Title

Literacy-based Curricula in University Foreign Language Instruction: Perceptions from Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Permalink

Journal

Author

Menke, Mandy R.

Publication Date

2018

DOI

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Literacy-based Curricula in University Foreign Language Instruction: Perceptions from Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

MANDY R. MENKE

University of Minnesota
E-mail: menkem@umn.edu

Recent scholarship has underscored the need for a new paradigm in university foreign language programs and put forward literacy as a necessary curricular goal (e.g., Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Kern, 2000; Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy, 2016; Swaffar & Arens, 2005). In light of the high percentage of courses they teach, non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) are instrumental to implementing new curricular paradigms. As such, knowing how they understand literacy and its role in foreign language education is essential to advancing the implementation of literacy-based pedagogies. This study reports on how non-tenure-track faculty conceptualized literacy during a 2.5 month Professional Learning Circle (PLC). Sociocultural and cognitive dimensions of literacy dominated the ways in which participants conceptualized literacy and its associated pedagogies; linguistic dimensions were backgrounded. Findings suggest that in order for a *literacy turn* to take hold, NTTF need opportunities to define relationships between language, culture, texts, and cognitive processes, and to differentiate literacy pedagogies from Communicative Language Teaching practices.

INTRODUCTION

University foreign language (FL) departments have faced a series of related challenges in recent years. Among the top concerns are declining enrollments (Goldberg, Looney, & Lusin, 2015), questions regarding the position or centrality of language and cultural studies to the mission of universities (e.g., Bernhardt, 1997; Warner, 2011; Wilkerson, 2006), and two-tiered departmental organization structures resulting in a lack of curricular cohesion (e.g., Modern Language Association, 2007). While the causes for these challenges are many, the typical curricular division between lower-level language courses and upper-division content courses has been identified as a leading contributor (e.g., Allen & Paesani, 2010; Kern, 2000; Modern Language Association, 2007; Swaffar & Arens, 2005). This division, which is the result of different objects of study – language in the lower level and literature or culture in the upper level – and different approaches to teaching—Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and textual analysis, respectively—has often resulted in bifurcated, non-cohesive programs, which conceptualize language competence as a tool or practical skill without "captur[ing] the complexity and the power of language use and acquisition" (Warner, 2011, p. 15).

Literacy has been put forth as a unifying concept to guide and connect both the *what* (i.e., content) and the *how* (i.e., approach) of instruction (e.g., Allen, 2009; Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Kern, 2000; Kumagai, López-Sánchez, & Wu, 2016; Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy, 2016; Redmann, 2005; Swaffar & Arens, 2005). Literacy, as a concept, emphasizes language's

central role in meaning making, the situatedness of language use, and the various cognitive processes necessary for interpreting, transforming, and creating texts of various genres (Kern, 2000, p. 16). Pedagogies associated with literacy promote meaning and communication, similar to CLT, yet they are based on a broader understanding of language that recognizes "language as a plural and flexible ground for communication" (Swaffar, 2006, p. 247). Through their engagement with texts and situated instances of language use, in literacy-oriented instruction, students can develop insights into the nature of language and its role in communication and societies. In many ways, the focus of literacy-oriented instruction is reminiscent of the original, non-reduced conceptualization of CLT as put forth by Breen and Candlin (1980) in which "what was to be negotiated was not only words and their meanings, but the conventions of their use in social contexts" (Kramsch, 2006, p. 250). Nonetheless, given the strong and nearly exclusive focus on self-referential, transactional, oral language in most instantiations of contemporary CLT instruction, in its current form, CLT presents a different instructional focus from literacy.

Steinhart (2006) acknowledged a "darker side" to the "dilemma" of expanding curricular goals and shifting pedagogical approaches, namely the professional preparation of teachers (p. 259). Although empirical evidence is emerging as to the nature of literacy-based lessons in post-secondary institutions (Paesani & Menke, 2017; Rowland, Canning, Faulhaber, Lingle, & Redgrave, 2014) as well as how instructors conceptualize literacy and use it as a framework for instruction (e.g., Allen, 2011; Allen & Dupuy, 2013; Dupuy & Allen, 2012; Nauman, 2011), the overwhelming focus of research into teacher conceptual development has been on graduate teaching assistants. How experienced instructors, in particular the non-tenure-track-faculty who teach between 35 and 56% of lower-level language courses, understand literacy and perceive its role in university FL instruction remains largely unknown. Because non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) are vital to carrying out curricular and instructional change, this study addresses this gap in the research by answering the following questions:

1. How do NTTF in FL departments conceptualize literacy?
2. How do NTTF in FL departments conceptualize literacy-based instruction?
3. How do NTTF in FL departments understand and articulate the potential benefits and challenges of literacy-based pedagogy?

BACKGROUND

CLT has been the leading framework in collegiate FL instruction for more than four decades. Together with proficiency-oriented approaches, it has expanded the focus of learning beyond language knowledge to language use, and it has been highly successful at getting students to talk and get their point across. The topics of study in CLT classrooms tend to be familiar and personal; and oral, functional, transactional language predominates (Byrnes, 2006; Kern, 2000). Indeed, Pennycook (1994) described the talk of students in CLT classes as "empty babble" (p. 311) given the tendency to separate form from meaning and decontextualize communication. Furthermore, CLT's focus on transactional language use "offer[s] little space for learners to critically reflect on the ineffability of meaning, the elusiveness of translation, and the potential and social excesses of what they say" (Warner, 2011, p. 9). As such, learners are seldom offered the opportunity to meaningfully engage with FL worlds or explore identity-mediating resources; they are not situated as active

collaborators in communication but rather as code breakers.

Given the way in which literacy-based pedagogies afford students opportunities to expand their language capacities, thinking skills, and understanding of target cultures through engagement with FL textual worlds, they have been put forward as a unifying concept and necessary curricular goal for university FL programs (e.g., Allen & Paesani, 2010; Kern, 2000; Swaffar & Arens, 2005). Literacy instruction seeks to empower and mobilize all students "to be effective, self-reliant and actively participating community members, citizens, and workers" (Kalantzis, Cope, Chan, & Dalley-Trim, 2016, p. 7).

Kern's (2000) definition of literacy acknowledges three interdependent dimensions of language use: linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural. The linguistic dimension reflects not only knowledge about a language's component parts but also language conventions and language use, which are socioculturally determined. Morphological, lexical, and syntactic elements are incorporated within this dimension as are the relationships between these elements and the larger text. Establishing form-meaning relationships requires active participation on the part of the learner, who must cognitively engage with a text in order to make meaning. As an active participant in creating and interpreting meaning, learners are "meaning makers" (Kucer, 2009, p. 7) who must plan, monitor, and revise as they create and interpret texts. The various cognitive processes that this requires (e.g., strategy use, self-reflection) are at the heart of the cognitive dimension of literacy. The sociocultural dimension reflects the social nature of literacy and the collaboration between text creators and text readers in constructing meaning. Gee (1996), in his work on Discourses, underscored the apprenticeship or acculturation that individuals must undergo in order to enact "the ways of talking, interacting, thinking, valuing, and believing" of a community (p. 41). Kucer (2009) proposed a fourth dimension of literacy, the developmental dimension, which highlights literacy's dynamic nature. Specifically, through interaction with other language users and texts, individuals' literacies evolve; their approach to texts and meaning making changes and develops to reflect their experiences and the resources available to them for constructing meaning.

As collegiate FL programs work with literacy as a guiding principle for curricula and instruction, scholars have begun to explore how instructors understand literacy, what activities and tools contribute to developing notions of literacy, and how instructors implement literacy frameworks in classrooms (e.g., Allen, 2011; Allen & Dupuy, 2013; Dupuy & Allen, 2012; Nauman, 2011). With the exception of Nauman (2011), who examines implementation of literacy-based approaches among experienced, university teachers of English in China, scholarly literature around appropriation of literacy has, to date, focused primarily on graduate teaching assistants (GTAs). Yet given the number of language courses they teach (Laurence, 2001), NTTF are also vital to implementing any curricular change. As Byrnes, Maxim, and Norris (2010) noted, "long-term contract instructors (in rare cases holding the title of "professor of the practice" and tenure) and contingent faculty (i.e., adjuncts and part-time or temporary instructors) are the actors who bear the burden of assuring that worthwhile FL abilities are developed within the FL studies unit" (p. 14). The ways in which this group of faculty, who may have been socialized into other approaches such as CLT, understands literacy and its associated pedagogies will impact the efficacy of any curricular changes as well as the outcomes of university FL students.

Approaches to language teacher education grounded in Sociocultural Theory (SCT) (e.g., Johnson, 2009; Johnson & Golombek, 2016) position educators as "learners of teaching" (Johnson, 2009, p. 2) and recognize the complex ways in which knowledge and practice develop and interact. Teachers' notions of language and how it is learned are grounded in

their lived experiences. Such everyday, or spontaneous, concepts about language and language learning are often unsystematic and below the level of consciousness (Karpov, 2003). Scientific concepts, in contrast, are learned consciously and "represent the generalization of the experience of humankind that is fixed in science" (Karpov, 2003, p. 66). In a dialectic relationship, "scientific concepts grow down through spontaneous concepts, and spontaneous concepts grow up through scientific concepts" (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 116). Because concepts become the tools that mediate teacher practice, examining them can shed light on the potential of literacy-based pedagogies to transform FL instruction and learning.

Kern (2000) noted that an expanded, dynamic definition of literacy is not widely shared among language teachers or students (p. 23). In an attempt to make the concept more concrete, he highlighted a series of principles to guide literacy-oriented instruction, assessment, and curriculum: conventions, cultural knowledge, language use, interpretation, collaboration, problem solving, and (self-)reflection. The first three principles—conventions, cultural knowledge, and language use—comprise the content of instruction whereas the remaining four—interpretation, collaboration, problem solving, and reflection—detail processes in which students engage during meaning-making activities. These seven principles of literacy have informed analyses into teacher conceptual development in university FL settings.

Previous studies examining teacher conceptualizations of literacy (Allen, 2011; Allen & Dupuy, 2013; Dupuy & Allen, 2012; Nauman, 2011) found that conceptual understandings developed gradually and unevenly as instructors struggled to integrate previous experiences, beliefs, and everyday concepts of FL teaching with scientific concepts related to literacy. In Dupuy and Allen's (2012) study of novice GTAs enrolled in a required methods course organized around the concept of literacy, language use and cultural knowledge were found to be the primary literacy principles guiding both the conceptual development and instructional practice of two novice GTAs. Other literacy principles of interpretation, problem solving, and reflection emerged as conceptual tools later in the course of their development, and not until the second half of an optional methodology seminar titled "Literacy and Advanced FL Teaching and Learning" for more advanced GTAs (Allen & Dupuy, 2013). GTAs identified practical applications and concrete examples as well as dialogic mediation with a Language Program Director as contributing factors in their conceptual development (Allen, 2011; Dupuy & Allen, 2012). They identified time and curricular features, such as textbooks and instruction-assessment misalignment, as constraints to implementation of literacy principles in instruction (Allen, 2011; Dupuy & Allen, 2012).

Nauman's (2011) case study of the conceptual development of a full-time English FL teacher in China similarly reported winding paths and uneven development across Kern's (2000) seven principles of literacy. Although the focus of the study was on the principle *literacy involves interpretation*, Nauman noted that the focal participant, Ao, verbally demonstrated increased understanding of all seven principles and that some aspects of half of the principles were observed in her teaching.[1] Through analysis of Ao's weekly seminar participation, instruction, and post-observation interviews, Nauman observed the incorporation of "new discourse and new instruction practices" (p. 115) as Ao transformed the way she and her students interacted with texts in the classroom. Ao changed the relationship that students had with texts by teaching them to interrogate texts rather than just find correct answers, and to view writing as a tool for thinking and communication, not

---

[1] Nauman makes this claim but does not provide any evidence of development for any principle other than *literacy as interpretation*.

just a means of practicing language forms. The opportunity to participate in extended professional development within the local teaching context fostered Ao's conceptual development and helped her translate everyday concepts into scientific concepts. After a year, she was still working to develop full and robust concepts of *literacy involves interpretation* and *literacy as communication.*

Taken as a whole, this previous research on GTA conceptual development documents the challenges novice teachers face in applying new, literacy-oriented views of language and language learning to the task of teaching. These challenges may be even greater for NTTF, who have more prior experience and potentially more deeply ingrained everyday concepts of teaching. Findings from Nauman (2011) suggest that extended professional development is necessary to effectuate change in the pedagogical concepts that guide instruction, so this study investigates conceptual development in experienced instructors participating in an ongoing professional development group.

METHODOLOGY

Data for this study were collected from a Professional Learning Circle (PLC) organized to explore the concept of literacy and literacy-based pedagogy. PLCs have their roots in the "wisdom circles" of Native American cultures, and through equal participation and respect for the collective wisdom of the group, they set out to "build, share, and express knowledge through a process of open dialogue and deep reflection around issues or problems with a focus on a shared outcome" (Riel, 2014). As the language program in which the participants taught was considering a transition from CLT to literacy-oriented pedagogies, the PLC was instituted by the Language Program Director as a professional development opportunity for GTAs and NTTF. The PLC met approximately once a month, and in this way responded to Nauman's (2011) recommendation that new concepts be introduced to experienced teachers through long-term teaching communities in order to facilitate explicit links with current teaching contexts.

Data sources for the current study are audio recordings of the first four PLC sessions, which took place over 2.5 months and included a total of 12 NTTF and 3 GTA participants. These 4 sessions were chosen from the 13 that were held over three academic semesters because their primary focus was the concept of literacy[2]; later sessions centered on the specifics of literacy-oriented pedagogies. Each 1.5-hour session was based on a book chapter that participants read in advance of the PLC. In order to respect the collective wisdom of the group, facilitation rotated among the researcher, NTTF, and GTAs. Typically, the facilitator prepared a series of discussion questions or activities designed to explore the content of the reading (see Appendix for an outline of Sessions 1 and 2); questions spurred reflection and conversation both in small groups and as a whole group. Throughout the initial PLCs the researcher participated as a peer colleague, positioning herself as a learner alongside the other participants. An overview of the analyzed sessions is provided in Table 1.

---

[2] Additional NTTF from the department as well as other language departments and one tenured professor participated in subsequent sessions.

Table 1. Overview of Analyzed PLC Sessions

Session	Facilitator	Focal Text	Participants
1	Researcher	Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy (2016) Introduction: Making the Case for Literacy in Collegiate Foreign Language Programs	8 NTTF 2 GTAs
2	Evan	Kern (2000) Chapter 1: Notions of Literacy	6 NTTF 2 GTAs
3	Researcher and Joan	Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy (2016) Chapter 1: Understanding the Multiliteracies Framework	8 NTTF 2 GTAs
4	Margaret	Paesani, Allen, & Dupuy (2016) Chapter 1: Understanding the Multiliteracies Framework	7 NTTF 1 GTA

The 12 NTTF focal participants for this study all held an M.A. or Ph.D. in Spanish or a related field (e.g., ESL, FL teaching), and each had more than 7 years of university FL teaching experience in a CLT program.[3] Unlike previous studies, which have focused on the conceptual development of individual participants over time, this case study seeks to understand how a particular group of NTTF understand literacy at a given point in time. Given their greater years of experience and unique position in the department, as well as their importance in carrying out curricular initiatives, NTTF were chosen as the focal group of this study.

All audio from the four PLC sessions was transcribed, and a two-cycle approach (Saldaña, 2016) to data coding and analysis was carried out in NVivo. During the first cycle, descriptive codes were applied to identify the topics of interactions (Tesch, 1990). Specifically, each reference to literacy and literacy-based pedagogies was coded according to the dimension (linguistic, cognitive, sociocultural, developmental) and principle (interpretation, collaboration, conventions, cultural knowledge, problem solving, reflection and self-reflection, and language use) reflected; in some instances, segments were double coded if more than one dimension and/or principle was reflected in the comment. In addition, positive or negative attitudes toward an aspect of literacy and potential benefits or challenges of the pedagogy were coded. The second cycle of coding sought to synthesize the content of coded segments into inferential categories or themes via pattern coding (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014) as a means of "consolidating meaning" in the data (Saldaña, 2016).

FINDINGS

Findings are presented in this section for the three research questions—conceptualization of literacy, conceptualization of literacy-oriented instruction, benefits and challenges— according to the themes that emerged during analysis. Representative excerpts from PLC discussions are presented as evidence in numbered examples.

---

[3] As can be seen in the overview of data in Table 1, not all participants attended each session. One of the 12 NTTF attended only 1 session whereas the other 11 attended at least 2.

Research Question #1: How do NTTF in FL Departments Conceptualize Literacy?

NTTF identified a variety of features that characterize literacy, which primarily reflected two complementary conceptualizations: literacy as culturally-situated knowledge and literacy as a set of skills that can be developed and taught.

Literacy as Culturally-Situated Knowledge

Throughout the four PLCs analyzed, NTTF equated literacy with the knowledge necessary to communicate and function in specific contexts. The contexts identified by participants were varied and included discussing heavy metal in a music shop, mourning Prince's passing in Minneapolis, and surviving in "primitive" settings. Participants' comments acknowledged that more than linguistic knowledge is needed to be able to carry out a broad range of communicative acts with diverse human groups; in this way, their comments suggest that literacy involves exploring others' worlds, not just others' words.

Evan's statement in (1) exemplifies this conceptualization in that individuals in preliterate societies share knowledge that allows them to survive; this knowledge comes from being a member of and participant in that community. In this way, an individual's literacy requires knowledge that comes from his/her communities and/or contexts of interaction. This is further illustrated by Margaret's recount of a previous conversation in (2). Because Melanie wasn't from Minneapolis nor a music aficionado, she was positioned as having "different literacy" than music lovers in Minnesota. Her lack of knowledge of (or literacy related to) Prince impeded her participation in community events in the days following his death.

(1) **Evan**: I think that it [literacy] goes back to lots of anthropology classes that I took, you know, as an undergrad. Um, that you'll, when you start looking at like preliterate cultures or cultures that people might consider as primitive, that they have real strong literacies in areas that we don't have any idea about. You know, using plants, using other kinds of tools in, in their own environment that make a lot of sense. So we would be incredibly limited. I mean if someone drops us off in their environment. You, yeah, you wouldn't be able to function. (PLC 1)

(2) **Margaret**: The second time we met, it was just the day after Prince had died and Evan did just a beautiful presentation of how [literacy] is supposed to work, which is how Prince, who is an international artist, passed away. How do people who are from here feel and deal with this versus, not versus, but in comparison and compatibility with people, international people? What happens when a famous person dies in different cultures and different places? What does that say about others and us? And then, it was fascinating because he did this whole beautiful piece and then Melanie was like: 'I'm not from here and I don't feel, and I don't listen to much music. And certainly not to Prince.' And so we talked about how that is still literacy. Just different literacy. (PLC 4)

The type of knowledge most frequently associated with literacy by NTTF was cultural knowledge. Although participants did not reach consensus on how closely literacy and

culture were equated, as seen in the exchange in (3), they all acknowledged that cultural knowledge was integral to literacy. In addition, cultural knowledge informed the use of environmental tools (Evan, PLC 1), which included language. For example, Joan emphasized during PLC 1 the role of cultural knowledge in understanding the meaning of individual words and whole texts, as seen in (4); she suggested that without this knowledge, comprehension or interpretation of texts may be incomplete.

(3) **Margaret**: So, literacy is like culture.
     Alexa: I think at least in part.
     Joan: It implies successful, a successful liter- or to be literate implies cultural knowledge. (PLC 2)

(4) **Joan**: So you also have to think, so the old definition of literacy was more like teach people to be able to read, to decode words, to get the meaning, and this is much broader [like to be able to decode the words, you need to know about the culture
     Pilar: [and to learn vocabulary
     Joan: and the context and you also need to think about your own culture and your own context, so it's, it's related to that very simple idea of literacy, but it's really expanding and laying out that these are also things that we need to consider and that's how we really get to understand the cultural text, which I like a lot. (PLC 1)

Cultural knowledge is thus not independent of linguistic knowledge but rather interacts with and moderates linguistic practices. Margaret, Rebecca, and Alexa highlighted the intersection of language and culture in example (5) and acknowledged the cultural basis of linguistic conventions and language use. As such, NTTF conceptualized literacy as involving knowledge of pragmatic and sociocultural norms, recognizing that, while language knowledge is necessary for literacy, knowledge must be grounded in a specific culture or context.

(5) **Rebecca**: And you're in different levels of understanding and interaction, it's not just like you know how to do the grammar and you can use the vocabulary, you also need to know with whom, when you're speaking, how to speak to them.
     Margaret: Culture is a really nefarious, like nebulous topic to begin with.
     Rebecca: Right.
     Alexa: But [students] have a difficult time understanding like that it's something that should be, that is separate but there's also connections. Sometimes I feel like they have trouble with the pragmatic understanding of what the target culture is and what, and the relations that it has, relationships that it has with the language, right? They don't necessarily understand that why, how sometimes the language can kind of indicate that the, the thought processes of how it's related to the, the target culture, if that makes sense?
     Rebecca: It does make sense, like the reason people are saying what they're saying, the way they say it has a cultural basis. (PLC 1)

In example (5) Alexa and Rebecca noted that cultural context shapes not only what an individual says and how, but also why. Such comments recognize the importance of individual speakers and their positioning in a situational context. Through their comments, NTTF acknowledged the complex, interdependent relationship of language and culture,

which is indicative of an awareness of the inadequacies of structuralist views of language. Sharon and Sally explore how such a culturally-grounded, situationally-determined understanding of language differs from that commonly held by students in (6).

(6) **Sharon**: It's not just grammar for grammar's sake. It's grammar to communicate.
Sally: But that's what [students] believe.
Sharon: But that's where we have to change it, right? We have to change that understanding that they have. (PLC 4)

Literacy as a Set of Skills That Can Be Developed and Taught

In addition to positioning literacy as culturally-situated knowledge, NTTF positioned literacy as a set of skills that allow an individual to engage in communication. Among the skills identified by participants were critical thinking, problem solving, and analysis and interpretation. The two conceptualizations of literacy—culturally-situated knowledge and a set of skills—were framed as complementary; skills allow individuals to fill in gaps when they don't have the necessary knowledge. Statements by Alexa and Joan in (7) and (8) exemplify this relationship.

(7) **Alexa**: So maybe literacy then involves both knowledge and skills. If you don't have the knowledge, what skills can you use to make up for that, to make inferences? (PLC 2)

(8) **Joan**: Trying to teach students how to use their own, I don't know, like tools, to fill in the gaps in the second language then to learn, to be able to build off that second language, that competence. (PLC 4)

NTTF underscored that as adult learners, university students bring specific cognitive skills to the tasks of language learning and textual interpretation. The skills comprising literacy are not tied to one specific language, but rather are applicable across languages. Comments by Joan in (8) and Pilar in (9) illustrate this as they referenced the "tools," "processes," and "skills" students possess. Pilar's comment in (9) additionally suggests that instruction can cultivate the mental processes associated with literacy.

(9) **Pilar**: Yeah, I also think, it's interesting: one of the things that I would, it probably goes with the cognitive dimension of literacy here is giving students permission and teaching them to use what they already know in their first language, not only language but also content and processes and you know, they don't have to start from nothing, but I think a lot of times they feel like they are starting from nothing, you know? So, how do we get them to, how do we encourage them or, or allow them to use their skills in other areas to inform what they're doing in our classrooms. (PLC 4)

The skills identified by participants align with those identified by literacy scholars, yet the positioning is different. NTTF highlighted critical thinking and problem solving as necessary in light of students' developing, yet still incomplete, linguistic and cultural knowledge base; literacy scholars conceptualize these skills as essential for identifying and reflecting on

relationships between individual components of language and the whole, between linguistic conventions and contexts of use, and between texts and real and imagined worlds.

Research Question #2: How do NTTF in FL Departments Conceptualize Literacy-Based Instruction?

Guided by their notions of literacy, NTTF conceptualized literacy-based instruction as targeting both knowledge and skills, grounded in textual interpretation, and similar to CLT. Throughout their conversations, the focus was on the *what* (content) of literacy instruction as opposed to the *how* (instructional practices).

Literacy-Based Instruction as Grounded in Textual Interpretation

Throughout their conversations, NTTF participants repeatedly accentuated the central role of texts in literacy-oriented instruction, as demonstrated by the exchange in (10), where Joan placed texts at the center of instruction, and Pilar then positioned them as a springboard for teaching grammar. In other interactions, participants also commented that vocabulary, culture, strategies, and academic skills could be taught through engagement and interaction with texts.

> (10) **Joan**: [Multiliteracies] places the text, whatever it is, if it's an audio recording, a song or a traditional *lectura* ['reading'], like a piece of *lectura* ['reading'] at the center and usually at the beginning of the lesson. And from there you go to what we traditionally call grammar and form. Instead of starting with grammar, or having grammar separate like we do now…it's more like alright you have a text, and you look at the text and talk about the context and the meaning of the text and then
> **Pilar**: *¿Qué gramática se necesita para, para poder comprender y expandir?* ['What grammar is needed to be able to understand and expand?'] (PLC 1)

Texts and interpretation then served to ground and connect varied aspects of instruction as further illustrated by Margaret in (11).

> (11) **Margaret**: Like here's a song. Let's talk about culture. Let's talk about you and your life. Let's talk about the grammar. Let's talk about the vocab and how it connects to it. (PLC 1)

Although participants stated that language forms (i.e., grammar and vocabulary) could be attended to through texts, as in (10) and (11), they also struggled to determine how textual interpretation and grammar instruction fit together. Some instructors suggested that grammar must be dealt with in advance of textual interpretation; for example, in (12) Rebecca explicitly positioned knowledge of language forms as a prerequisite for textual interpretation and something to be dealt with separately.

> (12) **Rebecca**: So I think part of this literacy thing with these lower level language classes, where you have to do this grammar stuff, involves a lot of that, front end preparation in there on their part. (PLC 2)

Throughout the PLCs some comments alluded to the influence of language forms on textual meaning while others revealed uncertainty as to how to teach language forms through texts, suggesting that NTTF were more certain of *what* they were to teach than *how* to do so.

Non-linguistic textual elements, such as music, genre, and images, were regularly given more attention than linguistic features during discussions, and language was at times noticeably absent from conversations about how to guide students in textual interpretation, as seen in (13). During PLC 2, Evan presented an activity in which students had to gather information from promotional travel videos. Participants focused on the information students could gather from the visuals and never mentioned how language forms were used to entice or persuade viewers to travel. Moreover, the interaction of linguistic and non-linguistic elements in creating meaning was never discussed despite specific examples of this interaction in both Kern (2000) and Paesani et al. (2016).

> (13) **Joan**: It might be interesting to have them do the video with no sound at all. So they
> have to make meaning from the images, that again have been selected by someone in
> kind of a scripted way, but right, but if it's not a listening comprehension, if you're
> focusing on information gathering, why does that information have to come audially,
> right? And for [the students] it's kind of a little break too. It's not like here's a video
> and you have to listen, listen, listen. (PLC 2)

Participants equated interacting with texts with critical thinking and textual interpretation or analysis. They referenced how literacy-based approaches require students to dig deep into meanings or, as Rebecca said, "understand plus" (PLC 2). They further noted how literacy pedagogies move students beyond comprehension to interpretation, which allows for the uncovering of multiple layers of meaning. Participants discussed on more than one occasion the process of moving from literal meanings to thinking through another lens, or going to the next layer, as in "*las capas de una cebolla*" ['the layers of an onion'] (Pilar, PLC 1). This process, according to NTTF, was more easily implemented with creative texts than informational texts. In example (14) Rebecca, Alexa, and Margaret described interpreting creative texts as "more comfortable," "easier," "expected," and "intuitive." Although they didn't negate the possibility of interpreting fact-based texts in literacy-based approaches, they emphasized the need for creative texts from a variety of genres.

> (14) **Rebecca**: I feel more comfortable doing [interpretation/analysis] with art as
> opposed to texts. Like, at least I feel like, for me, I'm able to help students draw
> connections between different cultural unders- meaning and things through art. …
> **Alexa**: It's easier with literature in the creative medium than it is with a text that's
> supposed to be factual. … The song was a lot easier to worry about interpretations of
> because
> **Margaret**: You're expected to do that.
> **Alexa**: This is not straightforward, fact-based. It's creative. So I think that disconnect
> between interpreting creative texts, which seems more intuitive, and interpreting
> **Margaret**: text texts
> **Alexa**: texts texts, a factual piece of information
> **Margaret**: with feelings and stuff, you don't you know. (PLC 2)

In (14) participants referenced only cultural knowledge, not language, as part of interpreting creative or literary texts despite the fact that literary and creative texts are often replete with

language play, which foregrounds the dynamic nature of language as authors manipulate language forms to meet their communicative purposes.

Participants additionally understood textual interpretation as allowing students to become active participants in the communication process, not just receiving information but transforming it as well. After two graduate students introduced the notion of double dialogism (Linell, 2009)[4] in PLC 2 to explain the relationship between texts and their readers/viewers/listeners, Alexa concluded in (15) that interpretation is not just understanding the words on the page, but also bringing one's own experiences to the act of interpretation. This conceptualization of interpretation recognizes the collaborative nature of communication, in which text creators and receivers are both active. As such, students bring something to the task of interpretation as well as take something from it.

(15) **Alexa**: I think that part of what you're getting at is this idea that we should be teaching students to not only try to interpret one dimensionally but also to use their experiences in understanding things
Rebecca: Exactly, yes.
Alexa: But then have what they're reading also inform their world view. So it's not just a one-directional communication. (PLC 2)

Literacy-Based Instruction as an Extension of CLT

NTTF regularly highlighted areas of overlap between literacy-based instruction and CLT (see examples (5)-(9) and (11)-(12)). With the exception of the role of texts, participants struggled to differentiate the two approaches given that they felt that they were already engaging students in textual interpretation. Margaret took particular offense to the assertion in Paesani et al. (2016) that CLT did not engage students in higher order thinking. Her statement in (16) is representative of many others that she made over the course of the 4 PLCs.

(16) **Margaret**: [quoting from text] So "Swaffar argued the current conceptualization of communicative competence encourages learners to recall information rather than interpret and analyze it." And I wrote this is not what we do in [4th semester class]. It's all about interpreting. It's all about *¿Qué piensas tú? Habla con tu compañero. ¿Y qué te hace pensar?* ['What do you think? Talk with your partner. What makes you think that?'] (PLC 1)

Margaret's conceptualization of interpretation in (16) is reflective of communication in CLT classrooms, which is based on personal responses and somewhat devoid of analytical thinking (see also (11)). Margaret does not acknowledge the literacy-based perspective of grounding interpretations in specific historical and cultural contexts or examining how linguistic forms (or other semiotic resources) contribute to meaning. Although Margaret was most adamant in her defense of CLT, many other participants concurred that their teaching practices already aligned with literacy-oriented instruction as illustrated by Pilar's agreement with Margaret in (17).

---

[4] Double dialogicality refers to a reciprocal mental process in which an individual both influences and is influenced by every interaction.

(17) **Margaret**: In my mind this is what we have been doing.
      Pilar: I just feel like we do a lot of this stuff already. (PLC 1)

Similarly, NTTF struggled to articulate the relationship between CLT and literacy-oriented pedagogies. One participant, Sally, positioned literacy instruction as building upon CLT practices (18). Within the propositional content of her comment, Sally situated literacy pedagogies as connected to CLT but not identical; the hedges and hesitations that marked her expression communicate a lack of commitment to her assertion, suggesting uncertainty about whether literacy pedagogies are different from CLT or not.

(18) **Sally**: It has taken from a lot- from communicative language teaching and other, other, uh, yeah, strategies, and I guess understandings of the teaching methodology, to kind of create this, this new thing. (PLC 1)

Despite the sense that they were already addressing literacy in instruction, some participants did acknowledge that the way in which they were implementing literacy may have been in "little pieces" or as an "idealized, hoped for goal" (Joan, PLC 1), not something that was systemic or implemented across all courses/sections. Joan's position and that of Margaret, as seen in (16) and (17), are different and may be indicative of their different roles in the department. As a course coordinator, Joan was responsible for curriculum development and for ensuring the quality of its implementation whereas Margaret was not. Joan, who is likely more aware of how different instructors implement curriculum, was concerned that textual interpretation not be left to the instructor but built into the content of the curriculum. In this way, NTTF conceded that within their current CLT curriculum, interpretation might not be implemented consistently across instructors.

Research Question #3: How do NTTF in FL Departments Understand and Articulate the Potential Benefits and Challenges of Literacy-Based Pedagogy?

Overall, NTTF responded positively to the notion of literacy as an overarching curricular objective for collegiate FL courses; the benefits they associated with a literacy-oriented curriculum were philosophical or abstract in nature whereas the constraints were practical. They suggested that the rich content of texts affords learners the opportunity to develop a variety of desired skills; nonetheless, the time involved in finding appropriate texts and engaging students in textual interpretation concerned participants. In addition, participants acknowledged the need to change the way teachers and students approach language learning and teaching.

Positive Student Outcomes through Engagement with Rich Content

Instructors sensed that literacy-based pedagogies expanded the content of FL instruction and gave them permission to incorporate issues of social justice and of contemporary relevance into their instruction. As such, they highlighted how literacy pedagogies incorporate real, relevant content (20, 21), treat FL students like adult learners (19, 21), promote feelings of accomplishment (19), foster interest in the language and curiosity for Spanish-speaking communities (20), and connect to other academic disciplines (20).

(19) **Pilar**: *Escriben un párrafo. Y ellos se sienten tan orgullosos que tienen un párrafo, como ellos dicen, un párrafo adulto. … se sienten muy logrados.* ['They write a paragraph. And they feel so proud that they have a paragraph, as they say, an adult paragraph…they feel accomplished.'] (PLC 1)

(20) **Sally**: I want my students to learn about Venezuela in [first semester Spanish] and the major trouble it's in, and then go to their political science class and be able to talk about it, you know? Like, take what they learned in their basic Spanish to enrich their class, you know?
Gail: Or go to their music class and be able to talk about [a song].
Laura: And hopefully to go and explore more... (PLC 4)

(21) **Sally**: You might be in a basic Spanish class, but we're going to talk about real things, that matter to you, to others, and you're going to learn some Spanish along the way. (PLC 1)

Moreover, NTTF participants positioned the capacities developed through literacy-oriented instruction as transcending language and as applicable to other disciplines. In addition to analytic and critical thinking skills (see (7), (8) and (9)), NTTF identified learning about the world as a potential outcome of textual interpretation, as exemplified by Margaret's comment in (22). NTTF expressed a desire for students to recognize that their worldview was not the only one and to consider how others might respond to texts, situations, or ideas.

(22) **Margaret**: [Discussing an interaction with a student who questioned why he needed to read a particular text] …so you want to be able to understand Spanish, but what we really want to do here is, this is going to be something that helps you to understand the world and I think that's one of the switches that our students have trouble with, for whatever reason. … [Literacy is] conducive to this idea that we're learning about the world. We're doing it through this, um, but you don't just read so you can prove to me that you know how to translate this into English, it's because it's changing how you are looking at the world. And that's a lofty goal. (PLC 1)

By introducing texts with "real" content and holding students accountable for that content, instructors attempted to elevate the status of FL learning, positioning it as a subject in which valuable content is learned, similar to political science. By focusing on the content of texts, however, instructors often dismissed the role of language, as reflected in Sally's comment "you're going to learn some Spanish along the way" (21). The object of instruction is thus shifted from learning language to "understanding the world."

In addition to introducing learners to new content, NTTF understood texts as exposing learners to language produced by native speakers, replete with dialectal and social variation. According to participants, regular exposure to authentic texts would increase learner comfort with native speaker speech and facilitate engagement with multiple voices and perspectives and the deconstruction of stereotypes. Participants expressed concern that their current practice perpetuated static, monolithic notions of Spanish-speaking communities, in which poverty and crime abound; texts that represent a variety of experiences and voices from within one community were offered as an alternative. Alexa's comment in (23) is representative of other comments by NTTF that posited texts and literacy-oriented

pedagogies as addressing this shortcoming.

> (23) **Alexa**: Yeah, exactly but doing mixing and matching [of texts], and that way, you can get a variety of texts that show a variety of different experiences from that part of the Spanish-speaking world that you're talking about instead of Nicaragua, they have drug problems and that's it. (PLC 1)

Furthermore, many participants agreed with Gail's assertion in (24) that the linguistic and sociocognitive challenges presented by authentic texts require students to adopt a learner stance, a favorable change in the perspective of many. Implicit within Gail's comment is the assumption that students expect language to be adapted to their level; she contrasts this with student agency or initiative in order to engage with the world.

> (24) **Gail**: [Students] just have to get past the idea that they're terrified of this native speaker who is speaking, you know, dialectally-appropriate language, you know, not some Pan-Hispanic way nobody talks. Now, and I don't know, yeah, but translating that message to the students that you don't need to know everything. Not everything needs to be tailored to you. The world is not tailored to you. It's what you are capable of getting out of it. (PLC 4)

The Challenges of Time and Changing Course

As NTTF discussed literacy-oriented pedagogies, obstacles associated with implementation emerged. Time and materials were at the forefront of the challenges identified by all participants, with time concerns involving both instruction and curriculum development. With respect to instruction, participants perceived literacy as an additional component to be added to what was already in place. No mention was made of what could be taken out of the curriculum; incorporating authentic texts, interpreting them, and reflecting on them represented additional course content to the NTTF participants. They questioned how the many different components of literacy could be addressed in the limited time they had with students (25) and how there would be sufficient time for regular reflection on the part of students (26).

> (25) **Alexa**: I think to be like truly multiliteracy and to kind of get into all these things you need a lot more time with the students than what you actually have. (PLC 1)

> (26) **Gail**: The issue is in a combined skills class how do you find the time to create these reflective moments for all the different skills? (PLC 4)

Although they identified ways in which literacy addresses gaps in current curricular content, they did not conceive of literacy as a concept to guide or unify their curricula or instructional practices. Consequently, they understood literacy to be one more thing that they must fit into their limited time with students.

A second time constraint NTTF identified was related to curriculum development. Participants critiqued the texts and cultural information included in their commercially-published textbooks, yet they noted the advantage of having materials already curated for them. The time investment needed to identify appropriate texts and develop a text-centric

curriculum overwhelmed them. Their concern was not only based on their familiarity with curricular development but also on the experiences of colleagues at other institutions. This is seen in the exchange in (27), in which participants discussed the time-intensive nature of curricular reform and Joan referenced a nearby program that had recently carried out a similar curricular redesign.

(27) **Joan**: She said over five years to actually get it done, but they have a good example of how it works. And I know that [visitor to campus] yesterday, she said they haven't been able to do it all yet because it takes so much time.
Alexa: Yeah, that's what I wrote here. I was like, you have to be working on text banks a lot.
Rebecca: You have to find [texts], incorporate them, and deal with them and evolve them.
Alexa: It would be really cool to have a variety of banks, but that takes a long time to develop. (PLC 1)

As such, the immediate concern was for the texts that would make up instruction as opposed to the specific pedagogies used to implement them, again reflective of a focus on the *what* of instruction as opposed to the *how*. Participants recognized that a pre-made curriculum like that of a textbook was unlikely to be available and that they would need to identify both the texts and the activities surrounding them, tasks they are unaccustomed to carrying out as instructors with little authority over the curriculum.

A final challenge identified by NTTF was changing the practices and expectations of faculty and students alike. Adopting a new way of teaching required returning to a novice state, and having to either relearn how to teach or prepare instructors to teach in a different way unsettled participants; this concern emerged during PLC 1 (28) and was revisited during each session.

(28) **Alexa**: [responding to conversation about overt instruction on the linguistic elements of a text] What does that look like? Like, how is that practical? How do you implement that into your classrooms? How do teachers feel comfortable with that? Like how does that work?
Rebecca: Yeah because everybody has to kind of understand a concept that is hard to understand.
Eliza: You gotta be comfortable doing it. I feel like, oh man, I don't want to spend two years being uncomfortable. I'm pretty comfortable now with what I – like I know how to do [CLT].
…
Alexa: The way it is, I just, I don't, I don't completely own [the Multiliteracies framework] yet.
Margaret: Yeah, right, it takes time to get your personal mojo.
Eliza: And I think it takes thoughtfulness, right? So part of the time you spend doing that is because you're thinking about it and making it your own. And that's an important thing to do…
Joan: Reflection is a huge component. (PLC 1)

Alexa questioned the practicality of focusing on linguistic forms in a text because in this CLT program, meaning was prioritized over accuracy, and explicit mentions of grammar

were to be avoided during in-class instruction. Each of the NTTF, all of whom had been teaching for at least 7 years at the time of the PLC, had been socialized into CLT and knew how to enact those instructional practices. Instructors recognized literacy as allowing for a focus on linguistic form and expressed uncertainty as to how to do this.

In addition to supporting instructors through a change in approach, a few participants noted the need to change students' expectations of language learning from learning only vocabulary and verb conjugations to connecting linguistic form and meaning within sociocultural contexts, as stated by Sally in (29).

(29) **Sally**: *Todo eso require tiempo y también like un cambio en la mentalidad de los estudiantes.* ['All this requires a lot of time and like a change in the mentality of the students.']
Joan: *Es mucho trabajo.* ['It's a lot of work.']
Pilar: *Hay que crear un sistema para apoyar a los instructores para que ellos puedan desempeñarse en el salon de clase.* ['A system for supporting instructors needs to be created so that they perform in the classroom.'] (PLC 1)

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate how NTTF understand literacy and literacy-based pedagogies, and the potential benefits and challenges they associate with literacy-based instruction. Two distinct, yet complementary conceptualizations of literacy emerged from the data: literacy as a culturally-situated product and literacy as a set of compensatory skills, or strategies, that can be taught. Texts and their interpretation, cultural knowledge, and problem solving were identified as key elements of literacy-oriented instruction, which NTTF struggled to distinguish from CLT practices. The challenge that the intellectually-stimulating content of texts would present to students was appealing, yet participants were concerned about the tasks of identifying texts and learning new ways of teaching. Concepts of language as well as FL learning and teaching rooted in CLT will be explored as possible explanations for findings, and the implications of these findings for literacy-driven curricular reform efforts will be discussed.

The first conceptualization, literacy as a culturally-situated product, positions literacy as something individuals either do or do not have, similar to the way lay definitions of literacy identify individuals as either literate or illiterate. This position does not acknowledge the dynamic, developmental quality of literacy central to scholarly definitions. NTTF recognized, however, that literacy is not just language skill; rather, it is culturally-situated knowledge as well as skills to offset any shortcomings. This second conceptualization, literacy as a group of skills, allows an individual to participate in diverse communicative events without the requisite knowledge; specifically, NTTF positioned these literacy-related skills as compensatory. Among the skills that participants referenced were drawing on background knowledge and problem solving, which are reminiscent of communication strategies emphasized within the CLT tradition. Interpretation and analysis, although always present in conversations, were not analyzed or defined. Consequently, the skills NTTF conceptualize as comprising literacy are reflective of CLT practices.

Although they complemented one another, the two conceptualizations of literacy remained distinct in PLC discussions. Participants did not identify interactions between knowledge and skills or integrate the two into one concept. Moreover, the way in which they situated cognitive processes as compensatory differs from the conceptualization put forth by

Kern (2000): "Literacy is construed as a collection of dynamic cultural processes, rather than a static monolithic set of psychological attributes" (p. 23). Although NTTF incorporated skills into their concepts of literacy, they did not consider them essential to literacy. Accordingly, literacy was primarily positioned as a body of culturally-situated knowledge to be acquired in order to function in a given environment. Missing within this conceptualization of literacy is the ability to think and reflect critically about the dialogic relationship of language, culture, and meaning as well as the ways in which language and culture shape cognition, attitudes, and meaning. Without linking language (as culture) and content, the conceptualization of literacy is incomplete.

Indeed, throughout the data analyzed for this study, sociocultural and cognitive dimensions are assigned more prominent roles than the linguistic dimension. Culture is given a preeminent role: Knowledge of specific communities and their sociocultural referents, their ways of thinking, and their shared understandings are essential to participants' conceptualization of FL literacy, reflective of a developing scientific understanding of the sociocultural dimension of literacy. And although language was referenced as being part of culture, its role was downplayed and the relationship between language and culture was not elaborated or articulated. As such, the three dimensions are consistently distinct rather than overlapping and interdependent.

Findings do not reveal why NTTF gave greater attention to sociocultural and cognitive dimensions than to linguistic dimensions; however, participants may have been more inclined to explore them due to their novelty and/or because they had been socialized into avoiding grammar in communicatively-oriented instruction. This study's data support the first possibility as participants regularly articulated the absence of "adult," "college," or "real world" topics in the language classroom as a shortcoming of CLT practices and embraced literacy-based instruction given its focus on rich texts and textual interpretation. In addition, previous scholarship on CLT practices highlights the absence of language forms from instruction (e.g., Kern, 2000; Kramsch, 2006; Schulz, 2006), supporting the possibility that participants' previous beliefs and practices influenced the lack of attention to language when discussing literacy.

The fact that NTTF attributed a less prominent role to language forms in their conceptualization of literacy, combined with their tendency to see grammar and textual interpretation as distinct, suggests that NTTF were uncertain about the role language forms play in communication and text-based instruction. Although they verbalized that grammar has a communicative function, they did not expand upon what that function is; they did, however, emphasize that linguistic conventions are socially-constructed and governed. The struggle to integrate form and meaning is not unique to this particular group of teachers socialized into CLT pedagogies. Rather, it aligns with reports from both literacy-driven (Allen & Dupuy, 2013; Paesani & Menke, 2017) and content-based curricular contexts (e.g., Camarrata & Tedick, 2012; Fortune, Tedick, & Walker, 2008), in which teachers struggled to reconcile what they perceived to be competing instructional foci: content and linguistic form. Disciplinary practices have regularly separated language from meaningful content. As Maxim (2014) pointed out, university FL faculty "have not thought about how the texts we engage could be models for our students' language development or how language functions to make content meaningful—we have been socialized to divide these language acquisition imperatives, not to teach them holistically" (p. 93). Yet as Steinhart (2006) and others have argued, "a shifting but continued dynamic relationship between a focus on content and focus on language learning" (p. 258) is essential for articulated, coherent curricula and developing students' foreign language literacy.

Taken together, this study's findings point to a fragmented conceptualization of literacy on the part of NTTF, which is consistent with other reports of teachers' conceptual development of literacy (Allen, 2011; Allen & Dupuy, 2013; Dupuy & Allen, 2012; Nauman, 2011). Allen and Dupuy (2013) proposed that the struggle to integrate the various dimensions and principles of literacy into a conceptual whole results from the need to reconcile previous experiences and everyday concepts of language and language learning with the complex, scientific concept of literacy defined herein. This may also be the case for these instructors, whose everyday concepts of FL teaching and learning stem from years of experience teaching in the same language program and successes teaching within a CLT framework.

Despite their inability to conceptualize literacy as a coherent whole during the 10-week period of PLC meetings, NTTF spoke favorably about instruction designed to develop literacy. Because of its focus on textual interpretation, participants perceived this approach as potentially expanding learners' knowledge of the world and advancing their cognitive or academic skills. Texts were understood by NTTF as the nexus of this learning, mediating both language learning and learning about varied foreign language worlds. Participants were enthusiastic about the possibility of texts transforming the object of FL education and introducing more intellectually-challenging content to their curriculum. The content of instruction appeared much more accessible to the NTTF participants than the specific ways of enacting the content in instruction. This finding may be the result of the readings that guided the four analyzed PLCs, as they were focused on the concept of literacy as opposed to the nuances of instruction. Nonetheless, discussing literacy scholarship in PLC sessions helped move participants toward scientific understandings of some literacy-based concepts.

For the potential of literacy pedagogies to be realized, however, conceptualizations of literacy must be refined and deepened, and practitioners must identify and implement literacy practices, not just textual content. Previous studies have documented the long-term nature of this endeavor for novice and experienced instructors (Allen, 2011; Allen & Dupuy, 2013; Nauman, 2011). Indeed, even after two methodology seminars, one of which was focused on literacy, GTAs struggled to articulate literacy-based objectives (Allen & Dupuy, 2013). The collective findings of this and previous studies on FL teachers' literacy conceptual development suggest that the literacy turn currently underway in collegiate FL programs is more likely to be a slow pivot than a quick, sharp turn. Although literacy implies a redefinition of learning objectives, incomplete, everyday understandings of literacy and related concepts, as well as instructors' inability to distinguish literacy and CLT pedagogies, may result in "an evolution more than a revolution," similar to what occurred with audiolingual and CLT approaches (Swaffar, 2006, p. 246). Without a robust understanding of the link between language, culture, texts, and cognitive processes, transforming instruction remains an "idealized, hoped for goal" (Joan, PLC 1) as opposed to a realistic possibility.

Johnson (2009) emphasized that new pedagogical concepts "develop dynamically through use, so they are learned over time and formed through the processes of synthesis and analysis" (p. 20) during which multiple links to other concepts and experiences are established. Developing the conceptual knowledge necessary to effectively implement literacy-based pedagogies will likely require human mediation, in addition to engagement with professional texts. Kennedy (1999) commented that teaching expertise grows out of both "expert" knowledge and teachers' own experiential knowledge. Within the context of a PLC, expert knowledge came from the scholarly texts with which teachers interacted; the import of the texts, however, appeared to be outweighed by participants' lived experiences. The lack of an outside expert provided NTTF a space to collaboratively explore a new topic

and question ideas without any threats to their identity as language educators, yet at the same time, opportunities for learning or clarification during moments of cognitive or emotional dissonance were missed. Johnson and Golombeck (2016) note that it is precisely at these moments of dissonance, or growth points (McNeill, 2000), where productive teacher learning and development can occur. Both the lack of an expert to mediate teacher learning and the abstract content of the scholarship read likely contributed to NTTF's current conceptualization of literacy, which reflected CLT practices and discourses as well as everyday concepts of literacy. In order for literacy to become a coherent, pedagogical concept to guide instruction, NTTF likely need the opportunity to experience and examine how literacy pedagogies differ from CLT, and to conceptualize the relationships between language, culture, texts, and cognitive processes.

CONCLUSION

Departments in which literacy has been applied to transform the object and nature of foreign language learning have benefitted from the engagement of all faculty (GTAs, NTTF, and tenure-track faculty) in the process (e.g., GUGD, 2011; Maxim, 2014). Given current trends in the hiring practices of FL departments, in which the relative percentage of tenure-track positions is decreasing (Modern Language Association, 2017), NTTF will play an increasingly important role in enacting any curricular reform. If literacy is to become the overarching concept guiding collegiate FL instruction, it is essential that NTTF appropriate conceptual and pedagogical tools of literacy. As such, the professional background and understandings they bring to the acts of curriculum development and instruction must be taken seriously.

   Findings from this study suggest that NTTF may not be currently prepared to implement text- and literacy-based pedagogies for FL learning; the specific ways in which language encodes culture and communicates meaning elude NTTF who continue to separate language and content learning. Their conceptualizations of literacy and its associated pedagogies draw heavily on conventionalized beliefs about language learning and teaching based in CLT. Consequently, their ability to use texts as a lens into the real and imagined worlds of others and to understand how others make meaning is limited. Without a coherent concept guiding instruction and sustained professional development to enact it, the time and curricular constraints this study's participants identified are likely to prevail and impede substantive reform efforts. Continued investigation into the conceptual development of various faculty groups (GTAs, NTTF, and tenure-track faculty) as well as the ways in which they enact their understandings in instruction will inform both professional development and curricular reform efforts. In order for literacy-oriented approaches to take hold and effect change across collegiate FL programs, literacy must be differentiated from current CLT practices and the dynamic relationship between language, culture, texts, and cognitive processes uncovered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

deeper with the analysis.

REFERENCES

Allen, H. W. (2009). A multiple literacies approach to the advanced French writing course. *The French Review, 82*(2), 368–385.

Allen, H. W. (2011). Embracing literacy-based teaching. A longitudinal study of the conceptual development of novice foreign language teachers. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on second language teacher education. A sociocultural perspective on professional development* (pp. 86–101). New York, NY: Routledge.

Allen, H. W., & Dupuy, B. (2013). Evolving notions of literacy-based foreign language teaching: A qualitative study of graduate student instructors. In H. W. Allen & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 171–191). Boston, MA: Heinle.

Allen, H. W., & Paesani, K. (2010). Exploring the feasibility of a pedagogy of multiliteracies in introductory foreign language courses. *L2 Journal, 2*, 119–142.

Bernhardt, E. (1997). Victim narratives or victimizing narratives? Discussions on the reinvention of language departments and language programs. *ADFL Bulletin, 29*(1), 13–19.

Breen, M., & Candlin, C. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 89–112.

Byrnes, H. (2006). Perspectives. Interrogating communicative competence as a framework for collegiate foreign language study. *Modern Language Journal, 90*, 244–266.

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

Camarrata, L., & Tedick, D. J. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The experience of immersion teachers. *Modern Language Journal, 96*(2), 251–269.

Dupuy, B., & Allen, H. W. (2012). Appropriating conceptual and pedagogical tools of literacy: A qualitative study of two novice foreign language teaching assistants. In G. Gorsuch (Ed.), *Working theories for teaching assistant and international teaching assistant development* (pp. 275–315). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Fortune, T. W., Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (2008). Integrated language and content teaching: Insights from the language immersion classroom. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 71–96). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London, England: Taylor & Francis.

Georgetown University German Department (GUGD). (2011). *Developing multiple literacies*. Accessed January 12, 2018 from https://german.georgetown.edu/scholarship/curriculumproject

Goldberg, D., Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2015). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2013*. New York, NY: Modern Language Association of America.

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education. A sociocultural perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, K. E., & Golombeck, P. R. (2016). *Mindful L2 teacher education. A sociocultural perspective on cultivating teachers' professional development*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., Chan, E., & Dalley-Trim, L. (2016). *Literacies* (2nd ed). Sydney, Australia: Cambridge.

Karpov, Y. V. (2003). Vygotsky's doctrine of scientific concepts. Its role in contemporary education. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 65–82). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, M. (1999). Schools and the problem of knowledge. In J. Rath & A. McAninch (Eds.), *What counts as knowledge in teacher education?* (pp. 29–45). Stanford, CT: Ablex.

Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*, 249–252.

Kucer, S. B. (2009). *Dimensions of literacy: A conceptual base for teaching reading and writing in school settings* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kumagai, Y., López-Sánchez, A., & Wu, S. (2016). *Multiliteraces in world language education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Laurence, D. (2001). The 1999 MLA survey staffing of English and foreign language departments. *Profession,* 211–224.

Linell, P. (2009). *Rethinking language, mind, and world dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Maxim, H. H. (2014). Curricular integration and faculty development: Teaching language-based content across the foreign language curriculum. In J. Swaffar & P. Urlaub (Eds.), *Transforming postsecondary foreign language teaching in the United States* (pp. 79–101). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

McNeill, D. (2000). *Language and gesture.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Modern Language Association. (2017). *Report on the MLA job information list, 2016-2017.* Accessed January 12, 2018 at https://www.mla.org/content/download/78816/2172744/Report-MLA-JIL-2016-17.pdf

Modern Language Association. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 234-245. Accessed June 14, 2017 at https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World

Nauman, G. (2011). Synthesizing the academic and the everyday. A Chinese teacher's developing conceptualization of literacy. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on second language teacher education. A sociocultural perspective on professional development* (pp. 102–117). New York, NY: Routledge.

Paesani, K., Allen, H. W., & Dupuy, B. (2016). *A multiliteracies framework for collegiate foreign language teaching.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Paesani, K., & Menke, M. (2017, November 19). *Making multiliteracies real: A tool for analyzing instructional materials.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Nashville, TN.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language.* London, England: Longman.

Redmann, J. (2005). An interactive reading journal for all levels of the foreign language curriculum. *Foreign Language Annals, 38*, 484–492.

Riel, M. (2014). *The learning circle model: Collaborative knowledge building.* Accessed on June 14, 2017 from https://sites.google.com/site/onlinelearningcircles/Home/learning-circles-defined

Rowland, L., Canning, N., Faulhaber, D., Lingle, W., & Redgrave, A. (2014). A multiliteracies approach to materials analysis. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 27*(2), 136–150.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Schulz, R. A. (2006). Reevaluating communicative competence as a major goal in postsecondary language requirement courses. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*, 252–255.

Steinhart, M. M. (2006). Breaching the artificial barrier between communicative competence and content. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*, 258–262.

Swaffar, J. (2006). Terminology and its discontents: Some caveats about communicative competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*, 246–249.

Swaffar, J., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum: An approach through multiple literacies.* New York, NY: Modern Language Association.

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools.* New York, NY: Falmer.

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language* (Hanfmann, E., & Vakar, G., Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published 1934)

Warner, C. (2011). Rethinking the role of language study in internationalizing higher education. *L2 Journal, 3*, 1–21.

Wilkerson, C. (2006). College faculty perceptions about foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals, 39*(2), 310–319.

APPENDIX

Outline of Session 1
Topic: Paesani et al. (2016) Introduction: Making the Case for Literacy in Collegiate Foreign Language Programs
Facilitator: Researcher/Language Program Director

1. Introduction to Professional Learning Circles
2. Small Group Discussion
   What is literacy? How does the definition presented align, differ, expand upon your previous conceptualizations of literacy?
   How would you define multiliteracies? What are your thoughts in relation to the case made for multiliteracies in FL teaching? Did any ideas or passages in the introduction prompt an aha moment for you and make you reflect on your own FL learning and teaching experiences? Did anything make you uncomfortable because it conflicted with your beliefs about foreign language teaching and learning?
3. Whole Group Discussion

Outline of Session 2
Topic: Kern (2000) Chapter 1: Notions of Literacy
Facilitator: Evan

1. Using the multiple definitions of literacy that Kern outlines as inspiration, come up with a working definition of literacy that you feel informs or can inform your teaching.
2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the statement on page 17 that literacy is essential for all language learners at all levels of language study?
3. How have you used this idea in your classes, if you have? Can you think of activities in your current teaching that you use to promote literacy as you have defined it? Give examples.
4. How might your instructional practices expand, change, or differ with this expanded notion of literacy?
5. Discussion of instructional activities: Is it successful in promoting literacy? How could you change it to make it more successful in promoting literacy?