Continuum
- MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 234-245.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- Rothery, J. (1996). Making changes: Developing an educational linguistics. In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in society* (pp. 86–123). London: Longman.
- Swaffar, J. (2004). A template for advanced learner tasks: Staging genre reading and cultural literacy through the précis. In H. Byrnes & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Advanced foreign language learning: A challenge to college programs* (pp. 19–45). Boston: Heinle.
- Swaffar, J., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum: A multi-literacies approach*. New York: Modern Language Association.