Overcoming Curricular Bifurcation:
A Departmental Approach to Curriculum Reform[1]

Hiram H. Maxim, Peter Höyng, Marianne Lancaster, Caroline Schaumann, and Maximilian Aue

Emory University

Abstract

The collegiate foreign language profession has become increasingly aware of the unnecessarily detrimental effects of bifurcated curricula on student learning and departmental governance, yet there have been few instances to date of departments that have been able to achieve unified, articulated programs of study. This article presents one foreign language department's initiatives and activities to do just that. We describe the collaborative process that the German Studies Department at Emory University underwent in its full-scale revision of the undergraduate curriculum. The chairperson begins the description by explaining his role in the reform process. Other faculty members continue the description by outlining the institutional and department context, the impetus for reform, the curriculum's theoretical framework, and the different curricular levels. An ongoing, multi-year project, the revised curriculum has placed demands on students and faculty but also indicated promise for enhanced departmental identity and student learning.

❧

It is no secret that collegiate foreign language (FL) education has been leading a bifurcated existence for decades. The divided departmental structure that characterizes much of the profession has been documented, discussed, and deconstructed in leading professional journals, including the *ADFL Bulletin* (e.g., Bernhardt, 1995; Byrnes, 2002; James, 1996; Kern, 2002; Swaffar, 1999), the *Modern Language Journal* (e.g., Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010), *Foreign Language Annals* (e.g., Barrette, Paesani, & Vinall, 2010; Weber-Feve, 2009), and *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German* (e.g., Bernhardt & Berman, 1999; Eigler, 2001). Moreover, leading professional organizations in FL education, such as the Modern Language Association (e.g., MLA, 2007), the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (e.g., National Standards, 2006), and the American Association of University Supervisors and Coordinators (e.g., Allen & Maxim, 2013; Levine & Phipps, 2012), have addressed and problematized this curricular and structural bifurcation. Perhaps the central characteristic of this division is the separation between so-called "language" courses at the lower level and so-called "content" courses at the upper level, which manifests itself further through the divergent pedagogies (communicative approaches vs. literary and cultural analysis) and competencies (speaking vs. reading/writing) that are prioritized at the two levels. Such differences reflect, in turn, differing notions of language and language acquisition. Whereas lower-level instruction frames lan-

---

[1] A shorter version of this article was presented at the 2010 AATG Annual Meeting in Boston, MA.

guage as a means for interaction, upper-level courses emphasize language as a means of cultural transmission. That is not to say that the approaches to language at the two levels are mutually exclusive; lower-level instruction certainly explores cultural phenomena and upper-level classes require interaction among participants. Yet the underlying assumptions about language differ, which has significant pedagogical and curricular implications. Additionally, the personnel configuration and departmental governance, particularly in departments with a graduate program in which graduate students, adjunct instructors, or non-tenure track faculty typically teach lower-level classes while tenured and tenure-track faculty teach upper-level courses often based on their research interests, exacerbates the aforementioned curricular division and helps to further institutionalize departmental bifurcation (MLA, 2007).

From a language learning perspective, these departmental divisions have significant consequences. If there is one thing that language researchers can agree on, it is the long-term nature of language development, yet a department with curricular dichotomies is not in the position to create a learning environment for such development to take place effectively or efficiently. In order to facilitate and support the longitudinal development of collegiate FL learners, there needs to be a systematic and coherent approach to language learning that spans the entire program. As is evidenced by the very few programs that have attempted to implement an articulated program of study,[2] however, establishing such systematicity and coherence remains a serious challenge to programs nationwide.

Nevertheless, there have been some positive steps toward addressing departmental bifurcation. For example, the implementation of "bridge" courses in departments nationwide, while arguably an implicit admittance of curricular incoherence, nevertheless demonstrates the attempt to overcome the challenging transition that students must make as they move from lower- to upper-level instruction. In addition to bridge courses, there has been an increasing trend over the past couple decades to expand the amount of meaningful content in lower-level instruction. Levine et al. in the 2008 edition of *Profession* make the case that the two-tiered system is "in many respects not the dominant model" (p. 243) in collegiate foreign language education any longer. In support of their argument, they cite data from the 2001 Modern Language Association (MLA) study "Successful College and University Foreign Language Programs, 1995–99: Part I" to illustrate that the traditional division between lower- and upper-level instruction is no longer as rigid as it once was. Specifically, they point to the considerable emphasis on literature and culture at the lower levels and a corresponding strong focus on non-literary texts at the upper levels. They also counter the claim that lower and upper levels implement different pedagogical approaches by citing that "few programs (23.1%) report more emphasis on oral communication than on reading and writing" (p. 245). Of course, the inclusion of more literature at the lower level and more non-literary texts at the upper level reflects only course *content* and does not indicate that departments are attending in any systematic way to the long-term development of how students understand and use language. It is, however, important to recognize the increased focus on textuality and literacy at the lower levels as an important step both in capturing better the realities on the ground in FL departments and in acknowledging the significant work that has been done over the years to overcome the disjunctures between different levels of study, particularly in programs with an exclusively undergraduate focus.

While the steps taken thus far are noteworthy, the question still remains why so much attention and discussion about curricular incoherence has resulted in so few substantive departmental reforms that integrate the study of language and content across all curricular levels.

---

[2] Two undergraduate programs that have successfully implemented a coherent undergraduate program of study are the German Department at Georgetown University and the German for Engineering Program at the University of Rhode Island.

Ultimately, this is a question that each individual program needs to answer based on its local situation, but in general terms one can point to a lack of consensus and/or a lack of expertise within a program to tackle curricular reform. Consensus is an interesting concept for the profession because, on the one hand, it would seem to be a necessary ingredient for any full-scale departmental reform but, on the other hand, it is not necessarily a commonly sought goal in higher education. In fact, there is the belief that programmatic thinking can bring with it too many prescriptive elements that can infringe upon some of the most prized aspects of higher education: academic freedom, autonomy, diversity, and decentralization. Kramsch (1995), for example, sees benefit in conflict over consensus within foreign language education as a way to achieve a productive dialectic among language professionals.

Curricular planning does not have to preclude diversity, however. What is important, as Graff and Birkenstein (2011) argue in their response to the common standards movement in American education, is the acknowledgment of fundamental goals within the academy and the need to develop a curricular plan to help students achieve them. Whereas they focus on critical thinking as such a goal, we in FL education might, for instance, use advanced cultural literacy as a fundamental standard for our programs. Our definition of that standard would and should vary and be open to analysis based on our scholarly background and interests, but there would seem to be consensus around the fact that the development of cultural literacy is a long-term process that requires programmatic support and commitment in the form of a coherent curricular path that assists learners in achieving fundamental disciplinary goals. Nevertheless, despite its obvious role in curricular reform, consensus is not always pursued or even desired in higher education.

Expertise in curricular reform is another essential ingredient in programmatic restructuring, but it too is not something that is necessarily privileged or promoted in collegiate FL studies. The logical place to attend to curriculum construction would be at the graduate level as part of the education and professionalization of the future professoriate; yet, as the latest volume by the American Association of University Supervisors and Coordinators (AAUSC) points out (Allen & Maxim, 2013), programmatic thinking has long been absent from graduate teacher education. What is needed is an examination and understanding of longitudinal notions of second language acquisition and the curricular structure needed to support that acquisition so that the next generation of faculty understands what pedagogical and curricular setting is needed to promote language development across multiple levels of instruction. As a result of this lacuna in U.S. professional knowledge and training, it should not be surprising that language professionals have had to look outside the North American research community for guidance on how to think curricularly and longitudinally about language development.[3]

With this professional state of affairs as the backdrop, the following pages will document how our home department, the German Studies Department in the College of Arts and Sciences at Emory University, overcame the aforementioned challenges and underwent a full-scale reform of its undergraduate program in order to better support the longitudinal development of students' language-based content knowledge.[4] Reflecting the collaborative nature of

---

[3] Although not necessarily focused on collegiate FL education, Systemic Functional Linguistics (e.g., Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), particularly in its work on genre, provides promising research and theoretical frameworks that have important applications for supporting articulated FL curriculum construction.

[4] The German Studies Department at Emory offers a major and minor in German Studies and currently graduates each year roughly 15 majors and minors combined. In the past five years, total enrollment in German classes has averaged around 200 students each semester. The department typically offers each semester 5 sections of first-year German, 3 sections of second-year German, and 1 section each of Level 3, 4, and 5. The overwhelming majority of German Studies majors combine their major with another field. In the past four

the curricular reform, each section of this article was authored by the departmental faculty member with the most experience and expertise with the respective topic. The discussion begins with Chair Peter Höyng's description of his own role in the reform process. Next, the department's applied linguist, Hiram Maxim, provides an overview of the program at the outset of the reform, the factors that coalesced to bring about change within the department as well as the theoretical framework and chronology of the reform. Following that, the faculty coordinators of the different curricular levels, Marianne Lancaster (Level 1), Hiram Maxim (Level 2), and Caroline Schaumann (Level 3) describe the changes that their respective levels underwent. The presentation of the reform concludes with a discussion of the remaining tasks to be done as our work in progress moves forward. Once a draft of the article was completed, all five full-time faculty members who teach German in the department proofread the draft and provided feedback before its submission.[5]

The Chairperson's Role in Curriculum Reform (Höyng)

Department chairpersons assume the role of academic leaders. As such, they should first and foremost develop strategies to benefit students' learning experience. These strategies, however, will only be implemented by working in a concerted effort with their colleagues and by securing as much support for their work as possible. It follows from this understanding of the chairs' role that they must be responsive and effective managers of existing resources. As administrators, department chairs function as communicators, facilitators, and mediators: they mediate between the dean(s) and the department's faculty and staff; facilitate communication between students and faculty, faculty and staff; communicate the department's efforts and strengths to colleagues in the college, university, and the profession and, last but not least, the community at large. Striking a balance between the long-term vision and effective daily management is the daunting task of department chairs who, precisely because of their position between their department and other entities, more often than not seem to have "no partners" (Trommler, 2000, p. 7).

While these demands on a chairperson apply more or less to any academic unit regardless of discipline, the chairperson of a language department is in a particularly precarious position. For one, FLs are increasingly regarded within the arts and sciences as of secondary importance to other academic disciplines (e.g., Summers, 2012), as providing a service that can be outsourced (e.g., Smith, 2012), or both. This places them in a more perilous position in the academy, a trend that the most recent economic downturn and its ensuing budgetary constraints have only accelerated. Yet over ten years ago, Brittain (2001) already pointed out one of the main reasons for this dislocation: "Foreign language study (…) has failed to secure a central place in the American curriculum because of the lack of a smooth continuum from elementary through university studies and the lack of universally accepted methods for evaluating language development" (p. 86).

Furthermore, our particular discipline of German Studies faces other difficulties that call for a response. First, there is the declining centrality of German in the academy. Whereas for many

years alone, German Studies majors have double majored in Sociology, Biology, Mathematics, Business, Music, Economics, Philosophy, Italian Studies, History, Psychology, Political Science, and Physics.

   [5] The German Studies Department at Emory University had six full-time faculty at the time this article was written, five of whom taught German full-time and one of whom taught Yiddish full-time. Four of the five German-language faculty were tenured at the time of the article, and one was a Senior Lecturer, the 2nd of 3 tiers among lecture-track faculty. The Yiddish-language faculty member was tenure-track at the time of the article. In addition, there have been on average two part-time faculty on staff each academic year. It is a policy of Emory University that part-time faculty are allowed to be employed for a total of four semesters.

decades through the 19th and 20th centuries in U.S. higher education one regarded German as a central disciplinary pillar, German language and culture no longer hold this central position (see Trommler, 2000). Reasons for this decline are many, but include the rise of English as the lingua franca among global elites (including those in German-speaking countries), the demographic shifts in the U.S. that understandably have drawn attention and resources to Spanish, and the geo-political shifts that have increased the prominence and demand for other languages both in the marketplace and in schools.

In the face of these changes, I find the four strategies that Roche (1999) outlined for enhancing the visibility and role of FL departments still ring true: first, to offer "intellectual opportunities to students and to other departments and programs; second, to use every possibility to publicize the importance of the department's area and accomplishments; third, to assume a leadership role on campus (…); and fourth, to develop alliances both within and beyond the university" (p. 10).

Carrying out these four strategies means first and foremost making the department's curriculum attractive to our undergraduate students not for reasons tied to their career plans but for reasons related to their intellectual development. We need to point out from the very outset of learning German that we are opening intellectual avenues through this language of which students would otherwise be unaware.

Understanding that a coherent, well-articulated, and content-driven curriculum holds the key to becoming a successful department, the chairperson needs to (a) call for change even when it challenges long-held and comfortable traditions, (b) communicate to faculty and staff that rebuilding a curriculum requires patience and remains an ongoing process, (c) facilitate a consensus for a departmental vision that can serve as a blueprint for the curriculum overhaul, (d) provide human and material resources necessary for a systematic and process-oriented new curriculum, and, last but not least, (e) communicate to the department, dean, and other constituents on and off campus that an intellectually attractive four-year curriculum is the foundation for the other three strategies: making your department's accomplishment public, becoming a role model for your campus, and building alliances on and off campus.[6]

The Framework and Chronology of the Curricular Reform (Maxim)

In the fall of 2007 the German Studies Department at Emory University embarked on a full-scale revision of its undergraduate curriculum. The impetus for this collaborative effort was the faculty's acknowledgment of the existing bifurcation within the curriculum. In particular, the faculty was concerned about the challenges that learners faced when they made the transition from lower- to upper-level instruction and the effect that difficult transition was having on student retention. These concerns about the curriculum were echoed by an external review of the department during the spring of 2007. Shortly thereafter, the 2007 report by the MLA's Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages was released and provided further evidence of the detrimental effects of a divided curriculum. Coinciding with the external review and the MLA's report was the hiring of an applied linguist with expertise in curriculum construction.

At the opening departmental retreat in August 2007, the faculty began the serious task of rethinking their curricular and pedagogical practices in order to create a four-year undergraduate curriculum that allowed for the smooth transition from one instructional level to the next with the ultimate goal of developing advanced, culturally literate users of German who would

---

[6] Similar strategies were suggested by Byrnes (2001) in the description of the curriculum reform in the Georgetown University German Department.

be able to function successfully in a range of professional contexts. Fortunately, under the chair-person's leadership the faculty had already agreed unanimously to undertake such a major cur-ricular reform and thereby had already overcome one of the most onerous hurdles facing many departments as they contemplate substantive curricular reform. The faculty had also unani-mously approved a vision statement for the department that outlined the major goals of the undergraduate program (see http://german.emory.edu).

Nevertheless, several central issues still had to be addressed at the outset. First and foremost, the faculty needed to adopt a theoretical framework for integrating the study of language and content across all four years of instruction as opposed to the bifurcated model of focusing on language before attending to content. Under the guidance of the department's applied linguist, the faculty turned to the construct of *genre*. Defined as a staged, goal-oriented, socially situated communicative event (e.g., book review, service encounter, eulogy), genre has become for applied linguists, particularly systemic-functional linguists, an effective theoretical and peda-gogical construct that exemplifies how language functions to make meaning (e.g., Macken-Horarik, 2002; Martin, 2009; Rothery & Stenglin, 1997). In their analyses of different genres, applied linguists have pointed out that each genre, as it unfolds in a particular situation, calls on specific grammatical and lexical items to realize its communicative goal. For that reason, genres have enormous pedagogical applications in that they demonstrate to learners how lexico-grammatical features are resources for communicating meaningfully. Moreover, instantiated as spoken or written texts, genres coincide nicely with the long tradition of textual engagement in collegiate foreign language study in the United States and thus are particularly well-suited for curricular implementation at the tertiary level. Examples of how specific genres were imple-mented in the curriculum will be provided later in the article.

Second, if the new undergraduate program were to integrate the study of language and content at all curricular levels, the faculty would have to develop principles for selecting and sequencing the language and content across the curriculum. In the bifurcated model, grammar is the typical sequencing principle for the lower levels, and at the upper levels the content is usually sequenced beginning with general, introductory literary-cultural topics and moving to specific themes and epochs with little or no systematic attention to language development. In contrast, in an integrated curriculum, the grammar reflects the content and vice-versa. In other words, the content focus of a particular level needs to be conveyed predominantly in the type of language targeted for that level, and the grammar focus must provide learners with the linguistic resources required to communicate about that content. In addition, the integrated language-content focus across the curriculum should be sequenced to create a clear trajectory for lan-guage development. To that end, the German Studies faculty turned once again to genre and found recent scholarship that had identified genre-based continua for curricular sequencing particularly helpful (e.g., Coffin, 2006; Christie & Derewianka, 2008). Specifically, the faculty agreed on a curricular trajectory that begins with a focus on *narration* at the lower level, shifts to *explanation* by the end of the second year of instruction, and concludes with *argumentation* at the uppermost level.[7]

Third, with a theoretical framework in place for sequencing its curriculum, the department had to next select relevant content that reflected the above-mentioned discursive trajectory from narration to explanation to argumentation. To begin with, because such a full-scale reform is only possible as a collaborative, departmental effort, the faculty agreed that they would form small sub-committees to focus on a specific curricular level and that each sub-committee would consist of faculty members who were familiar either with that level or with the previous or sub-

---

[7] The authors are grateful to the Georgetown University German Department for advancing this approach to curricular sequencing.

sequent level. Faculty who worked on the curriculum reform did not receive any additional compensation directly, but their contribution was acknowledged in their annual review that served as the basis for merit-based pay raises.

Over the course of the first year of the reform process (2007-2008), each sub-committee decided on an overall content focus for its respective level by focusing on three main criteria: (a) content that was culturally significant in the sense that it represented issues, topics, and information that had relevance to a larger community or society beyond the author; (b) content that was of interest to both students and instructors based on faculty's scholarly expertise and informal student surveys; and (c) content whose predominant textual manifestation reflected the discursive emphasis for that level. For example, the content focus for first-year German centers around specific roles or group affiliations that have an impact on one's self-identity (e.g., student, consumer, traveler, family member) and, as such, provides topics that allow faculty to work consistently with students on the discursive focus of that level, namely, narration. As a comparison, the content emphasis in the second-year course is on factors that play a role in one's coming of age (e.g., family, nature, school), which allows for more sophisticated attention to narration while also providing opportunities to practice the next major discursive focus, explanation (e.g., telling a story about how and why schooling played a role in one's coming of age).

Last, the faculty had to decide where in the curriculum to begin their work. Some discussion in the profession has suggested starting with the curricular level that is in most need of attention (e.g., Byrnes, 2006). Although the faculty had already acknowledged the challenging transition from lower- to upper-level instruction, they also recognized that, in the end, each level of the curriculum needed to be revised and thus chose to start at the very beginning: German 101 and 102. The process for the revision of each level was the same. Once the content focus for the level was established, the sub-committee went about the painstaking work of gathering authentic printed and visual texts that delivered the cultural content and served as vehicles of instruction. If that was not enough of a challenge, the texts also needed to reflect the discursive focus of the level in order to provide pedagogical models for the instructors and students. Once texts were selected, they were didacticized to emphasize specific themes as well as lexico-grammatical structures for instruction. This multi-step process then had important implications for assessment because assessment events needed to be developed that elicited the type of integrated language and content knowledge that was consistent with the expected outcomes of each level (see Appendix D for sample assessment of writing). Because some texts can lose their relevance over time, there was an attempt to select texts that were potentially more timeless in their treatment of a topic. Faculty also review the selected texts on a regular basis for their appropriateness.

Over the past four years the faculty has worked collaboratively to complete the above-described framework. As the chronology of the curriculum reform indicates (see http://german.emory.edu), the first three levels of the curriculum either have been fully implemented or piloted. The piloting of the final two levels is currently underway and will be completed by December 2013. In addition to the continuing sub-committee work, substantial time has been spent in departmental meetings reviewing the current state of the curriculum. In fact, a recently adopted policy is that new courses or levels are presented to the rest of the faculty for comment before they are implemented. A central topic at each of these presentations is how the proposed course fits into the new curriculum and abides by the agreed-upon curricular trajectory. Another ongoing aspect of the reform process is the continual examination of the articulation between levels. Specifically, this past year substantial effort was focused on the transition between the second and third level, particularly in terms of writing development. Biweekly meetings between instructors at both levels resulted in a plan for moving students further into the discursive realm of explanation while acknowledging the strong emphasis on narration in the second level.

As the overview in Appendix A indicates, the curriculum consists of five levels.[8] The first three levels (Levels 1–3) are taken sequentially, and the final two levels (Levels 4 and 5) consist of electives with a range of topics that change each semester. Students must complete one Level-4 course before they can enroll in Level-5 courses. Levels 1–3 follow a similar structure in that an overarching theme frames each level and is broken down into sub-themes that comprise the specific instructional units:

Level 1: *Wer ich bin: Das Selbstkonzept*
  (ich als StudentIn, HobbyistIn, Familienmitglied, KonsumentIn, Reisende(r), StaatsbürgerIn)
Level 2: *Das Erwachsenwerden*
  (die Rolle der Familie, der Natur, der Reise, der Schule, des Krieges und der Liebe beim Erwachsenwerden)
Level 3: *Süße Pein*
  (die Darstellung der Liebe in der deutschsprachigen Kultur der Gegenwart, des geteilten Deutschlands, der Weimarer Republik, der Jahrhundertwende, des 19. Jahrhunderts, der Romantik, des Mittelalters)

A more detailed description of each of the five levels follows.

Level 1: *Wer ich bin* (Lancaster)

As indicated above, first-year German has a title, "*Wer ich bin: Das Selbstkonzept,*" that specifies the particular thematic focus of the two-course sequence (101 & 102), namely, an exploration of the roles and group affiliations that contribute to the identity formation of young adults in the United States and the German-speaking world. Specifically, students examine the following six different roles or groups devoting 4–5 weeks to each:

German 101: (1) Student; (2) Hobbyist; (3) Family member;
German 102: (4) Consumer; (5) Tourist/Traveler; (6) Citizen.

Because of its explicit thematic emphasis that frames and informs how the language is approached, the course differs from traditional first-year language courses. The six different roles or group affiliations listed above serve as thematic units for the course, and for each unit those aspects of the German language that are needed to communicate effectively about that theme establish the unit's language focus. Because of the thematic foci of the course, the traditional textbook takes on a different role. Whereas the first-year course used to move chronologically through a first-year commercial textbook and relied on the textbook to introduce content and language, now the content is determined independently of the textbook and the textbook is used based on how it relates to the chosen content. The first-year subcommittee decided which grammar topics were needed to communicate meaningfully about each content area, and then those grammar topics were assigned regardless of where they appeared in the textbook. For example, subordinating conjunctions, a grammar topic that appears in the eighth chapter of the textbook *Deutsch: Na klar!*, is already introduced in the second unit in German 101 so that students have that resource to discuss why and when they undertake certain activities as part of the larger discussion of their extra-curricular interests and hobbies. Students' foray into chapter eight at this point in the semester is only to understand and ultimately apply this one grammatical concept; they are not asked to engage the thematic focus or vocabulary of that chapter. For those who are very used to moving through a textbook in a chronological manner,

---

[8] This curricular structure follows the model established by the German curriculum at Georgetown University.

this unorthodox approach takes some adjustment, but it is described in detail in the course syllabus and often referred to by instructors in the first semester. Ultimately, it has been the department's experience that any initial anxieties or concerns dissipate once students understand how this flexible use of the textbook provides them with the structures and vocabulary necessary for communicating successfully about the themes of the course.[9]

At the same time, this theme-oriented approach does not mean that the traditional building blocks of language, namely, grammar and vocabulary, are not covered in a systematic and explicit way. In fact, students see right away that much of what they do for class resembles how one might imagine a typical first-year language course; that is, students read texts, learn relevant vocabulary, study grammatical structures that appear in the texts, complete exercises for homework on the grammar and vocabulary, interact with classmates and the instructor on specific topics, and complete writing and speaking assignments. What all these activities have in common is that they aim to familiarize students with the language and the content that is the focus of each respective unit. Students' first introduction to a unit is through an overview of the targeted communicative goals, cultural knowledge, genres, structures, approaches, and assessment procedures (see Appendix B for a sample unit overview).

Central to the students' engagement with the content at this and at every curricular level is an emphasis on using written and spoken language to conduct cultural inquiry about their own culture and the cultures of the German-speaking world. Already in the first unit, for example, learners examine the influence of being a student on one's identity and are asked to think about their learning, living, eating, and socializing habits in relation to what they learn about students in the German-speaking world. Students gain the vocabulary to address these issues through vocabulary lists in the textbook as well as internally developed semantic fields on the topics of living, eating, and daily routines. One of the primary means for facilitating such cultural inquiry is through daily, curriculum-dependent worksheets that direct the students to use targeted language features to discuss specific issues and topics related to the unit's content focus. In the first unit, after reading a short description of a German university student's daily routine, students complete a worksheet that asks them to relate their typical day to what this one student describes (Appendix C). Topics that they are asked to consider include course attendance policies, internship possibilities, hours of homework, and extracurricular activities. Although the development of these worksheets was a very time-intensive undertaking for the department, they were deemed necessary because the textbook exercises neither focused on the same thematic issues nor allowed for the type of integrated language-content practice characteristic of the new curriculum.

These worksheets also serve as preparation for the speaking and writing assignments throughout the course. At the end of the first unit, for example, students have to write a 250-word letter in German to their imaginary cousin in Austria, describing the basics of their student existence while also commenting about what they have learned about Austrian student life. As students continue this exercise of relating their own real-world situations to the situations of peers in other cultures in their progression up through the curriculum, they are asked to examine how their worldview shapes and might be re-shaped by practices and products in other parts of the world.

---

[9] Although the textbook *Deutsch: Na klar!* is used in this unorthodox manner, it is the department's current belief that it still provides enough vital information and activities that it is worth purchasing. For example, the book is still the primary source for grammar explanations and vocabulary and thus an important component of the course.

Level 2: *Erwachsenwerden* (Maxim)

Moving beyond the focus on personal identity emphasized in first-year German, second-year German explores how various societal factors have affected German-speaking youths' coming of age in different time periods in the German-speaking world and draws comparisons with coming of age processes in English-speaking cultures. Specifically, each semester the course examines the following factors as they pertain to coming of age:

German 201: (1) Family; (2) Nature; (3) Travel;
German 202: (4) Education; (5) War; (6) Love.

The criteria for determining this content focus were the same as those used for selecting content at all levels: (a) content that is culturally significant and of interest to both students and instructors; and (b) content whose predominant textual manifestation reflects the discursive emphasis for that level. In the case of Level 2 with its continued focus on narration that began in Level 1 as well as its transition to explanation that continues in Level 3, the coming-of-age theme lends itself well to the level. Most tales of coming of age are inherently narrative, but they also thematize factors and/or consequences that help explain the maturation process. In the unit on education, for example, students read "Jugend im Griensteidl," Stefan Zweig's autobiographical account of his school days in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna, and examine not only how he narrates this time period but also how he explains the reasons for and the results of his boredom with traditional schooling. The other two texts in the unit, Michael Haneke's film *Das weiße Band* and Corinna Schnabel's short story "Ich möchte gern schreiben," provide further opportunities for understanding how stories are told as well as how causes and consequences are presented in them. In addition to the texts themselves serving as blueprints for student production, a grammar textbook is used to study the language necessary to communicate meaningfully about the topic of coming of age.[10] All six units in Level 2 culminate with students engaging the targeted theme in writing and speaking through a narration-explanation of their own or a fictional situation (see Appendix D for sample writing and speaking assignments from Level 2).

Another feature of the curriculum that is particularly prominent in Level 2 is the conscious overlap with topics discussed in Level 1 or 3 in order to ease the transition and to strengthen the articulation between levels but also to explore the same topics from a different perspective and with a different discursive focus. For example, the sub-themes of schooling, family, and travel in Level 1 are revisited in Level 2 but from the perspective of coming of age and with a discursive focus that gradually shifts from narration to explanation. In another example, Level 2 ends with the sub-theme of love as a way of preparing students for Level 3 when love becomes the over-arching topic. In addition to certain themes being revisited, certain genres and authors are also treated more than once in the curriculum. For instance, the reading of three different Grimm fairy tales in the first half of Level 2 is anticipated by the reading of a Grimm tale at the end of Level 1, and in the second half of Level 2 students read the novella *Die Geschichte von Herrn Sommer* by Patrick Süskind, which then prepares them for reading Süskind's *Der Kontrabass* in the first half of Level 3.

---

[10] The department currently uses the fifth edition of *Handbuch zur deutschen Grammatik* by Rankin and Wells (2011) as the grammar reference text in Level 2.

Level 3: *Süße Pein* (Schaumann)

In the past, the third-year sequence included a survey course in German literature followed by a culture course focused on Germany after 1945. In the third-year subcommittee discussions, these courses with their separation of literature and culture were replaced with a carefully structured, more cohesive sequence that combines the teaching of fiction, non-fiction, and other cultural artifacts. We retain a particular focus on literature, but now integrate literary and non-literary texts, films, artwork, and music. While there is still an emphasis on the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, we all agreed to teach German culture in a comprehensive, inclusive manner rather than as being defined by the ramifications of the Holocaust and World War II.

Looking for an overarching topic that could be applied to a range of contexts and time periods, the sub-committee settled on the changing portrayal of love in German cultural narratives. While accessible to students in that they articulate an intimately familiar, recurring topic, representations of love also span an unusually wide spectrum of texts and moreover offer a glimpse into distinct histories and cultural practices. Course materials for the sequence are thus drawn from a literary canon on *süße Pein* ("sweet pain") but are expected to vary with each instructor and each individual course. Examining a variety of texts (prose, drama, essays, poetry, film, artworks, and music) from the Middle Ages to the twenty-first century, students encounter differing literary perspectives, metaphors, themes, and language, and discuss their respective cultural implications.

Because the sub-committee felt that contemporary texts were more manageable for students from both a linguistic and thematic standpoint, the committee structured the level to follow a reverse chronological approach across the two semesters. This course structure also allows for Patrick Süskind's *Der Kontrabass* to be the first text discussed in the class, thus establishing the aforementioned transition from the second-year course when students read Süskind's *Die Geschichte von Herrn Sommer*. Other readings in the first semester of Level 3 include texts by Judith Hermann, Doris Dörrie, Clemens Meyer, Peter Stamm, Bernhard Schlink, and Arthur Schnitzler, as well as various films, including *Nichts als Gespenster* (Martin Gypkens), *Walk on Water* (Eytan Fox), and *Auf der anderen Seite* (Fatih Akın), and clips from film adaptations of the readings. The course also introduces love poetry, moving from contemporary poems by Hans Magnus Enzensberger and C.W. Delius to Ingeborg Bachmann and Bertolt Brecht, and concludes with Expressionist poetry. German 302 continues the focus on love, beginning with Frank Wedekind's *Frühlings Erwachen* and concluding with *Minnelieder*, and currently incorporates E.T.A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandman,* as well as parts of *Faust I*, and the *Nibelungenlied*. Additionally, these fictional texts are complemented by short essays by Sigmund Freud and Stefan Zweig, and the films *Die Verwirrungen des Zöglings Törleß* (dir. Volker Schlöndorff) and *Faust* (dir. F.W. Murnau). The discussion of poetry also continues at this level and comprises Romantic poetry, poems by Goethe, and *Minnelieder*. These diverse texts offer ample opportunities to discuss themes such as schooling and sex education, the mechanisms of seduction and guilt, a subject's destiny and autonomy, madness and memory, obsession, travel and tourism, and cross-cultural relationships.

All of these love-related themes also facilitate the discursive shift already begun in the second half of Level 2 away from narration to a focus on explanation. This discursive emphasis is particularly evident in the writing assignments for the level. Students in German 301 begin by writing a plot summary, a genre that still retains much narrativity, before they embark on assignments that require explanation of a particular textual element (e.g., character portrayal; scene analysis). Recent sub-committee work has focused on specifying to a greater degree the particular lexico-grammatical features of the targeted "explaining" writing and speaking assignments. This has been a multi-step process of (a) selecting successful student performances, (b) identify-

ing specific language features at the word, sentence, and discourse level that contributed significantly to the successful performances, (c) codifying and categorizing these features, and (d) revising the pedagogy and the assignments to emphasize these features. Appendix E features a revised writing assignment that specifies not only the content and the structure of the task but also lexico-grammatical items necessary to realize its communicative purpose. In addition, the task description contains suggested rhetorical phrasings for accomplishing different communicative goals of the assignment.

Although all language modalities are emphasized across the curriculum, writing receives particular attention due to the text-based and literacy-oriented nature of the curriculum. In fact, beginning with Level 3, all courses within the curriculum have such a significant writing component that they satisfy the university's post-first-year writing requirement as part of the undergraduate general education requirements.

Levels 4 and 5 (Maxim and Aue)

Although the topics for Level 4 and 5 courses change each semester, the determination of the content for these two levels follows the same above-mentioned criteria used for selecting content for all levels: content (a) that is culturally significant; (b) is of interest to both students and instructors; and (c) whose predominant textual manifestation reflects the discursive emphasis for that level. While the content differs for each course, the focus during the pilot phase of these two levels has been to achieve consensus and consistency regarding the discursive focus and targeted language features of each level. Level 4 continues the focus on explanation but moves away from the text-centric explanations that predominate in Level 3 and emphasizes to a greater degree explaining a text in relation to larger socio-historical issues. As an example, a Level 4 course on post-war Austrian theater examines the theatrical productions for both their text-intrinsic qualities as well as their role in Austrian identity formation following independence. Students are thus not only asked to explain features of the studied texts but also to explain the texts' place in the larger social and political movements of the time. To do so, students need to consider text-extrinsic factors that affect or result from the textual production, which require evaluating existing explanations about Austrian theater's place in society for their validity and relevance vis-à-vis their own explanations. In other words, as students form their own explanations, they also need to consider and refer to previously given explanations. In this way, students in Level 4 courses begin to make the transition to the final discursive stage of the curriculum, namely, argumentation.

Level 5, representing the highest level in the curriculum, focuses extensively on developing students' ability to form effective arguments. As the sub-committee worked on articulating the student learning outcomes of this level, it found Graff and Birkenstein's (2011) definition of the concept of critical thinking to be particularly helpful in identifying the stages of the argumentation process. Although Graff and Birkenstein were writing about critical thinking in first-language (L1) writing development and assessment, the basic moves of critical thinking that they outline are equally relevant for collegiate FL education. In short, they identify the following fundamentals of argumentation:

Locating a controversial issue or problem;
Accurately summarizing the views of others;
Framing and explaining quotations;
Offering one's own argument and explaining why it matters;
Moving between one's own position and the one being responded to without confusing readers;

Weighing evidence;
Anticipating counterarguments;
Drawing conclusions (p. 222).

As Graff and Birkenstein point out, students are by no means well-skilled in these fundamentals even in their native tongue. As a result, explicit pedagogical attention needs to be devoted to the argumentation process in terms of both the conceptual procedure of building an argument and the linguistic means needed to realize an effective argument. In a Level 5 course that examines the discourse of contemporary political events in Germany, students focus in their reading and in their own language production on how arguments are reported, evaluated, countered, and weakened with specific attention to the rhetorical and linguistic devices used. The editorial is the predominant written genre that students produce, and they work on their oral arguments in a series of role-playing talk shows on the topics of the course. One of the major tasks of the pilot phase is the development of guides for students on how to express themselves in these significantly different argumentative genres (see Appendix F for one such example).

Perhaps surprisingly, our new curricular approach has not caused any significant problems to students entering the program laterally with prior formal classroom instruction in German. They are placed into the curriculum based on their score on the standardized placement exam that we are using for the time being until our own internal and curriculum-dependent placement exam is developed. Then, once in the curriculum, they find that our approach is not that significantly different from their previous experiences in that they are still asked to communicate using the meaning-making resources (e.g., grammar and vocabulary) that have been emphasized in instruction.

Programmatic Assessment

While the department is proud of the progress it has made on its curricular reform, that pride would be empty without validation of its efforts through systematic and meaningful program-wide outcomes assessment. The implementation of a curriculum-wide assessment plan is still underway as the curricular reform enters its final stage, but a process has been established that can be applied to all levels and will result in a system for determining the degree to which stated level-specific outcomes are being met. To begin with, student learning outcomes are stated for each curricular level based on the specific knowledge, abilities, and dispositions that the level-specific sub-committees established.[11] Although the department was aware of and considered existing proficiency guidelines by both ACTFL and the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), the faculty decided that neither of these guidelines captured effectively nor entirely the humanistically oriented learning that characterizes collegiate foreign language instruction.[12] For that reason, program-specific outcomes were established that reflect the curriculum's text-based and cultural literacy-oriented approach. Then, following the model established by the Georgetown University German Department's exemplary approach

---

[11] See http://german.emory.edu for level-specific student learning outcomes. The focus on expressing learning outcomes in terms of abilities, dispositions, and knowledge reflects the guidance that the department has received from language assessment consultants from the National Foreign Language Resource Center at the University of Hawai'i and from the department's involvement in the Consortium on Useful Assessment in Humanities Education.

[12] The authors acknowledge the role of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines in state teacher certification, but students at Emory have typically not pursued this career path.

to program evaluation, each sub-committee developed end-of-level writing and speaking tasks that were designed to elicit performances deemed prototypical for learners at the end of the respective level (see Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris [2010]). An important aspect of these tasks is that they are embedded in the curriculum and thereby reflect curricular goals and pedagogy. This is not to say that "off-the-shelf" independent measures would not also be helpful in order to make claims and comparisons vis-à-vis other programs, but more important right now is establishing the degree to which departmental goals are being met. To that end, the department is in the process of collecting performances from all students, regardless of major or course of study, on the end-of-level tasks that will then be analyzed for a range of variables related to the expected outcomes (e.g., syntactic development, cultural knowledge, textual cohesion and coherence).[13]

Until those data are analyzed thoroughly, the department is relying on student and instructor feedback to evaluate its curricular practices. In addition to completing the standard end-of-semester university course evaluation forms, students are also asked to complete course-specific evaluations developed by the department (Appendix G). Particularly during the pilot phase of a curricular level, the evaluations are very specific and seek student feedback on all aspects of the course. Instructors have evaluated the student feedback and made adjustments to the courses as necessary. Of particular concern early on in the reform process was the non-standard approach to the textbook in first-year German. The faculty was thus pleased to note that students responded favorably to this approach. The faculty also has met and continues to meet on a regular basis to discuss specific courses and to make recommendations for improvements. One of the benefits of having a small group of colleagues in the department is that dialogue about the curriculum happens often and easily. There is no question that one of the motivations for this frequency and intensity of discussion is that the faculty sees the positive results that our work has on the students.

Because the department is still in the data gathering stage, it does not have comprehensive statistical information to indicate above-average learning-outcome results, but it can point to a few early indicators of success: increased enrollments for each of the past four years in Levels 1–3 (31% increase in Level 1; 51% increase in Level 2; 47% increase in Level 3); an increase in the retention rate from Level 1 to Level 2 from 20% to 38% in the past four years; and an increased interest in study and internship abroad programs. In a relatively small program at a university where many of the students pursue a pre-professional track that often does not involve foreign language study, the department sees these recent developments as grounds for optimism.[14]

Conclusion

As this description of the curriculum has shown, great attention has been devoted to establishing a program of study that focuses on developing students' German cultural literacy to a level that will allow them to interact successfully with German speakers in a range of professional contexts. While the specifics of the program reflect our particular institutional learning environment, the conceptualization of a coherent curriculum is one that we feel has applicability in a range of educational settings, including at the secondary level. Moreover, the process our department underwent of (a) acknowledging our bifurcation, (b) agreeing on a unified

---

[13] This process for analyzing learner corpora was borrowed from the Georgetown University German Department's approach to program evaluation.

[14] The department was also pleased to have its efforts recognized within the profession when it was designated by the AATG as a Center of Excellence in 2012. For more information visit http://www.aatg.org/content/college-university-centers-excellence.

departmental vision, and (c) establishing a multi-year plan to develop a theoretically grounded, articulated curriculum is also one that has relevance for the profession at large. That is not to say that such an undertaking is without challenges. Nevertheless, it is our belief that the nature of our discipline combined with our precarious position in the academy today that requires us to respond with a clear vision of our goals and a coherent, programmatic approach for accomplishing those goals. If we aim to develop learners with advanced German cultural literacy and programs that demonstrate the centrality of foreign language studies for a liberal arts education, then we need curricula that provide a transparent and coherent learner pathway that allows students the opportunity to achieve advanced abilities in the language and to become familiar with genre-based textual analysis to such a point that they will be able to continue that type of reading and thinking and arguing once they leave the institution and move on to their next destination. Without such theoretically grounded curricular coherence, we run the risk not only of providing a disservice to our students but also of becoming further marginalized or misunderstood within higher education.[15] In the end, each program needs to decide on the approach that best suits its local context, but it has been this department's experience that curricular reform, even in the face of its multi-year, evolving, lengthy, ongoing nature, results in a program of study that serves the students, the faculty, and the discipline well.

References

Allen, H. W., & Maxim, H. H. (Eds.) (2013). *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century.* Boston: Cengage.

Barrette, C. M., Paesani, K., & Vinall, K. (2010). Toward an integrated curriculum: Maximizing the use of target language literature. *Foreign Language Annals, 43* (2), 216–230.

Bernhardt, E., & Berman, R. (1999). From German 1 to German Studies 001: A chronicle of curricular reform. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 32* (1), 22–31.

Bernhardt, E. B. (1995). Teaching literature or teaching students? *ADFL Bulletin, 26* (2), 5–6.

Brittain, F. P. (2001). The role of the department chair in foreign language articulation. *ADFL Bulletin, 32* (3), 86–92.

Byrnes, H. (2001). Reconsidering graduate students' education as teachers: 'It takes a department!' *The Modern Language Journal, 85* (4), 512–530.

Byrnes, H. (2002). Language and culture: Shall the twain ever meet in foreign language departments? *ADFL Bulletin, 33* (2), 25–32.

Byrnes, H. (2006). A semiotic perspective on culture and foreign language teaching: Implications for collegiate materials development. In V. Galloway & B. Cothran (Eds.), *Language and culture out of bounds: Discipline-blurred perspectives on the foreign language classroom* (pp. 37–66). Boston: Heinle.

Byrnes, H. (2013). Reconsidering graduate students' education as scholar-teachers: Mind your language! In H. W. Allen & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 17–42). Boston: Heine, Cengage Learning.

Byrnes, H., Maxim, H. H., & Norris, J. M. (2010). Realizing advanced L2 writing development in collegiate FL education: Curricular design, pedagogy, and assessment. *The 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.

Di Donato, R., Clyde, M., & Vansant, J. (2011). *Deutsch, na klar! An introductory German course.* 6th ed. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Eigler, F. (2001). Designing a third-year German course. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, *34* (2), 107–118.

Graff, G., & Birkenstein, C. (2011). A progressive case for educational standardization: How not to respond to calls for common standards. In D. Heiland & L. J. Rosenthal (Eds.), *Literary study, measurement, and the sublime: Disciplinary assessment* (pp. 217–226). New York: Teagle Foundation.

[15] As a case in point, the agency that accredits colleges and universities in the Southeast, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), recently issued the guideline that "introductory" foreign language courses are "skill courses" and not "pure humanities courses".

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Arnold.

James, D. (1996). Bypassing the traditional leadership: Who's minding the store? *ADFL Bulletin*, *28* (3), 5–11.

Kern, R. (2002). Reconciling the language-literature split through literacy. *ADFL Bulletin*, *33* (3), 20–24.

Kramsch, C. (1995). Embracing conflict versus achieving consensus in foreign language education. *ADFL Bulletin*, *26* (3), 6–12.

Levine, G. S., Chavez, M., Crane, C., Melin, C. & Lovik, T. A. (2008). The language program director in curricular and departmental reform. *Profession*, 240–254.

Levine, G. S., & Phipps, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy.* Boston: Heinle, Cengage Learning.

Macken-Horarik, M. (2002). "Something to shoot for": A systemic-functional approach to teaching genre in secondary school. In A. M. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 17–42). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Martin, J. R. (2009). Genre and language learning: A social semiotic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, *20*, 10–21.

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

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (2006). Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century: Including Arabic, Chinese, Classical Languages, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish (3rd rev. ed.). Yonkers, NY: Author.

Rankin, J., & Wells, L. D. (2011). *Handbuch zur deutschen Grammatik: Wiederholen und anwenden*. Fifth edition. Heinle, Cengage Learning.

Roche, M. (1999). Strategies for enhancing the visibility and role of foreign language departments. *ADFL Bulletin*, *30* (2), 10–18.

Rothery, J., & Stenglin, M. (1997). Entertaining and instructing: Exploring experience through story. In F. Christie & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genres and Institutions. Social Processes in the Workplace and School* (pp. 231–263). London: Cassell.

Smith, M. (2012, Jan. 27). Rosetta reservations. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved February 20, 2013, http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/01/27/educators-question-taking-rosetta-stone-credit.

Summers, L. H. (2012, Jan. 20). What you (really) need to know. The New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/22/education/edlife/the-21st-century-education.html.

Swaffar, J. (1999). The case for foreign languages as a discipline. *ADFL Bulletin*, *30*(3), 6–12.

Trommler, F. (2000). The art and ethos of chairing: Unpacking the toolbox of governance. *ADFL Bulletin*, *32* (1), 7–11.

Weber-Feve, S. (2009). Integrating language and literature: Teaching textual analysis with input and output activities and an input-to-output approach. *Foreign Language Annals*, *42*(3), 453–467.

Appendix A. Overview of Undergraduate German Studies Curriculum

First-Year German (Level 1)

Focus: *Wer ich bin: Das Selbstkonzept* / Exploring self-identity in the German-speaking world

Logic: An exploration and comparison of young adults' identity in the American English- and German-speaking worlds through the study and analysis of the different roles they assume in contemporary society.

Themes:

Roles/Group affiliations	Characteristics
Student	what one studies, wears, eats, discusses
Hobbyist	what one likes to do outside of studies
Family member	what one's role is within the family
Consumer	What / why / how one buys & shops
Tourist / Traveler	where / why / how one travels / what one sees
Citizen / Passport holder	where one does (not) belong

Language acquisitional foci
- discursive level
  - recreate, recount, and narrate immediate, personal events in chronological fashion
- sentence level
  - major syntactic patterns
  - verbal paradigm (present and perfect tenses; *Satzbau*)

- case system, including prepositions
- coordination and subordination
- pre- and post-nominal modification (relative clauses; adjective endings)
- indicative, subjunctive, imperative mood
- word level
  - relevant lexical fields

Textual engagement
- fledgling ability to identify
  - author intentionality/stance
  - intended audience
  - genre
  - presuppositions
  - cultural implications
  - textual organization (*e.g.,* chronology, comparison, contrast, cause-and-effect, deductive, inductive, summative) via discourse markers, semantic connections, paragraph structure

Sample written assignments: personal letters & emails; personal recounts; personal narratives

Sample oral assignments: conversation; interview

Implications: Students come to an understanding of how the different roles we assume in society affect the formation of our identity and of how our different roles are often situationally and culturally determined.

Second-Year German (Level 2)

Focus: *Das Erwachsenwerden* / Coming of age through the ages in the German-speaking world

Logic: An examination from different thematic perspectives of how youth have come of age over time in the German-speaking world and a comparison with contemporary comings of age in German and English language cultures.

Themes:

Societal factors	*Characteristics*
Family	Conforming to or rebelling against family order
Nature	Encountering nature as a hindrance or ally for maturation – the lure of the city vs. the serenity of nature
Travel	Gaining self-knowledge through travel; escaping confining social order at home
Education	Pursuing knowledge within confines of educational institutions
War	Constructive and destructive aspects of war
Love	Liberating or debilitating effects of love

Language acquisitional foci
- discursive level
  - Situate, narrate, and account for personal events in time and place; compare, contrast, and explain events, beliefs, actions
- sentence level (with differing degrees of emphasis and expectation)
  - major syntactic patterns
  - verbal paradigm (present and perfect tenses; *Satzbau*);
  - case system with prepositions
  - coordination and subordination
  - pre- and post-nominal modification (relative clauses; adjective endings)
  - subjunctive mood
  - passive voice
- word level
  - relevant lexical fields

Textual engagement
- growing ability to identify
  - author intentionality/stance
  - intended audience
  - genre
  - presuppositions
  - cultural implications
  - textual organization (e.g., chronology, comparison, contrast, cause-and-effect, deductive, inductive, summative) via discourse markers, semantic connections, paragraph structure

Sample written assignments: personal recounts; personal narratives; personal reports

Sample oral assignments: talk show; personal narrative

Implications: Students come to an understanding of how different societal phenomena affect one's coming of age during different periods in history. Moreover, they come to better understand their own rites of passage within their culture

Third-Year German (Level 3)

Focus: *Süße Pein* / portrayals of love in German-language cultural production

Logic: An examination of the tensions and dichotomies inherent in the portrayal of love at different points in German-language cultural production

Themes:

Types of love	Issues
Courtly love	(ir)reverence; (dis)trust; obsession; (blind) devotion; loss; disappointment; separation; (dis)loyalty; heartbreak; silence; longing; rejection
Motherly love	
Unrequited love	
Spiritual love	
Postmodern love	

Language acquisitional foci
- discursive level
  - Explain the factors and/or consequences of events, actions, beliefs
- sentence level (with differing degrees of emphasis and expectation)
  - major syntactic patterns with emphasis on textual cohesion through foregrounding & backgrounding of information
  - shift from verbal to nominal paradigm;
  - expanded notions of subordination;
  - pre- and post-nominal modification (relative clauses; adjective endings)
  - subjunctive mood;
  - passive voice
- word level
  - relevant lexical fields

Textual engagement
- expanded ability to identify
  - author intentionality/stance
  - intended audience
  - genre
  - presuppositions
  - cultural implications & metaphors
  - textual organization (e.g., chronology, comparison, contrast, cause-and-effect, deductive, inductive, summative) via discourse markers, semantic connections, paragraph structure

Sample written assignments: plot summaries; character analysis; comparison

Sample oral assignments: *Referat*; presentation of a graph

Implications: Students develop the ability to comprehend and analyze the changes, influences, and forms of expressions of cultural narratives, and are able to apply this ability to subsequent narratives they encounter

Fourth-Year German (Levels 4 and 5)

Focus: *Sozio-kulturelle Strömungen / Bewegungen in der deutschsprachigen Welt* / The exploration of major socio-cultural and existential questions in the German-speaking world

Logic: An in-depth examination of the expression, treatment, and public discussion of major issues in the German-speaking world

Themes:

Sample issues	Forms of expression
Modernism	essays, fiction, poetry, drama, journalism, humor, advertising, political rhetoric, film, visual arts, music, sport, architecture, monuments, legal documents, religious treatises
Notions of space	
Intimacy	
Romanticism	
Mass media	
Terrorism	
Ostalgie	

Language acquisitional foci
- discursive level
    - Explain and situate events, actions, beliefs in larger socio-historical context
    - Engage public and institutional issues, values, and beliefs
    - Address whether previously given explanations of an event or outcome are valid by reporting, evaluating, countering, and weakening alternative positions (Level 5)
- sentence level (with differing degrees of emphasis and expectation)
    - major syntactic patterns with emphasis on increased complexity and variation through foregrounding & backgrounding of information
    - nominal paradigm — pre- and post-nominal modification (relative clauses; adjective endings; extended adjectival attributes)
    - expanded notions of subordination
    - subjunctive mood & indirect discourse
    - passive voice
- word level
    - relevant lexical fields

Textual engagement
- advanced ability to identify
    - author intentionality/stance
    - intended audience
    - genre
    - presuppositions
    - cultural implications & metaphors
    - textual organization (*e.g.*, chronology, comparison, contrast, cause-and-effect, deductive, inductive, summative) via discourse markers, semantic connections, paragraph structure

Sample written assignments: plot summaries; book reviews; literature review of secondary sources; newspaper articles; conference abstracts; independent research paper

Sample oral assignments: *Referat*; debate; monologic presentation

Implications: Students culminate their understanding of central methodological questions and debates in German Studies and exit the undergraduate program with the ability to engage in independent cultural inquiry

Appendix B. Sample Unit Overview for First-Year German: "Family"

Communicative Goals: In this unit, you will focus on talking about your role as a family member. Specifically, you will

- learn to talk about your family and your relatives, their biographical information, and their interests
- learn to talk about your relationship to particular members of your family
- learn to talk about family traditions and celebrations
- learn to talk about your childhood in your family, including childhood celebrations, childhood trips, childhood privileges and constraints

Cultural Knowledge: This unit will expose you to how families are configured in the German-speaking world and which holidays and celebrations are popular. You will also read two classic texts involving children and a poem by one of the great German poets of the 20th century

Genres: You will study graphs and figures, read a poem, listen to and read a ballad, and read a classic children's story, all about families and relationships

Structures: At the end of the unit, you will have familiarized yourself with

- the genitive case
- genitive prepositions
- the present perfect tense
- the imperfect tense of modal verbs and "sein" and "haben"
- ordinal numbers
- the imperative mood

Approaches: You are getting to the point where you are starting to feel somewhat comfortable talking and writing about basic, everyday topics. You will get a chance to practice these again in the 3rd person when you talk about family members. When you learn the past tense, you will also review the many expressions that you have been practicing all semester, only this time you will need to put the expressions in the past tense.

You will be asked to spend more time outside of class reading the texts assigned in this unit. They will receive full attention in class, but you will also be expected to start making some sense of them on your own. Pay attention to what the text is trying to do (e.g., describe, persuade, explain) and see if you can identify some examples of how this is being done. There will be some words in the texts that you will not understand. Do not let that worry you, but try to get the gist/the most important information from the text without insisting on understanding everything. Also, once the text has been discussed more thoroughly in class, look to note specific vocabulary or phrases that you might be able to *recycle* in your own language production.

Continue to spend time outside of class *studying* (i.e., not just reading passively) the relevant vocabulary and grammar. Class time will be spent on both of these areas as well, but that will not be enough time for you to get a firm grasp of the material. Make a point of reviewing class material each day and look to build up an arsenal of expressions that you are comfortable using to talk about how you use your time.

Assessment: At the end of this unit, there will be a take-home writing assignment consisting of two drafts. Your speaking abilities will be assessed on an oral final exam. In addition, your instructor might choose to give short in-class quizzes to test your understanding of specific topics, particularly past participles. There is no unit test for this unit; rather, your knowledge of this unit will be tested on the written and oral final exams.

Appendix C. Sample *Arbeitsblatt* from first-semester German (101)

Deutsch 101
Thema 1: Student
David R.: Fragen zum Text

Beantworten Sie die Fragen! Schreiben Sie vollständige Sätze (= *complete sentences*)!

1. Die Professoren kontrollieren Davids Anwesenheit (= *attendance*) nicht. Kontrollieren Ihre Professoren Ihre Anwesenheit?
2. David hat Praktika. Haben Sie dieses Semester Praktika?
3. David ist von Früh bis zum Abend in der Uni. Sind Sie auch so lange an der Uni?

4. David geht abends in der Woche selten aus und geht oft früh ins Bett. Was machen Sie abends in der Woche?
5. David studiert Elektrotechnik, und das ist ein full-time Programm: 60 Stunden pro Woche. Wie viele Stunden pro Woche lernen Sie (Kurse, Hausaufgabe, Praktika, Tutorübungen)?
6. David findet sein Studium zeitaufwendig und stressig. Finden Sie Ihr Studium auch so?

Appendix D. Sample Writing Assignment for Level 2 (Unit on Nature, the 2nd of 6 Themes)

Erzählung: „Eine Begegnung mit der Natur"

Aufgabe
Genre: persönliche Erzählung

In allen Texten dieser Unterrichtseinheit werden verschiedene Begegnungen mit der Natur dargestellt (von Hänsel und Gretels Angst vor dem großen dunklen Wald und der bösen Hexe bis zu Christraut Peters' Interesse an dem Schutz und der Pflege der Natur). Schreiben Sie jetzt eine wahre oder fiktive Erzählung, in der Sie eine Begegnung mit der Natur beschreiben. Konzentrieren Sie sich auf den Einfluss dieser Begegnung auf Sie und Ihr Erwachsenwerden. Die Erzählung enthält folgende Teile:
- Hintergrundinformationen über sich selbst
- Beschreibung der Begegnung
- Der Einfluss der Begegnung auf Sie
- Schlussbemerkung

Da dieses Genre eine persönliche Erzählung ist, schreiben Sie in der 1. Person. Schreiben Sie ca. 2 Seiten.

Inhalt

Besprechen Sie die folgenden Themen in dieser Erzählung:
- Hintergrundinformationen: Wo sind Sie aufgewachsen, z.B. auf dem Land, in der Stadt? Waren Sie als Kind oft draußen? Was haben Sie gemacht? Welche Rolle spielte die Natur in Ihrem Leben? Was für eine Beziehung hatten Sie zur Natur?
- Begegnung: Wo waren Sie und was ist passiert (z.B. eine Kanufahrt in Maine? Ein Hundebiss vom bösen Hund des Nachbarn? Ein vernichtender Sturm? Eine Müllhalde irgendwo in New Jersey? Mitten im Betondschungel einer Großstadt)? Wie haben Sie damals darauf reagiert? Was haben Sie gemacht? Was haben Sie gedacht?
- Einfluss: Wie hat diese Begegnung Sie beeinflusst? Positiv oder negativ? Haben Sie sich verändert? Hat sich Ihre Beziehung zur Natur geändert? Wie verhalten Sie sich jetzt der Natur gegenüber?
- Schlussbemerkung: Wie sehen Sie jetzt die Natur? Erwarten Sie weitere Entwicklungen? Was für eine Zukunft wünschen Sie sich?

Sprachliche Schwerpunkte

- Wortstellung
- Verbform: Konjugation, Vergangenheitsformen (Präteritum, Perfekt)
- Temporalphrasen
- Genus u. Kasus (besonders nach Präpositionen)
- Adjektivendungen
- Infinitivsätze
- Rechtschreibung, Kommasetzung
- Hilfreiches Vokabular aus den Texten
- Diskursmarker zu Vergleich

Benotungskriterien

Die Kategorien Aufgabe, Inhalt und sprachlicher Fokus werden äquivalent gewertet. Die Gesamtnote ergibt sich aus den Teilnoten. In der revidierten Version können Sie Ihre Note um maximal 2 "Stufen" verbessern (sehr gute Korrektur: Verbesserung um 2 Stufen; gute Korrektur: 1 Stufe, mittelmäßige bis schwache Korrektur: keine Verbesserung der Note).

Appendix E. Sample Writing and Speaking Assignments for Level 2 (Unit on Nature, the 2nd of 6 Themes)

Talk Show: „Die Natur und ich"

Aufgabe (20%)
Genre: Talk Show
Die folgenden Personen versammeln sich in Atlanta und halten ein Gespräch miteinander über Ihre Beziehung zur Natur:

Hänsel
Gretel
ihr Vater
ihre Stiefmutter
die böse Hexe
der Knabe
das Röslein
Christraut Peters

Sie wählen eine der Rollen, und Ihr/e Lehrer/in moderiert die Talk Show und führt das Gespräch durch verschiedene Fragen zu den unten angeführten Themen. Die Teilnehmer sollten nicht nur auf die Fragen des Moderators sondern auch *auf die Antworten und Kommentare der anderen Teilnehmer reagieren*. Sehr wichtig dabei ist, dass alle Sie verstehen, also benutzen Sie Vokabeln, die die anderen Teilnehmer verstehen können. Die ganze Talk Show dauert ca. 25 Minuten.

Inhalt (40%)
Der Moderator stellt Fragen zu den folgenden Themen während der Talk Show:
- Die Rolle der Natur in Ihrem Leben, als Sie jünger waren
- Ereignisse, Vorfälle in der Natur;
- Der Einfluss der Natur auf Ihr Erwachsenwerden;
- Die Rolle der Natur in Ihrem Leben in der Zukunft
- Ihre Wünsche für die Zukunft

Vorbereitung
    a. Wiederholen Sie die Texte, das Vokabular und die Grammatik, die für das Thema und Ihre Rolle relevant sind;
    b. Denken Sie über mögliche Fragen nach, die der Moderator stellen könnte;
    c. Schreiben Sie Notizen, die Sie während der Diskussion benutzen (3x5 Karteikärtchen).

Sprachlicher Schwerpunkt (40%)
- Redewendungen vom grünen Blatt (*Opinion, Agreement, Disagreement*);
- Wortstellung (WS);
- Kongruenz (SV);
- Genus (G), Kasus (K) besonders nach Präpositionen;
- Komparativ;
- Konjunktiv;
- Vergangenheitsformen (Präteritum; Perfekt);
- Hilfreiches Vokabular von den Texten
- Aussprache

Appendix F. Revised Writing Assignment for Level 3

Eine Zusammenfassung

Eine Zusammenfassung gibt in eigenen Worten wieder, was im Text passiert, sowohl in Bezug auf das Geschehen als auch auf die Perspektiven, Gedanken und Gefühle der Protagonisten. Dazu ist es nötig, die argumentative Struktur des Originaltextes zu erkennen. Es kommt nicht nur darauf an festzustellen: Was erzählt der Autor/die Autorin, sondern auch: wie beschreibt er/sie das und warum sagt er/sie das an dieser Stelle? Die Themen im Text sollten anhand von Beispielen dargestellt werden. Achten Sie darauf, dass ein Absatz jeweils ein Thema im Detail erörtert, dass die Absätze in sich geschlossen sind, und dass keine Wiederholungen auftauchen.

Inhalt

Einleitung
- Autor, Titel, Ort und Zeit der Handlung
- Textsorte (Drama, Gedicht, Roman)
- Protagonisten, Perspektive
- Worum geht es?

Hauptteil
- Inhaltsangabe in Sinnabschnitten
- Zeitlich richtige Reihenfolge: auch wenn es im Originaltext Zeitsprünge und Rückblenden gibt!
- Was sind die wichtigsten Ereignisse, und wie hängen sie zusammen?
- Was denken und fühlen die Personen?
- Wichtige Details und Beispiele

Schluss
- Offene Fragen
- Effekt auf Leser/in
- Kurze Bewertung

Sprachliche Schwerpunkte
- Zeitform: Präsens, nur für Rückgriffe Imperfekt;
- Verbposition in Nebensätzen;
- Adjektivendungen;
- Passende rhetorische Mittel;
- indirekte Rede (keine wörtliche Rede oder Zitate; kein Hinweis auf Textstellen);
- Passiv bei der Einleitung (wurde veröffentlicht/geschrieben);
- Tätigkeitsverben im Hauptteil;
- Satzanfänge im Hauptteil durch folgende inhaltsorientierte Begriffe markiert:
    - Temporalphrasen, um eine Chronologie zu erstellen;
    - Nomen und Nominalisierungen, um Ereignisse zusammenzufassen (z.B. Diese Umstände .../ Wegen dieser Entscheidung ...)
    - Adverbien, um den Zustand der Figuren darzustellen (z.B., Verzweifelt geht (Figur) nach Hause/Gejagt von den Bewohnern flieht (Figur) ...)

Rhetorische Mittel bei einer Zusammenfassung

Um ein Werk einzuführen
Bei dem Roman/Drama/Gedicht (Titel) von (Autor) handelt es sich um ...
In diesem Text geht es um ...
(Titel) wurde (Jahr) von (Autor) geschrieben.
(Titel) erzählt die Geschichte von (Held), der ...
(Titel) von (Autor) versetzt den Leser in (Zeit/Ort der Handlung).
(Titel) spielt in der Zeit von (Ereignis).
Die Geschichte/die Handlung spielt (Zeit) in (Ort)

Um Figuren einzuleiten
Im Mittelpunkt der Handlung steht/stehen ...
Weitere Personen sind ...

Die Akteure sind im Wesentlichen ...

Um Ereignisse einzuordnen
    Zu Beginn des Textes / der Geschichte ... (Verb + Subjekt)
    Zunächst ...   Danach …   Schließlich ... (Verb + Subjekt)

    Diesem Ereignis folgt(e) …   Nachher   Darüber hinaus .... (Verb + Subjekt)

    Während … (Nebensatz)
    Sobald … (Nebensatz)
    Nachdem ... / bevor ... (Nebensatz)   Nach .... / vor ... (Nomen)
    Als … (Nebensatz)   Bis zum Morgen/nächsten Tag/Zeitpunkt als … (Nebensatz)
    Genau in diesem Moment … (Verb + Subjekt)
    Nicht lange danach/Bald darauf … (Verb + Subjekt)
    Eines Tages/Abends … (Verb + Subjekt)
    Am selben/folgenden Tag … (Verb + Subjekt)
    Einige Zeit/Stunden/Monate/Jahre später … (Verb + Subjekt)
    In der Zwischenzeit … (Verb + Subjekt)
    Schließlich … (Verb + Subjekt)

Um Textstellen zu erläutern
    Außerdem / Zudem / Weiterhin ... (Verb + Subjekt)
    Dabei ... (Verb + Subjekt)
    Was die Sache noch verschlimmert(e), ist/war, dass … (Nebensatz)

Um Kausalität zu verdeutlichen
    dadurch ... (Verb + Subjekt)
    deswegen/deshalb/daher/aus diesem Grund ... (Verb + Subjekt)
    Weil … (Nebensatz)Wegen ... (Nomen)

Um Ereignisse/Figuren gegenüberzustellen
    Im Gegensatz dazu, hingegen, trotzdem, allerdings, dennoch ... (Verb + Subjekt)
    Im Vergleich zu (+ Dativ); verglichen mit (+ Dativ)
    Im Unterschied zu (+ Dativ); sich unterscheiden von (+ Dativ)

Um auf die Wirkung des Werkes/mögliche Absichten des Autors einzugehen
    Der Roman zeigt ... (auf)
    Auf den Leser wirkt die Erzählung irritierend/distanziert/echt, denn ... (Hauptsatz)
    Mit der Figur stellt (Autor) ... dar.

Appendix G. Rhetorical Guides for Argumentation

Eine gute Argumentation ist mehr als nur eine Behauptung. Sie verlangt vor allem eine Begründung, dazu möglichst auch Belege und Beispiele. Sie könnte so aussehen:

Behauptung: Der Stromnetzausbau muss beschleunigt werden,
Begründung: denn Strom muss in den Süden transportiert werden,
Beleg: damit Störfälle vermieden werden können
Beispiel: wie z. B. einen Blackout.
Schlussfolgerung: Deshalb sollte man das Netzausbaugesetz in Kraft treten lassen.

Formulierungshilfen

Begründende Aussagen:
    Das ist so, weil/da/denn...
    Das zeigt sich daran, dass...

> Das ist daran zu sehen, dass...
> Der Grund dafür ist, dass...usw.

Schlussfolgernde Aussagen:
> Deshalb sollte...
> Daher ergibt sich, dass...
> schließlich.../also...

Zustimmung:
> Ich stimme X(dem) zu/bei.
> Ich bin auch der Meinung, dass...
> Ich bin mit X einverstanden, dass...
> X hat recht, wenn er sagt, dass...
> Man muss zugeben/zugestehen/bestätigen/einräumen/anerkennen, dass...
> Das Argument, dass..., ist überzeugend.

Ablehnung:
> Es ist falsch/ungenau, wenn X sagt, dass …
> Hier bin ich anderer Meinung.
> Diesem Argument kann ich nicht zustimmen.
> Das muss man ablehnen/zurückweisen/bestreiten/kritisieren/bezweifeln/in Frage stellen/korrigieren.

Einschränkung:
> … zwar … aber …
> Das ist nur bedingt/teilweise richtig.
> … wenn/falls/vorausgesetzt, dass …
> … allerdings …
> Man muss auch berücksichtigen, dass …

Das Abwägen (Vergleichen):
> zwar-aber/einerseits-andererseits
> Im Vergleich zu …, im Unterschied/Gegensatz zu …
> Das ist zu erwägen/zu überlegen/zu prüfen/zu berücksichtigen/ in Betracht zu ziehen.

Meinungsäußerung:
> Ich meine/denke/glaube/nehme an (usw.), dass …
> Ich bin der Meinung, dass …
> Nach meiner Meinung/Meiner Meinung nach ist …
> Meine Meinung darüber/dazu ist, dass …

Appendix H. End-of-Semester Course Evaluation for Third-Semester German (201)

As you perhaps know, the German Studies Department is in the middle of a full-scale reform of its undergraduate curriculum and is therefore very interested in hearing how you felt about the overall structure and focus of the course, i.e., a course with an overarching framework ("Coming of Age") within which there were instructional units that focused on specific factors that influence one's coming of age (e.g., family, nature, travel). Please respond to the specific questions and write additional comments on the back of this form. The German Studies Department thanks you for your input and interest.

Please write the number that corresponds to your reaction to the following statements about your study of German at Emory this semester.

1 = Strongly agree   2 = Agree   3 = Disagree   4 = Strongly disagree   n/a = not applicable; unable to respond.

Please turn in your responses with the registrar's bubble sheet course evaluation forms.

___ 1. I am satisfied with the progress I made in my learning of German this semester.
___ 2. I enjoyed the overarching topic of "coming of age" as the organizing principle for the course.
___ 3. Dividing the semester into three sub-themes (family, nature, travel) was an effective way of engaging the topic of coming of age.

___ 4. *Not* enough attention was placed on the development of my grammatical knowledge.
___ 5. I did *not* have enough opportunities to speak in class
___ 6. The worksheets (*Arbeitsblätter*) were a helpful way to engage the material.
___ 7. The worksheets (*Arbeitsblätter*) were a helpful way to develop my language abilities.
___ 8. Overall, the difficulty of the texts was appropriate for my level of German.
___ 9. The take-home writing assignments (*Schreibaufgaben*) allowed me to develop my writing abilities.
___10. The topics of the take-home writing assignments interested me.
___11. The talk shows were an effective way for me to exhibit my speaking abilities.
___12. I enjoyed reading *Die Verwandlung* over the course of the semester.
___13. It was clear to me what the goals and foci were for each unit.
___14. There was too much homework this semester.
___15. I came to class each day having read the assigned material and completed the homework.
___16. I am pleased with how the course went.

Which of the three units (family, nature, travel) was your favorite this semester? Why? Which was your least favorite? Why? Please indicate both the level of difficulty and the level of interest for each text

Texte	*Difficulty* 3 = too difficult 2 = just right 1 = too easy	*Interest* 3 = fascinating 2 = not bad 1 = boring	*Mark Your One Favorite Text with **
Familie			
Aschenputtel, Brüder Grimm			
Good Bye, Lenin, Wolfgang Becker (Film)			
„Susanne, 42, Die Hoffnungsvolle," Peter Sichrovsky			
Natur			
Hänsel und Gretel, Brüder Grimm			
Heidenröslein, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe			
„Ein halbes Jahr Grün" Christraut Peters			
Reisen			
Rotkäppchen, Brüder Grimm			
„Nach der Heirat wirst du Schweizerin sein," Conchita Herzig			
„Wer ist ein Türke," Sinasi Dikmen			
Die Verwandlung, Franz Kafka			

Any additional comments? Thank you very much for your responses.