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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Communicative development has been one of the main concerns within the foreign language profession during the last ten years. There is now a general consensus that communicative development must account for discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic, as well as grammatical development (Savignon, 1983). Kramsch (1986) has found that of all the communication errors that learners commit, discourse errors are those that most often block comprehension. Yet, despite this finding, very little foreign language research has been conducted that examines discourse development across different levels of language experience.

Extended response tasks provide one means of examining discourse development. Extended response can show what discourse functions learners perform in a simple context without pressures of input or time constraints. These discourse functions include descriptive functions, such as elaboration, circumstance, perspective, and restatement, as well as interpretive functions, such as evaluation, opposition, metacommunication, purpose, and cause. When examined across different language experience groups and within native and non-native languages, these discourse functions can provide information about communicative development that can then be used to facilitate performance on more complex interactive tasks.
Although extended response has not been given sufficient attention in foreign language research and methodology, L1 researchers have pointed out the problems that can occur when extended response tasks are repressed within educational contexts. Petrosky (1982) argues that, when extended response is not used in comprehension tasks, memorization and regurgitation of texts occurs. Thinking occurs only through reflective interpretation of a text, via extended response, in which learners are given opportunities to interact cognitively with a given text.

Learning, argues Britton (1982), is the process of mixing fact and observation with emotive, evaluatory comment. Learning results from the expression of the interpretation of experience. Meanings can not be taken over ready-made. Only by relating one's personal experience to a text can one learn to master language and to think in an original manner (Anderson et al., 1977, 1978; Ausubel et al., 1978). When schools neglect extended response as a viable academic task, they deprive students of an important means of relating their experience to a text and, thus, of an important learning process.

Lack of extended response within school tasks inhibits spectator writing, a function of language that is critical to communicative development (Britton, 1982). The spectator function of language use - which occurs with literature, stories, films, television plays, personal writing, and spoken narrative - is critical to communicative development because it enables the learner to reflect and evaluate upon experiences in and of themselves. In the spectator function, preoccupation with an event is itself the end.
This contrasts with the participant or transactional function of language use in which language is used as a means to an end (to buy and sell, to inform, instruct, persuade).

The spectator function of language use, therefore, exhibits a reflective component that is minimal in the participant function. This reflection and preoccupation with an experience facilitates, in turn, more complex cognitive operations in learners and, thus, leads to increased communicative development. According to the spectator function, learning occurs when an individual experiences an event and then is given the opportunity to reflect upon it at a later time. The reflective process occurs as the individual attempts to apply his/her interpretive framework to the events experienced. He or she modifies, assimilates, and extends these events according to his/her own thoughts, sentiments, and interests.

The spectator role is also critical to communicative development because it promotes audience awareness. In his work on the development of writing abilities in grades one through six, Britton (1975) found that in 67 written scripts where evidence of public audience awareness occurred, 48 were examples of spectator writing. In other words, spectator writing demonstrated more evidence of public audience than transactional writing. Britton explains that, in spectator writing, the writer secures an audience by interesting him. This interest is achieved by presentation of the learner's own interpretation of facts or events, his/her speculations and ideas. In transactional writing, the relationship is often only
one of utility. Within the academic context, there are generally very few instances where a learner will be able to communicate information that is unknown to his/her teacher.

Despite the reflective component inherent in the spectator function of language use, the spectator function has come to be associated in the American context with expressivity, subjective experience, and tasks such as diaries and personal writing. The reflective component has been virtually ignored within American academic contexts. The intention of this study is therefore to examine personal oral narrative as a type of extended response task that can inform educators about the inter-relationship between the spectator role, reflective processes, and communicative development.

The study focuses particularly on vicarious personal oral narratives of a silent film, rather than on autobiographical personal oral narratives. Use of a silent film to elicit personal narrative response provides a distancing component that figures in most types of communicative activity. In writing, for example, the writer is separated from the verbal object that he or she attempts to represent. In face-to-face interaction, distance occurs by virtue of the nature of the face-to-face activity itself. Participants often differ in terms of their norms for interaction and interpretation, their strategies for achieving communication, and their perception of salient features important to a communicative task.

In both written and spoken activities, the speaker/writer must reflect upon the gap that exists between himself or herself, the
text, and the audience. He or she must also attempt to lessen the distance in order to achieve successful communication. In autobiographical personal oral narrative, although there is a chronological distance between the moment of telling and the moment at which the experience occurred, there is no psychological distance that must be overcome. Of the two types of personal oral narrative, the vicarious type was therefore used for the current study.

The use of personal oral narrative as a valid genre within educational research has traditionally been problematic (Barnes, Britton, & Rosen, 1971; Cazden & Hymes, 1978). This perspective has stemmed, largely, from the belief that cognitive development occurs when oral strategies are replaced by written ones. Because personal oral narrative is an oral genre, it has been assumed that personal oral narratives are of minimal interest to educational research.

More recently, however, the claim that personal oral narratives are of slight educational interest has been challenged by a number of researchers and theorists. Robinson and Hawpe (1986) argue that narrative thinking is a type of causal thinking that consists of creating a fit between a situation and a story schema. Because narrative thinking integrates what is known about an event to interpretations of those events, narrative thinking resembles other acts of comprehension and problem solving of interest to
cognitive psychologists. Because the area of personal experience is the area in which all experience becomes integrated, Robinson and Hawpe argue that teachers should cultivate rather than disparage this type of discourse (p. 77).

Stenning and Michell (1985) and Collins (1985) show that examination of personal oral narrative tasks can provide researchers with information about concepts of meaning that underlie classroom language use. Stenning and Michell examined the use of explanations in story-telling in ten children from each age group (5-10 years) from each of two schools (working class and middle class). Subjects were asked to narrate a picture story. Then, they were asked the meaning of specific parts of the story in order to provide an additional opportunity to offer explanations if they had not done so in the spontaneous story-telling task. Stenning and Michell found a descriptiveness in the story-telling of the 7 and 8-year-olds, even though these children could explain when prompted. Stenning and Michell conclude that the lack of explanation during the spontaneous storytelling task may reflect descriptive rather than explanatory models of classroom language use.

Given the fact that extended response tasks are important to educational development, and given the fact that personal oral narrative constitutes a type of extended response task that is primary in thinking, research needs to be conducted that examines to what extent different groups of foreign language learners express complexity within personal oral narrative extended response. Information about what learners can do on this discourse task can
then be used to better understand how to approach communicative problems on more complex interactive tasks.

**Theoretical Bases**

Much L2 research has been conducted independently, without attention to relationships that exist across discourse processes. As a whole, the literature tends to be analytic rather than synthetic, focusing on the components of a single domain rather than on the relationship of these components to other aspects of human understanding. The theoretical bases for this study include interdisciplinary thinking on relationships between reading, composition, and response (Petrosky, 1982); thinking on personal oral narratives as a basic mechanism in human understanding (Collins, 1985; Gee, 1984, 1985; Robinson, 1981; Robinson & Hawpe, 1986); rhetorical structure theory (Kumpf, 1986; Mann & Thompson, 1988) and communication theory (Saville-Troike, 1982).

Some of the most influential thinking over the past 15 years within the domain of reading comprehension has focused on reading as a process that is directly related to the schema of an individual (Anderson et al., 1977, 1978; Ausubel et al., 1978; Gagne, 1987; Rummelhart, 1975). Schema are mental configurations built from prior knowledge, feelings, personality, and culture that readers impose on new experiences. Research has shown that an individual's schema unquestionably affects the quantity and quality of information recalled (Bernhardt, 1984; Carrell, 1984; Hudson, 1982).

Petrosky comments, however, that the same researchers who advocate reading as a constructive process often discount
composition or extended response as contaminatory in assessments of comprehension. By eliminating extended oral or written response as representations of comprehension, educators equate comprehension with recall of text. This ignores the critical role of interpretation and affect in the comprehension process.

Petrosky's argument may be related to that of Bartlett (1932), who asserts: "the first notion to get rid of is that memory is primarily or literally reduplicative. In a world of constantly changing environment, literal recall is extraordinarily unimportant" (p. 204).

Comprehension goes beyond understanding a text on its own terms. Of equal or greater importance is the ability to reflect upon and integrate a text within one's personal framework and context of situation. Extended oral or written response thus becomes the medium through which one can examine how individuals use thoughts and feelings as reflective mechanisms that flesh out connections in texts. Extended response becomes an expression and explanation of comprehension. Figure 1 documents the relationship between extended response and communication.
Figure 1. A Communicative Model of Extended Response
Personal oral narrative constitutes a specific type of extended response. Personal oral narratives are used to understand and explain experience. They are the most common form of organizing and reflecting upon reality and represent a type of causal thinking that integrates interpretation within that which is known about an event. It is this causal component that distinguishes narratives from other types of temporally ordered events, such as chronologies (Robinson & Hawpe, 1986).

Robinson and Hawpe (1986) list three components of narrative thinking: (a) the narrative schema (b) the narrator's knowledge (c) an array of cognitive strategies (selection, comparison, interpretation, etc.). These components may be related to the model of Figure 2 as follows:
Figure 2. A Communicative Model of Personal Oral Narrative Extended Response
The model illustrates the two levels of frame and their role in communication. The narrative schema constitutes the individual's expectations about kinds of information found in a narrative and the relationships among categories of information. For example, an individual's narrative schema may be restricted to concrete, perceived events or be more complex so as to include abstract representations of those events (Applebee, 1978). The narrator's knowledge refers to the prior experiences which are used to understand the text and context at hand. The fit is realized through extended response, which enables the learner to reflect upon events. This reflection, in turn, facilitates comprehension and coherent communication.

In addition to the importance of text and frame, context is a third critical component within a communicative model of extended oral response. Extended oral response does not exist in a vacuum. An individual response is directed toward at least one other individual, and the response must provide a clear, coherent message to that listener. Extended oral response can therefore be viewed as a rhetorical act in which a speaker combines events, personal reflection, and knowledge of the communicative needs of his/her audience to create textual relations that produce a coherent representation in the mind of the listener. Failure to do so results in unsuccessful communication (Britton, 1975; Gumperz, 1984).
One way of examining the contextual awareness present within discourse is to measure the frequency and types of rhetorical predicates used. Rhetorical structure theory (Mann and Thompson, 1988) identifies relationships that hold between two portions of a text and assumes that the relationships are produced to provide the listener with a given effect. At the most basic level, the relationships that hold are conceived as nuclei and satellites.

Nucleii are defined as clauses that, when removed, produce an incoherent text. They may be strung together to produce a sequential effect on the listener. Satellites provide the significance of the material in the nuclei. They constitute reflections of the narrator about the content of a text or about the narration itself. Satellites combine with nuclei to produce a variety of effects on listeners: restatement, elaboration, background, circumstance, purpose, interpretation, and evaluation among others. The basic unit of analysis in the identification of these rhetorical predicates is the proposition.

Kumpf (1986) has recently applied the procedures offered by Mann and Thompson to the personal oral narratives of Japanese and Spanish ESL learners. Examples of the procedures and their application to the ESL data include the following:

1. **Elaboration**: a satellite provides details of a claim.
   
   Example: The tornado made such a mess:
   
   tree was all over
   awning was torn
2. **Background:** a satellite provides additional related information.

Example: I looked in on her

She was about ninety-two at the time

3. **Sequence:** nuclei have equal status as serial events; the story line is moved forward.

Example: I put Hanna and Kumo inside

I run to get a gun

He shot the snake

4. **Circumstance:** the nucleus describes the situation, and the satellite gives information about the attending circumstance.

Example: When I was going to lunch in you know the cafeteria everybody looking at me

5. **Condition:** the satellite provides the condition under which the nucleus holds.

Example: If you can spend two thousand dollars more I can give you a real nice car

6. **Cause:** the satellite makes a statement, and the nucleus provides the result.

Example: Hiro's boss wanted him to go to Burma

I didn't feel like to go

so I had to quit
7. **Reason:** the nucleus makes a statement, and the satellite provides the reason.

   Example: I wanna go back to my country because here is too much problem

8. **Opposition:** the satellite expresses a proposition not espoused by the speaker/writer, and the nucleus gives the opposing proposition.

   Example: the wedding was like a party of babies no like a wedding

9. **Contrast:** one nucleus provides a contrast to another nucleus.

   Example: I tea want but cannot say

10. **Purpose:** the nucleus describes the situation and the satellite, the purpose that the situation fulfills.

    Example: Elena want to come back to her country to pass the Christmastime with her family

11. **Joint:** an additive relation: two non-sequential statements follow each other.

    Example: I working a one lady she is working on the post office and I have-ah she have two babies

12. **Response:** the satellite is a question and the nucleus is the response.
Example: I but you know what happen to me the first day?

They going to give me the uniform

13. Reported Speech:

the reporting verb is considered the nucleus of a structure and the directly quoted material is considered as satellite material.

Example: and then my son said

oh Tere ah...somebody stole her wallet in the bus

and then she don't have any money to come back at her home

14. Evidence: a satellite may provide evidence for the nucleus.

Example: She was very shame

because she say "I'm sorry"

15. Balloon: when no relationship between propositions is obvious, a balloon is inserted.

Example: and then I went to school

and then I asked

and then somebody told me

and then that time was raining very hard

and then I looking

The rhetorical predicate concept is integrated within the comprehension/communication model in Figure 3 as follows:
Figure 3. A Rhetorical Model of Personal Oral Narrative Extended Response
The model presents rhetorical predicates as the realization of cognitive strategies that seek to create a fit between frame and text for oneself and for one's audience. The model illustrates that knowledge of the communicative needs of the audience, personal frame, and the text itself all combine as factors that affect the rhetorical predicates and cognitive strategies used within an extended response task. The rhetorical predicates used affect, in turn, the communicative product received by the listener.

The rhetorical model presented in Figure 3 must also, however, be situated within a communicative model that accounts for the full range of linguistic, interaction, and cultural phenomena which describe and explain communication (Saville-Troike, 1982). Figure 4 presents one conception of the components of communication:
1. Linguistic knowledge
   (a) Verbal elements
   (b) Patterns of verbal elements within particular speech events
   (c) Range of possible variants (in all elements and their organization)
   (d) Meaning of variants in particular situations
2. Interaction skills
   (a) Perception of salient features in communicative situations
   (b) Selection and interpretation of forms appropriate to specific situations, roles, and relationships (rules for the use of speech)
   (c) Norms of interaction and interpretation
   (d) Strategies for achieving goals
3. Cultural knowledge
   (a) Social structure
   (b) Values and attitudes
   (c) Cognitive map/schema
   (d) Enculturation processes (transmission of knowledge and skills)

Figure 4. Saville-Troike's Communicative Model for Speech Events (1982)
Linguistic knowledge is examined in the current study through the verbal elements defined as rhetorical predicates. By examining rhetorical predicate use in different language learner groups, the study attempts to discern patterns of rhetorical predicate use within the speech event of a personal oral narrative extended response task. Insofar as rhetorical predicates are used to produce a given effect on the listener, the study also examines interaction skills between and within groups in terms of the communicative knowledge of what should be salient in a personal oral narrative task, knowledge about which strategies to use in order to successfully communicate a personal oral narrative, and knowledge of norms for communicative interaction. While this particular study does not examine Hispanic vs. American cultural differences in performance of this task, it examines the cultural context of academia and explores issues concerning the relationship between the social structure, values, and enculturation processes of the classroom and their bearing on communicative development within an extended response context.

Purpose of the Study

The chief purpose of this study is to examine variability in rhetorical predicate use between levels of language experience in native and foreign languages within a personal oral narrative extended response task in order to gain information about similarities and differences in communicative development of native, advanced non-native, and novice Spanish speakers.
Furthermore, the study intends to demonstrate how the spectator function of language use, as manifest in extended response tasks and operationalized through rhetorical predicates, contributes significantly to communicative development.

Within the area of foreign language reading, Bernhardt (1983) and others (Lee, 1986) have shown that there are similarities as well as differences in the ways that native and non-native speakers process printed information. By way of extension, native and non-native speakers may vary in the manner in which they process oral discourse.

Because this study is concerned with foreign language communicative development, it is also important to document the two extremes of non-native performance. Therefore, novice as well as advanced non-native Spanish speakers will be examined in this study in order to provide baseline research for additional studies that will look at additional populations and contexts and their relationship to discourse development.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be addressed in the study:

1. Do language experience groups differ in terms of the quantity and type of rhetorical predicates produced?

2. Do native language experience groups differ in terms of the quantity and type of rhetorical predicates produced?
3. Do non-native language experience groups differ in terms of the quantity and type of rhetorical predicates produced?

4. Do non-native Spanish language experience groups differ from the native Spanish experience group in terms of the quantity and type of rhetorical predicates produced within the Spanish narrations?

5. Is there a relationship between language of narration and the quantity and type of rhetorical predicates produced within the novice, advanced non-native, and advanced native groups?

**Definition of Terms**

1. *Language experience* is defined as the academic placement level of a subject within a novice Spanish, advanced non-native Spanish, or advanced native Spanish group. The academic placement level of a subject accounts for experience factors in addition to linguistic proficiency. These include experience with literature courses, experience with academic writing, and number of years in a country where the target language is spoken.
2. **Novice Spanish speaker** is defined as a person enrolled in Spanish 103 at The Ohio State University during the Spring Quarter 1988.

3. **Advanced Non-native Spanish speaker** is defined as a person that was a Spanish Graduate Teaching Associate at The Ohio State University during the Spring Quarter 1988 and where English was the native language of the speaker.

4. **Advanced Native Spanish speaker** is defined as a person that was a Spanish Graduate Teaching Associate at The Ohio State University during the Spring Quarter 1988 and where Spanish is the native language of the speaker.

5. **Foreign language narration** is defined as a narrative produced in Spanish by subjects with English as their native language or a narrative produced in English by subjects with Spanish as their native language.

6. **Native language narration** is defined as the production of a narrative in English by subjects that claim English as their native language or a narrative produced in Spanish by subjects with Spanish as their native language.

7. **Rhetorical predicate** is defined as the frequency with which a subject inter-relates two propositions to form relationships of elaboration, background, circumstance, condition, cause, reason, opposition, contrast, purpose, joint, reported speech, evidence, and balloon.
8. **Extended response task** is defined as a personal oral narrative task produced without restrictions by a given subject after viewing a seven-minute silent film.

9. **Communicative development** is defined as the frequency of rhetorical predicates produced within an extended response task.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

It is assumed that subjects narrate that which they consider critical to the personal oral narrative task, and that they omit information that they consider less important.

It is further assumed that subjects at more advanced Spanish placement levels possess more language experience than subjects at lower levels.

The intent of this study is to add only a small amount of knowledge to the relationship between language experience, language of narration, and communicative development. Because native subjects from four different cultures (Colombia, Chile, Spain, Mexico) have been used in this study, the investigator makes no claims that cultural factors affect the native of communicative development. Additional research is needed in order to examine this question.

**Value of the Study**

This research may be of value to the teaching of foreign languages. The results of this study may influence the type of discourse input that instructors provide to students, as well as the development of materials that induce greater attention to extended
response tasks, the spectator function of language use, and types of rhetorical predicates used in a variety of discourse tasks. Byrnes (1987) has articulated the need for studies that examine how learners express increased propositional complexity: "Just when and with what linguistic means adult learners are able to express increased propositional complexity are areas of inquiry for which few data corpuses provide information" (p. 49). The current study attempts to provide a partial solution to this problem.

In a foreign language context, rhetorical structures on an extended response task can provide information about the communicative development of various groups of language learners in native and foreign languages. Insofar as extended response is an expression and explanation of comprehension, and given the fact that comprehension is a constructive, compositional process, the information gained from such tasks can provide insights into typical discourse problems that foreign language learners face in academic contexts.

Petrosky (1982) has argued that the kind of thinking involved in extended response tasks may be compared to that needed for essay writing. The interpretations and opinions that are realized through extended response in academic contexts, for example, can be used to facilitate the production of thesis statements and arguments in essays. By documenting communicative development within one extended response task, that of personal oral narrative, one can begin to understand more specifically how this development could be facilitated.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to survey the literature that pertains to the relationship between extended response, rhetorical structure, and the communicative development of learners with varied degrees of language experience in native and non-native languages. A secondary purpose of the chapter is to demonstrate the importance of interpretation as an important rhetorical structure within extended response tasks that, in turn, facilitates communicative development. In addition, the chapter provides a rationale for the use of media and for the analysis of spoken discourse in foreign language research.

The chapter will consist of five main sections: (a) Rhetorical Organization, Language Experience, Language of Narration, and Communicative Development (b) Constructivity, Schemas, Interpretation, Extended Response, and Communicative Development (c) The Media and Communicative Development (d) Personal Oral Narrative and Communicative Development (e) Complexity in Spoken and Written Discourse.
Rhetorical Organization, Language Experience, Language of Narration, and Communicative Development

One of the hallmarks of communicative development is a sense of audience (Bowie, 1987; Britton, 1982; Connor, 1984; Dixon, 1986; Ede and Lunsford, 1984; Kroll, 1984). The ability to make adjustments and choices in speech or writing is essential to both spoken and written discourse (Elbow, 1985; Gumperz, 1984; Kramsch, 1986). The adjustments made depend upon the context of situation, the social arena that surrounds the speaker. Knowledge of how to interact appropriately within a given situation constitutes communicative competence for that situation which includes knowledge of speaking rules as well as grammatical rules (Hymes, 1974). At a basic level, communicative acts evolve from addressee- addressee relationships. The addressor determines what communicative means are necessary to secure the relationship and then acts accordingly (Britton, 1975).

Gumperz (1984) has adopted the term "communicative task" to account for the recurrent, general interactive intentions of a speech event. These intentions include describing, explaining, emphasizing, justifying, expressing feelings, etc. Examination of communicative tasks, according to Gumperz, provides an alternative to examination of grammatical and paradigmatic forms of speaking and writing. It is the incorporation of communicative intentions into a grammatical framework, he argues, that is problematic for beginning writers. Gumperz suggests examining how natural spoken language is chunked.
into rhetorical units in order to determine the kinds of rhetorical ties across messages.

Additional support for examination of rhetorical units in discourse comes from work in L1 expository research (Kintsch, 1973; Meyer, 1975). Both Kintsch and Meyer have examined rhetorical predicates in their work. Whereas Kintsch is more concerned with the total propositions recalled, Meyer distinguishes between top level and lower information. Meyer defines rhetorical predicates as that which give prose its overall organization. They are higher in the organizational scheme than content predicates because they show the relationship between predicates.

Rhetorical predicates, according to Meyer (1975), consist of a small number of organizing relations in prose that are comprised of three main types: paratactic, hypotactic, and neutral. Paratactic predicates present arguments of equal weight; hypotactic arguments present arguments of unequal weight, and neutral predicates, such as collection and covariance, may be either paratactic or hypotactic. Meyer provides the following list of hypotactic rhetorical predicates: attribution, equivalent, specific, explanation, evidence, analogy, manner, adversative, setting, representational identification, replacement identification, and constituency identification.

Whereas Meyer and Kintsch are primarily concerned with the propositions recalled from text, Mann and Thompson (1988) have developed a rhetorical system that accounts for production as well as comprehension of text. Their rhetorical predicates include
purpose, condition, other, interpretation, evaluation, restatement, summary, elaboration, antithesis, motivation, solutionhood, circumstance, enablement, cause/result, background, evidence, elaboration, and sequence. Although many of the rhetorical predicates are similar to those offered by Meyer, Mann and Thompson also include others such as interpretation, evaluation, and restatement that are not present in the Meyer taxonomy.

Within L2 discourse, rhetorical studies have been conducted by Jacobs (1981), Connor (1984), Connor and McCagg (1987), Scarcella (1984), Kramsch (1983), and Kumpf (1986). Jacobs examined the rhetorical density of pre-med biology ESL and native speaking students. For all written utterances, Jacobs identified rhetorical propositions such as comparison/contrast, cause/effect, purpose, condition, etc., that occurred between utterances. She provides the following example:

The surface layer of the alimentary canal, for example, has tight junctions between its cells so that no foreign material can enter through the route (p. 212).

Jacobs identifies three content propositions and two rhetorical propositions within this utterance. The first rhetorical proposition, purpose, is represented by the "so that" clause. The second rhetorical proposition, specification, specifies an earlier sentence of the discourse.

In her examination of texts, Jacobs found content predications but very few rhetorical predications used in ESL writing. Yet, Jacobs, argues, complexity of discourse must be determined by the
combination of semantic and rhetorical predicates in a text. It is precisely this combination, she argues, that is necessary for clear communication (p. 247).

Connor (1984) and Connor and McCagg (1987) examined the use of rhetorical and content predicates among Spanish and Japanese ESL students and native American students. Subjects were asked to read a passage and to paraphrase what was read. The subject recalls were then compared to abstract representations of the text, using Meyer's procedures. Connor found that L1 subjects produced more total propositions than L2 subjects, but that differences between the groups were in subordinate rather than superordinate categories. Connor also examined the quality of the recalls. She found that the native writers focused on one or two of the major problems in the text and then elaborated on them. Non-native writers, on the other hand, described all the major ideas in the text but did not elaborate. This procedure negatively affected judgements by native speakers on the quality of their writing.

In addition, Connor added two other categories to her qualitative analysis: pragmatic condition of task and perspective. She found that L1 subjects did better at producing higher level perspective propositions (third person reference as opposed to first person naming) than L2 learners.

The value of such work, Connor argues, is that it can provide insights into the understanding of how propositions can be linked to form coherent texts; it can help students understand the concept of
audience; and it can help students understand cultural differences concerning the amount and type of context building necessary.

Scarcella (1984) found that skillful native English writers used a variety of devices to engage the attention of the reader, whereas the non-native writers used only one or two devices. In the production of thesis statements, skilled native English writers used explicit statement and pre-sequences, whereas non-native writers did not. The study shows how the groups differed in their internalization of a sense of audience, and how this difference affected the quality of their writing.

Kramsch (1983) examined communicative, intracommunicative, and metacommunicative themes used by German foreign language learners while constructing topics. Communicative themes were defined as themes that represented people, things, and ideas. Intracommunicative themes were defined as rhetorical predicates such as cause/effect or cohesive devices such as anaphora. Metacommunicative themes included opinion markers and prefacing remarks that secured the attention of the listener. Kramsch found that, although there was developmental evidence for the metacommunication measure when beginning and advanced levels were compared, there was very little development in terms of use of communicative and intracommunicative themes. In native German discourse, however, these types of themes were very common.

Kumpf's study (1986) is one of the few studies that systematically applies the study of rhetorical predicates to personal oral narrative. Kumpf examined how Japanese and Spanish
L2 learners at different levels of language experience structured narratives in English and the relationship between this structure and grammatical form. Specifically, Kumpf examined the hierarchical characteristics of personal narratives through rhetorical predicates, intersentential relations, and macro-structures. She found that the frequency of adverbial clause use was linked to developmental level, as was the ability to use conjoiners for a variety of discourse functions.

Because Kumpf's study focuses on personal oral narratives, it is informative to understand her procedures for the determination of what constitutes a rhetorical predicate. Kumpf has defined the nucleus as that which expresses the purpose of a speaker or writer. Satellites, on the other hand, provide adjunct information (p. 22). Kumpf's definition of nuclei as expressions of purpose is confusing, given that satellites can also express purpose - rhetorical purposes such as circumstance, background, etc. Mann and Thompson's (1988) definition of a nucleus as that which, when deleted, produces an incoherent text, appears to be less problematic. Kumpf also argues that rhetorical complexity is a function of hypotaxis. Hypotaxis is defined as that which joins clauses of unequal structural status and includes adverbial clauses such as purpose and circumstance (p. 31). Given the complex structure inherent in hypotaxis, Kumpf reasons, hypotaxis is a point of departure for examining the rhetorical production of different language learner groups.
Kumpf's assumption that rhetorical complexity is structurally signalled through hypotaxis contrasts with Meyer's assertion that some rhetorical predicates can be either hypotactic or paratactic.

This study demonstrates that complexity cannot be accounted for solely in terms of structural hypotaxis. In the following example, "he had no proof" is an interpretation that explains the reason or cause behind a lack of intervention:

1. I felt as if
2. probably he suspected
3. they were the three
4. who had taken his basket full of fruits
5. but he had no proof
6. so he just looked at them
7. and then let them pass

Although the clause "but he had no proof" is produced paratactically, it adds to the significance of the narration, and thereby increases its complexity. While it is understandable that Kumpf uses structural hypotaxis as the basis for examining communicative development in learners, given the structural focus of her study, the position of this researcher is that structural complexity is not always an indicator of cognitive complexity. Research needs to be conducted that includes structural complexity within rhetorical analysis as a necessary, but not sufficient criterion, of communicative development.

To summarize, the literature indicates that examination of rhetorical predicates is a productive means of examining
communicative problems of second language learners. The literature specifically indicates that learners with different levels of language experience vary in their use of adverbial clauses and their use of conjoiners for a variety of discourse functions.

Native discourse differs from non-native discourse in that native discourse uses a greater variety of devices to secure attention, uses higher level perspective, focuses on select problems and then elaborates on them, and uses more subordinate structures. Non-native discourse, on the other hand, uses fewer devices to secure the listener's attention, describes all major points of a text without elaborating on any one point, does not convey perspective to any significant degree, may not convey pragmatic condition of task, and uses fewer subordinate structures than native discourse.

The literature also indicates that rhetorical predicates differ from content predicates in that they link together independent propositions to create coherent texts. Rhetorical predicates may appear in hypotactic or paratactic form and may include interpretive as well as descriptive links between textual events. In addition to examination of the rhetorical links within a spoken or written text, the research indicates that it is also useful to examine the degree to which a text is connected to a given task (pragmatic condition) and to the mental processes of the speaker or writer (metacommunication). These two additional categories may be useful to rhetorical analysis because they provide the listener-reader with information about the degree of truthfulness of
a message as well as whether the message is taken from autobiographical or vicarious experience.

Constructivity, Schemas, Interpretation, Extended Response, and Communicative Development

The first task that an individual must accomplish before he or she attempts to narrate events is to call to mind his or her interpretation of those events. After viewing a silent film, for example, the individual must relate the contents of the film to his or her knowledge of the world in order to offer the listener a meaningful account of the film. A theory of remembering as a constructive process was first discussed by Bartlett (1932), who argued against the notion that memory is merely a storage space for fixed impressions. He specifically states: "the first notion to get rid of is that memory is primarily or literally reduplicative. In a world of constantly changing environment, literal recall is extraordinarily unimportant " (p. 204). Bartlett continues to argue that condensation, elaboration, and invention are common features of ordinary remembering, and that these involve the integration of materials that originally belong to different schemata. Bartlett explains schemata as dynamic, living traces within one's knowledge structure that constantly change through invention, condensation and elaboration according to one's interest and ideals.

Individual schemas, or frames, constitute a critical factor in the construction of meaning (Spiro, 1980; Tannen, 1979a; van Dijk, 1980, Wicks, 1986). The importance of constructivity to learning has been demonstrated by research in cognitive psychology. Kintsch
and van Dijk (1978) found that in protocol tasks in which subjects were asked to recall narratives, recalls often contained reconstructively added details and explanations, and explications of coherence relations between proposition (p. 375).

This connection between interpretation and communicative development is also articulated by Widdowson (1983):

Interpretive procedures are needed to exploit schematic knowledge and bring it to bear on particular instances of use. And it is this procedural ability which realizes schematic knowledge as a communicative behavior that I refer to as capacity. This concept, therefore, covers a range of different activities which have been variously referred to as inference, practical reasoning, computing cross reference, negotiation of meaning, problem solving, and so on. (p. 78)

Graman's experiences in working with Latin American and Spanish ESL students further illustrates how schemas help construct coherent meaning in the minds of speakers, writers, and comprehenders. Graman (1988) found that his students, sheperds and farmworkers in a rural Colorado area, developed intellectually and linguistically when they responded to their own experience and built words to describe these experiences. Graman argues that, by focusing on their desires, problems, and confusions, students had a built-in reason for wanting to learn (p. 444). In other words, individual frames and the personal response to these frames were
found to play a powerful role in the construction of linguistic and conceptual meaning.

The idea that schema function to construct meaning in text is to claim that schema function to provide coherence in text. This is Carrell's point (1982) when she argues against the idea that definite articles, pronouns, conjunctions, and lexical features produce coherence in text. Rather, these are cohesive features that can not be equated with coherence or the interaction between reader and text. She argues that it is not just the structure and content of a text that is important, but what the reader or listener does with the text. Schema thoery, unlike propositional analysis, cohesion theory, and story grammars, takes mental processes into account.

Carrell's argument indirectly makes an excellent case for the role of extended response tasks in models of communicative development. If it is what the reader or writer does with a text that is important, then opportunities for extended response to texts must be provided. Elbow (1985) argues, for example, that most writing is dominated by the experience of not writing: elaborate planning and frequent pausing in mid-course. The focus on the "indelibility of writing", he argues, is counter-productive. Only by using writing as a vehicle of expression for thoughts and feelings does one know what one thinks and "get one's head outside." The idea of expressing one's thoughts and feelings in order to learn about oneself and to be able to communicate one's ideas to others is clearly consistent with schema theories of growth and development.
To summarize, the literature indicates than an individual's schema constitutes a powerful factor as to what and how information is constructed and communicated. The literature suggests that it is educationally sound to encourage extended response tasks that, in turn, provide learners with opportunities to engage the schema mechanism and develop their communicative capacity.

The Media and Communicative Development

As of the 1970's, media researchers have begun to address the following cognitive issues: (a) the kinds of cognitions that become involved in the processing of differently packaged and coded material (b) developmental cognitive processes and their relationship to understanding of media attributes, including the comprehension of stories and how one learns to process narration (Clark and Salomon, 1986).

Among the theories that have evolved is that of Olson (1974), who argues that any account of human activity must begin with an understanding of how information is picked up, transformed, and stored. With reference to the activity of viewing a film, Olson distinguishes between the knowledge that one acquires about the depicted objects, and the development of cognitive skills related to observation.

In instruction, Olson (1976) argues, the content is related to the knowledge acquired, and the means employed is related to the skills, strategies, and heuristics developed. Each of the elements - content and means - result in different kinds of transfer of learning:
content results in transfer of rules and principles; means results in transfer of mental operations. While all instructional means may map upon the same knowledge structure, they differ with respect to the cognitive processes that they activate and cultivate.

Olson then argues that the function of media is not so much to convey old knowledge in new forms, but rather to cultivate new skills for exploration and internal representation (Clark and Salomon, p. 468). The value of using film in research and instruction, then, is the potential it holds for developing certain mental operations in learners. Even a simple film without unusual symbolism can encourage interpretive skills that lead, in turn, to greater communicative development.

**Personal Oral Narrative and Communicative Development**

Within the personal oral narrative genre, partial coherence is achieved through the interpretations of the speaker as he or she relates his or her prior experience to his or her perceptions of the narrative. One of the first investigators to explain the role of interpretation in personal oral narratives was Labov (1967, 1972). Labov explains that interpretations are used to convey the point of the narrative, the reason that it was told. Interpretations add personal commentary to a narrative; they specify the narrator's relationship to the narrative he or she is relating.

Further clarification of the role of interpretation in building coherence within personal oral narratives is provided by Eisner (1975), Polanyi (1979), and Tannen (1980).
Eisner (1975) posits that evaluation signals the degree of narrator involvement within the personal oral narrative and that this, in turn, affects the narrative content. If a personal oral narrative is uninvolved, events are merely reported. As use of evaluation increases, storyability increases.

Polanyi (1979) concurs with Eisner that evaluative language is a distinguishing factor between "reports" and "stories." According to Polanyi, reports give a picture of what went on; they describe the facts. It is not important to explain "why" the events took place in reports. Stories, on the other hand, explain what meaning the narrative events have for the narrator. Evaluation functions to give different weights to messages so that some information emerges more salient than other types of information.

In a comparison of how Greek and American women communicated a silent film, Tannen (1980) defined interpretation as "cognitive leaps" made by a speaker, resulting in the reporting of information that was not actually depicted in the film and which represents the imposition of one's own knowledge and experience on what one sees. Tannen explains that repetition, inferring characters' emotions, and value judgements are all manifestations of interpretation. She found interpretive differences between the two cultures in relating the film and accounted for the fact by explaining that a "school culture" dominated the American perspective, whereas a peer interaction culture characterized the Greek approach. In other words, the Greeks had a more highly
developed sense of audience than the Americans, who focused on the information as a transactional activity, that of giving information.

The review suggests that interpretation, used within a personal oral narrative task, signals a more highly developed sense of audience than mere reports. Interpretations are therefore an important rhetorical strategy that warrant examination in studies of communicative development.

**Complexity in Spoken and Written Discourse**

Traditionally, it has been argued that written discourse is more complex than spoken discourse (Chase, 1982; Gumperz, 1984). The arguments focus on (a) the increased structural complexity of written discourse (b) a higher percentage of content messages in written discourse (c) the fact that cognitive development is a progression from oral to literate strategies; therefore, written discourse is more cognitively complex than oral discourse.

The argument that written discourse is more structurally complex than spoken discourse may be seen in Chafe's chart on integration of written discourse versus involvement features of spoken discourse. Chafe (1982) asserts that nominalization, participles, conjoined phrases, sequences of prepositional phrases, introductory phrases, and adverbial conjunctions are all features of written discourse. These contrast to the first person reference, repetitions, false starts, and coordinating conjunctions of spoken discourse.
More recently, Beaman (1984) has challenged the structural superiority of written discourse. In a comparison of syntactic complexity in spoken and written discourse, Beaman found that that-clauses occurred with twice the frequency in the spoken narratives as in the written. Nominal relative clauses did not occur at all in written narratives. Written narratives, however, demonstrated greater use of the to-infinitive clause and of the -ing clause than did spoken discourse. Beaman argues, based on her findings, that spoken discourse is just as complex as written discourse and more complex in some respects. Both modalities demonstrate complexity but in different ways.

While Beaman focuses on syntactic complexity of spoken narratives, other researchers, such as Polanyi (1982) and Young (1987), have demonstrated the macro-structural complexity of the spoken narrative genre. Polanyi, for example, shows that everyday stories manipulate point of view, identity of reference, and meaning. Polanyi provides the example of the woman who, shaking her hand, exclaims: "I shook this I-V and said I'm on an I-V and I can't eat" (p. 157). The utterance collapses the storytelling frame and storyworld frame. The speaker talks from two worlds at once.

Young, in her work on the phenomenology of narratives, articulates three frames for everyday stories: (a) the taleworld, or story, that has its own spatial and temporal reference point (b) the storyrealm, or the world of the teller (c) the conversational realm.
Narrators can move in and out of these frames. They can, for example, assume the role of a character involved in the story action or present the narrative action from the point of view of an omniscient narrator. Because several levels of meaning are present within the telling, personal narratives must be seen as complex rather than as simplistic structures.

The argument that written discourse contains more content messages has also been questioned. Hidi and Hildyard (1983), in a developmental study, compared third and fifth grade children on opinion essay and narrative tasks across oral and written modalities. They found that fifth grade children produced narratives and opinion essays better than third grade children and that greater skills were achieved with the narrative task at both grade levels. No significant differences were found for modality, however, on semantic well-formedness of the content.

Elbow (1985) argues that a tacit assumption behind written discourse is that it is important to get the message right. He then points out that there are also occasions, such as in formal speech, where it is important to get spoken discourse right. The "babbling" American culture that does not give much credence to the spoken word is not to be seen as representative of all cultures or situations.

The third argument is that cognitive development is a process of evolution from oral strategies to more sophisticated literate strategies. Tannen (1982) argues against this oral-literate dichotomy and for the notion of a continuum that shifts its focus on
involvement vs. message content. Tannen found, for example, that Jewish New Yorkers did not explicitly state the point of spoken discourse, a strategy that proved irritating to native Californians. Whereas New Yorkers used exaggerated paralinguistic features to make their points, Californians relied on lexicalization. Tannen comments that both groups were highly literate, but that they differed as to which aspects of the communicative channel they chose to elaborate.

Elbow points out that, if one accepts the argument that cognitive development consists of movement from oral to literate strategies, then most imaginative literature would be considered lower developmental:

"I'm frightened at the tendency to label students cognitively retarded who tend to exploit those oral or concrete strategies that characterize so much good literature, namely narration, description, invested detail, and expression of feeling" (p. 293).

Elbow points out, therefore, the dangers of over-emphasizing the abstract. He further argues that the test of good organization in writing is whether it produces coherence for the audience (p. 295). This, he states, is accomplished by incorporating voice and involvement, features of spoken discourse, onto the written page.

The literature indicates that spoken and written discourse are both complex, but in different ways. The literature shows that semantic content is not exclusively reserved for the written mode. In addition, the literature suggests that communicative development
can be enhanced by incorporation of voice and involvement features, characteristic of spoken discourse, into written discourse. Therefore, research that investigates the degree of involvement and coherence within spoken discourse can also inform educators about communicative problems learners potentially face in written discourse.

Summary

The purpose of this review has been to report selected research related to rhetorical organization, language experience, native vs. non-native discourse, and communicative development; constructivity, schemas, interpretation, extended response, and communicative development; media and communicative development; personal oral narrative and communicative development; and the complexities of spoken discourse. Theoretically, the relationship between extended response and communicative development appears to be sound. Empirically, the examination of rhetorical predicates used by learners with varying degrees of language experience in native and non-native languages seems appropriate. As Connor suggests, the value of such research is that it provides information about audience awareness and the degree to which learners know how to link propositions to form coherent texts.

The examination of how rhetorical predicates are used within an extended response spoken discourse task across different groups of Spanish foreign language learners has yet to be investigated. If development, as Britton (1975) suggests, is the ability to do two things with language, where formerly only one could be done, then
research should examine the extent to which learners can go beyond recall of information and incorporate interpretive and descriptive rhetorical predicates into their communicative products.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Population and Sample

The population from which the sample was drawn consisted of all novice and graduate Spanish students in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at The Ohio State University during the Spring Quarter 1988. One third of the sample consisted of novice Spanish 103 students who were selected from the third quarter of a four-quarter sequence of language study. The majority of these students were fulfilling a four-quarter language requirement and were selected on a paid volunteer basis by the researcher, who randomly selected classrooms to visit and solicited volunteers until the necessary quota was reached. The mean age of these subjects was 21.5 with 7 males and 5 females in the group. None of the subjects had ever lived in a Spanish-speaking country. Two subjects, however, claimed to have Spanish-speaking people in their family. The mean years of Spanish instruction was 2.5 and the mean grade reported on their last Spanish mid-term on a scale of 1-4 was 3.2.

Two-thirds of the sample was drawn from the population of Spanish Graduate Teaching Associates. Because of the heavy time demands on Graduate Teaching Associates, their participation was
solicited on a voluntary basis. Non-native advanced speakers of Spanish that claimed English as their native language and Spanish as their foreign language were used as a second group. Mean age of this group was 28.3 with 4 males and 8 females within the group. Three subjects had Spanish-speaking people in their family and 8 subjects had lived in a Spanish-speaking country for an average of 6 months. Mean number of years of language instruction was 7.

Native Spanish speakers were used as a third group in order to provide a comparison measure with the non-native Spanish learners. The average age was 30 years with 6 males and 6 females in the group. The mean number of years of English instruction was 4.4; mean number of years that subjects had been living in a country where English was spoken was 7.0.

Research Data
The data collected for this study consisted of personal oral narratives in English from the 10 novice Spanish learners; personal oral narratives in Spanish from the 10 novice Spanish learners; personal oral narratives in English from the 10 advanced Spanish learners; personal oral narratives in Spanish from the 10 advanced Spanish learners; personal oral narratives in English from the 10 native Spanish speakers; and personal oral narratives in Spanish from the 10 native Spanish speakers. The basic purpose of the data was documentation of the relationship between language experience, language of narration, and frequency and type of rhetorical
predicates used in order to provide information about communicative
development of Spanish foreign language learners.

Research Design

The current study may be characterized as quasi-experimental
research. The design for the study was a two-way full factorial
ANOVA design (Ary, 1979). The design layout is presented in
Figure 5.

The following independent variables were used in the study:
1. Language Experience (A)
2. Language of Narration (B).

The first independent variable, language experience, was fixed
and assigned with three levels-Novice Level (A1), Advanced Non-
Native Level (A2), and Advanced Native Level (A3). It was a
between-groups variable.

The second independent variable, language of narration, was
fixed and assigned and crossed with the first independent variable.
It had two levels—native narration (B1) and non-native narration
(B2). It was a within-groups variable.
This basic research design led to four planned comparisons for the language experience variable and one planned comparison for the language of narration variable. The planned comparisons are graphically displayed in Figures 6 - 10. Shaded areas reflect the groups under investigation. The abbreviation "Sp" refers to a retelling that occurred in Spanish. The abbreviation "Eng" refers to a retelling that occurred in English.

The first planned comparison examined the combined performance of native and non-native languages between novice Spanish, advanced non-native Spanish, and native Spanish groups.
The purpose of this comparison was to determine the variability in average performance on the rhetorical predicate measure. The second measure, that involving the native language, was used as a repeated measure in this comparison. It provided a more reliable estimate of performance than any one measure. Figure 6 presents the groups under comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Native</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novice Spanish</strong></td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Spanish</strong></td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Erg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Spanish</strong></td>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>Sp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Comparison of Combined Non-Native and Native Narrations (L1 + L2) Between Groups
The second planned comparison examined rhetorical predicate use between the native languages of Novice, Advanced, and Native Spanish speakers. In other words, the English narrations of the Novice and Advanced groups were compared with the Spanish narrations of the Native Spanish group. Figure 6 shows the focus of the comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Native</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Spanish</td>
<td>Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Spanish</td>
<td>Sp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Comparison of Native (L1) Narrations Between Groups
The third comparison examined rhetorical predicate use between the non-native languages of Novice, Advanced, and Native Spanish groups. In other words, the study examined variability in performance within the Spanish narrations of the Novice and Advanced groups as compared to the English narrations of the Native Spanish group. Figure 8 documents the comparison:

![Comparison Table]

Figure 8. Comparison of Non-Native (L2) Narrations Between Groups
The fourth comparison examined rhetorical predicate use within the non-native Spanish narrations of the Novice and Advanced Spanish speakers in comparison to the native Spanish narrations of the Native Spanish speakers. Figure 9 documents the comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Native</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice Spanish</td>
<td>Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Spanish</td>
<td>Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Spanish</td>
<td>Sp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Comparison of Non-Native Spanish Narrations versus Native Spanish Narrations (L2 Spanish versus L1 Spanish) Between Groups
The fifth and final comparison examined variability in rhetorical predicate use within each language experience group as a function of native or non-native language of narration. Figure 10 documents the comparison:

Figure 10. Comparison of Non-Native versus Native Narrations (L1 versus L2) Within Novice Spanish, Advanced Non-Native Spanish, and Native Spanish Groups

The study had twelve dependent variables. The first dependent variable, total rhetorical predicates used, was selected to provide
an overall picture of rhetorical predicate use across language experience groups and within language of narration. In addition, the decision was made to examine the frequency of use of two other dependent variables, descriptive predicates and interpretive predicates, and their relationship with the two independent variables. This analysis provided global information concerning the frequency of use of types of rhetorical predicates. In addition to the global analysis, a secondary analysis (Rentel, 1988) was conducted on four types of descriptive rhetorical predicates (perspective, restatement, circumstance, elaboration/background,) and five types of interpretive rhetorical predicates (evaluation, purpose, cause/result; opposition/condition; and metacommunication) in order to present a more complete explanation of the relationship between language experience, language of narration, and rhetorical predicate use.
Coding of the Data

The coding of the data consisted of three steps: (a) coding of propositions (b) coding of nucleii propositions (c) coding of satellite propositions.

Step 1: Coding of Propositions

The unit of analysis in this study was the propositional unit (Brown and Yule, 1983; Warren, Nicholas, and Trabasso, 1979; ). A propositional unit is defined in this study as a unit that contains one predicate relation. The first step in the analysis was to divide the texts into main and subordinate propositions. Beaman (1984) discusses specific procedures for coding subordinate clauses of texts. In addition, Peterson and McAbe (1987) have justified the analysis of prepositional phrases has subordinate clauses. These procedures were followed in analyzing propositional units and are described below:

1. Nominal subordinates: subordinate clauses that function as noun phrases. These fall into five major categories: (a) that- clauses (b) interrogative clauses (c) nominal relative clauses (d) to-infinitive clauses and (e) -ing clauses.

1. That Clauses

Clauses that complement main clauses with mental state verbs.

I think that the ladder is doing something there
I thought that they were going to beat him up
He notices that the boy left his hat on the road.

2. **Wh-Interrogative Clauses**
   Clauses that leave a gap of unknown information.
   He passes by where the man is.
   I don't know why he is doing that.

3. **Nominal Relative Clauses**
   Clauses that can be paraphrased by a noun phrase containing a postmodifying relative clause.
   I guess what he's picking is pears
   (I guess it's pears that he's picking)

4. **To-Infinitive Clauses**
   He proceeds to confiscate one basket full of pears.
   The cyclist gave the boy 3 pears to thank him.

5. **Ing Clauses**
   A boy comes riding by on a bike.
   And there's a ladder coming out of the tree

2. **Adjectival Clauses**
   relative clauses beginning with a who-pronoun, that, or with a zero marker (no conjunction).
   He goes by the man that is picking the pears.
   But anyway so then the boy who had stolen pears
3. **Adverbial Clauses**

Clauses that begin with adverbs of time, such as "when", "while," "as." Also, clauses beginning with the conjunctions "because" and "if."

*As they're passing by the man*

*At the same time that the man is picking pears*

4. **Prepositional Phrases**

Peterson and McAbe have argued that prepositional phrases are very often analyzed as subordinate clauses (1987). All prepositional phrases that expressed rhetorical relations were analyzed as separate propositions.

   1. He's gathering pears
      for market
   2. They receive three pears
      one for each of them.

5. **Evaluative Adverbs**

Adverbs that expressed commentary on the narrative topic were analyzed as separate propositions.

   1. He's collecting pears
      obviously
   2. He inadvertently
      runs into a rock.
Step 2: Coding of Nuclei Propositions

For purposes of this study, all main clauses that recalled content present in the film were coded as nuclei. Interpretive statements that were structured as main clauses were not coded as nuclei but as satellites. Subordinate clauses that conveyed content represented in the film were not coded as nuclei but as satellites. The basis for this decision is Mann and Thompson's (1988) definition of a nucleus as that which provides a brief synopsis of a text and carries the action forward... If a particular nucleus is removed, then the significance of the material in its satellites is not apparent (266).

Text 1.8.2. (see Appendix), according to the above procedure, may be reduced to the following series of nuclei:

1. O.K. There was a man
2. and then a man and a goat came by
3. then a boy on a bicycle came
4. and took a basket of fruit
5. and rode away
6. then he saw a girl on a bicycle
7. and he crashed
8. and spilled the fruit
9. three boys helped him
10. he gave them each a piece of fruit
11. they went their own way
12. then later the three boys walked by the man
This study makes no claim that nucleii consist of foregrounded information, or that background information is only a function of satellites (Tomlin, 1984). As Kumpf (1986) explains, sequential information can be staged either paratactically or hypotactically, according to the wishes of the speaker. In addition, interpretations, which may occur in hypotactic form, are essential to the content of a personal oral narrative. Although researchers such as Jacobs (1981) have examined the ratio of rhetorical predicates to content predicates, in personal oral narrative this procedure becomes problematic as the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

The focus of this study is not on the quantity of information recalled, but on the quantity of rhetorical predicates used to communicate the recalled information to the listener. Therefore, the nucleii of all texts were not coded for statistical analysis. The coding served a conceptual purpose: that of distinguishing nucleii from satellites, which were the focus of the investigation.

**Step 3: Coding of Satellite Propositions**

The following satellite propositions were coded in the texts: elaboration/background, circumstance, opposition/condition, purpose, cause/result, interpretation, restatement. In addition, the literature review indicates that the perspective and metacommunicative categories also provide information on rhetorical structure. These categories were also coded in the analysis.
Although this study builds on categories developed by Kumpf (1986), in her study of personal oral narratives of past experience, it also includes additional categories, discussed in Mann and Thompson (1988), as well as modifications of the Kumpf categories.

The modification and addition of categories is due to the fact that one of the purposes of the current study is to show the integral relationship between interpretive predicates and communicative development. While Kumpf includes categories such as "purpose," "cause," and "opposition" that can partially account for interpretive response, her primary concern is documentation of adverbial clauses and their relationship to rhetorical structure. Main clauses, such as "Elena wants to come back to her country," are coded as nucleii, rather than as "evaluation" or "interpretation." Because the attribution of emotion within a film constitutes material that adds to the significance of a text it is therefore considered satellite material under the terms of this study. The category "evaluation" was therefore added as part of the coding system of the current study and combines Mann and Thompson's (1988) categories of "interpretation" and "evaluation" under this single category.

Preliminary coding of the data by an outside rater revealed difficulties with the operational definitions provided by Kumpf and Mann and Thompson. The difficulties were noted and definitions were modified prior to submitting a sample of the data for rater reliability. The following modifications were made for the present study:
1. The "cause" category was expanded into a more global category hereafter referred to as "cause/result". In the Kumpf definition, result was not attributed to satellites, whereas in the present study satellites are frequently used to explain the result of a narrative action.

2. The "reason" category provided by Kumpf was accounted for in this study as either "cause/result" or "purpose" categories to avoid unnecessary confusion.

3. Given the fact that a silent film was used to elicit the data of the current study, reported speech was considered as satellite information and reporting verbs are considered as satellites rather than as nucleii.

4. Preliminary analyses revealed difficulties in discriminating between evidence, elaboration, and background categories. Hence, these three categories were collapsed in the present study under the single category of "elaboration/background."

5. Preliminary analysis of the data revealed very few instances of response, and joint, categories in the data. Therefore, these categories were omitted from the coding procedures.

6. The contrast category, as used in Kumpf, presents two nucleii that oppose each other. In the current study, all nucleii presented in the silent film are sequentially presented and do not contradict each other. Contrast functions in this study in an interpretive manner; the speaker represents events that contrast to his personal expectations and comments on this contrast of
expectations. In addition, the subject may represent an action and then contrast it with a hypothetical action or situation. Hence, contrast in this study is more akin to Kumpf's "opposition" and "condition" categories and was coded under the category "opposition/condition."

7. Although Kumpf does not use metacommunication or perspective as categories within her analysis, the literature review indicates that they are relevant to a communicative analysis of text and are therefore incorporated into the current study. It should be noted that the definition of perspective used within the current analysis is more related to Connor's (1984) definition of "pragmatic task condition" than to the use of third or first person pronouns with which she defines "perspective." The use of the term "perspective" to refer to Connor's "pragmatic task condition" is taken from Tannen (1980), who also used a silent film to elicit data for her study. The modified definitions, as well as the definitions for the perspective and metacognitive categories, are included below. For purpose of analysis, the definitions are grouped according to descriptive or interpretive type.

A. Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates

1. Elaboration is defined as the frequency with which a subject specifies a previously reported narrative event.

Example: 1. the boys call him 

whistle at him
2. they help him up
   *they pick up all his pears*
3. they got their prize
   *they got three pears*

2. **Background** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator expresses, in the past tense, any information that occurred prior to the time frame of the current proposition under narration.
   
   Example: 1. *le da tres peras a los tres amigos que le ayudaron*
         2. *he hurt his knee when he fell down*
         3. *before that the man came down from the tree*

3. **Circumstance** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator presents a narrative event or state within a subordinate clause. Also, the frequency with which a narrator attributes possession to a character in the film.
   
   Example: 1. *El hombre trabaja en la finca cuando el chico llega en la bicicleta*
         2. *el niño empezó pasear en bicicleta*
         3. *caminaron cerca de este hombre que fue tomando esta comida*
4. **Restatement** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator restates information present in the nucleus where that information is presented of a comparable length to the nucleus.

Example: se daba cuenta

que le faltaba una cesta

Sí, se daba cuenta

que le faltaba una cesta

5. **Perspective** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator explicitly refers to his or her perceptual process of viewing the film through words such as "see","hear", "perceive," etc. or the frequency with which a narrator explicitly uses the word "film" in a proposition, where that proposition is not an interpretive predicate. References to the beginning of the film should be coded as perspective. The phrase "the fact is" should be coded as perspective. In addition, use of the words "you" (with the exception of the conversational marker "you know") or "we" within a proposition where that proposition is not an interpretive predicate should be coded as perspective. If the narrator refers to his or her interpretive perceptual process, upon viewing the film, the proposition would be coded as "evaluation."

Example: 1. La historia comienza con un hombre

2. Se escucha el sonido de un gallo
3. Pero el caso es que
4. se ve unos chicos mas bien de la ciudad

B. Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates

6. **Purpose** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator presents a situation that is unrealized, that is preceded by the concept "for," or "in order to," or "so that." In addition, all embedded clauses that conveyed the purpose relation of the subordinate clause were coded under this category. In the example below, the proposition "si el hombre le está mirando" is embedded in the subordinate proposition "a ver". Both are coded as purpose.

Example: 1. mira arriba varias veces
   **a ver**
   *si el hombre le está mirando*

2. le da tres peras
   **una para cada muchacho**
   (idea is that he gives them so that each of the boys will have one)

7. **Evaluation** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator makes an inference that cannot be scored as any other rhetorical relation. Propositions are not coded as evaluations when they express "purpose," "cause/result," "opposition," or "condition."

Examples of propositions that are coded as evaluations include:

1. Use of the words "notes", "sees", "knows", etc. in main or subordinate clauses, where the words refer to a
cognitive process attributed to a character as opposed to perception on the part of a character of a physical object that occurs in the film and where this cognitive process cannot be coded as any other rhetorical relation.

Example: los tres muchachos caminaron

cuando el hombre nota
que un basquete de sus pares no está allí

2. All negative propositions

Example: no ponen las peras

no dice nada

3. Comparisons of entities to other entities

Example: cae como un terremoto

pero es una pera

4. All references to speech. Given the silent nature of the film, any reference to speech is an evaluation.

Example: he says thank-you

5. Predictions of what characters in the film will do.

Example: que va a cruzar con ella

6. Evaluations

Example: 1. the most important thing

is why one person tried
to destroy the big image in this area

2. se portaron muy bien con él

8. Cause/Result is defined as the frequency with which a narrator expresses a positive or negative mental state that
results from or contributes to a narrative action. For example, the event in which the pear-picker descends from the tree may bring about an attribution of mental state on the part of a character which would then be coded as "result." A mental state may also be responsible for a subsequent narrative action. For example, a decision may affect what happens in the film. The decision would be coded as "cause."

Example: 1. he just doesn't pay attention to where he's going and he falls from his bike

2. one of the boys sees that the boy lost his hat and he whistles

9. **Condition** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator contrasts a statement in a nucleus to a hypothetical action or situation.

Example: no sé si va a mirar a ella o es que el viento le lleva el sombrero

10. **Opposition** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator presents a personal expectation that is not realized in the narrative action of the film.
Example: I would think

they were going
to beat him up
and steal the pears
but no
they are nice boys
they help him out

11. **Metacomunication** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator expresses opinions or doubts about the events that he or she is narrating through words such as "I believe," "it seems" etc., where these opinions are expressed in main clauses.

Example: 1. I don't know
what those boys are doing there

2. It seems
that the boys are out of place

C. **Extraneous Rhetorical Predicates**

12. **Ballooon** is defined as the frequency with which a narrator produces a rhetorical relation that is incomprehensible to the coder of the data.

Example: viene en una bicicleta
que pura los pares

**Rater Reliability**

In order to insure rater reliability, the researcher solicited a bilingual native Spanish instructor to score one third of the data.
Scoring reliability was established as follows:
1. the researcher mailed an instruction packet, pointing out the definitions for each of the dependent variables to be coded. The instruction packet included a description of the film, a practice text, a description of the coding scheme, general coding instructions, and randomly selected texts.
2. After the texts were coded by the second rater and returned to the researcher, the two independently obtained sets of scores were then correlated to produce Pearson correlation coefficients of Elaboration/Background (r = .85); Purpose (r = .87); Evaluation (r = .92); Restatement (r = .99); Circumstance (r = .96); Perspective (r = .90); Cause/Result (r = .95); Metacommunication (r = 1.00); Condition/Opposition (r = .99).

\section*{Scoring}
After the coding was completed, the following scores were tabulated for each of the texts:
1. the frequency of total rhetorical predicates
2. the frequency of descriptive predicates
3. the frequency of interpretive predicates
4. the frequency of secondary rhetorical predicates
The "balloon" category occurred infrequently within the data and was omitted from the scoring procedure. As mentioned previously, the purpose of this study was not to measure the amount of information recalled but, rather, the amount of rhetorical predicates used to communicate recalled information. Therefore, the "sequence" rhetorical predicate was omitted from the scoring procedure.

**Data Analysis**

The data was analyzed for the following information: (a) the total frequency of global rhetorical predicates in each group (total rhetorical predicates, total descriptive rhetorical predicates, total interpretive rhetorical predicates) (b) the total frequency of secondary rhetorical predicates in each group (circumstance, perspective, restatement, elaboration/background; evaluation, purpose, cause/result, opposition/condition, metacommunications).

The null hypotheses for the study were as follows:

**H01:** There will be no significant difference attributable to language experience on the frequency of rhetorical predicates produced.

**H02:** There will be no significant difference attributable to native language experience on the frequency of rhetorical predicates produced.

**H03:** There will be no significant difference attributable to non-native language experience on the frequency of rhetorical predicates produced.
HO4: There will be no significant difference attributable to non-native Spanish experience versus native Spanish experience within the Spanish narrations.

HO5: There will be no significant difference attributable to language of narration on the rhetorical predicates produced within the novice, advanced non-native, and advanced native narrations.

Statistical Analysis

The coded data was subjected to a two-factor analysis of variance to test the null hypotheses of no differences between groups. The Statview 512 package for the Apple computer was utilized to analyze the data.

General Procedures: Novice Speakers

The researcher met with instructors of the 103 Spanish classes one week before the study began in order to obtain permission for using time to solicit volunteers for the study. The researcher then visited the classes prior to the data collection in order to solicit subjects. Subjects were informed that the researcher was investigating communicative development within a personal oral narrative context and that it would be necessary to tape the narrations.

General Procedures: Advanced and Native Speakers

The researcher personally contacted Spanish Graduate Teaching Associates in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at The Ohio State University to request their
participation in the study. All subjects were informed of the taping procedures prior to participation in the study and of the fact that the purpose of the study was not to examine linguistic accuracy, but to study communicative development within a personal oral narrative task.

Specific Procedures for all Groups

All three groups met in one of the language laboratories in the Dieter Cunz Hall of Languages at The Ohio State University. Subjects participated individually for 30-minute periods on two tasks: (a) a personal oral narration of a silent film in the foreign language of the subject (b) a personal oral narration of the same silent film in the native language of the subject. Subjects were required to narrate in their foreign language before narrating in the native language. All narratives were tape recorded using an Olympus PearlCorder S301 recorder. A code was used to identify individual speakers according to language experience groups. Thus, 12 on the tape indicated that the speaker was the second novice speaker to perform.

The Film

A silent film known as "the pear film" (Chafe, 1980) was used to elicit the rhetorical predicates under investigation. Although other techniques have been used to study communicative development, such as picture reconstruction tasks (Bialystok, 1983b), the decision to use a silent film was based on the following criteria: (a) it controls for topic and therefore functions as a more useful base for comparison than individual personal oral narratives on different
topics; (b) there is a substantial literature base that has used the film for personal oral narrative study (Chafe, 1980; Clancy, 1980; Downing, 1980, Tannen, 1980); (c) it functions as an ideal extended response task with which one may examine communicative development, independent of audience input; (d) the film used in the current study is ideal for elicitation of interpretative response because it works through a clear sequence of events that are understandable to all subjects and does not presuppose prior knowledge of a variety of film codes, necessary for interpretation of more complex films.

A description of the film content is presented by Chafe (1980):

The film begins with a man picking pears on a ladder in a tree. He descends the ladder, kneels, and dumps the pears from the pocket of an apron he is wearing into one of three baskets below the tree. He removes a bandana from around his neck and wipes off one of the pears. Then he returns to the ladder and climbs back into the tree.

Toward the end of this sequence we hear the sound of a goat, and when the picker is back in the tree a man approaches with a goat on a leash. As they pass by the basket of pears, the goat strains toward them, but is pulled past by the man and the two of them disappear in the distance.
We see another closeup of the picker at his work, and then see a boy approaching on a bike. He coasts in toward the baskets, stops, gets off his bike, looks at the picker, puts down his bike, looks at the picker, walks toward the baskets, again looking at the picker, picks up a pear, puts it back down, looks once more at the picker, and lifts up a basket full of pears. He puts the basket down near his bike, lifts up the bike and straddles it, picks up the basket, and places it on the rack in front of his handlebars, and rides off. We see again the man continuing to pick pears.

The boy is now riding down the road, and we see a pear fall from the basket on his bike. Then we see a girl on a bicycle approaching from the other direction. As they pass, the boy turns to look at the girl, his hat flies off, and the pears spill onto the ground. The boy extricates himself from under the bike, and brushes off his leg.

In the meantime we hear what turns out to be the sound of a paddleball, and then we see three boys standing there, looking at the bike boy on the ground. The three boys pick up the scattered pears and put them back in the basket. The bike boy sets his bike upright, and two of the other boys lift the basket of pears back onto it. The bike boy begins walking his bike in the direction he was going, while the three other boys begin walking off in the other direction.
As they walk by, the bike boy's hat on the road, the boy with the paddleball sees it, picks it up, turns around, and we hear a loud whistle as he signals to the bike boy. The bike boy stops, takes three pears out of the basket, and holds them out as the other boy approaches with the hat. They exchange the pears and the hat, and the bike boy keeps going while the boy with the paddleball runs back to his two companions, to each of whom he hands a pear. They continue on, eating their pears.

The second scene now changes back to the tree, where we see the picker again descending the ladder. He looks at the two baskets, where earlier there were three, points at them, backs up against the ladder, shakes his head, and tips up his hat. The three boys are now seen approaching, eating their pears. The picker watches them pass by, and they walk off into the distance.

Directions Used in the Study
Subjects were given oral instructions, and always in the native language of the subject. Cohen and Olshtain (1982) have pointed out that providing instructions in the native language may enhance the response of subjects. The instructions given in this study are derived from those given to subjects in the original pear study (Chafe, 1980). The instructions were as follows:
I'm studying how people talk in a foreign language about things that they've experienced. In this case, I'm interested in how people who have seen a film tell it to people who haven't seen it. You are to assume that I have not seen the film and that I'm very interested in having you tell me in Spanish about what happened.

After relating the film in Spanish, the subjects were given the following instructions:

Please tell me again what happened, this time in English.

The instructions given to the native Spanish speakers were as follows:

Me interesa como una persona habla en un lenguaje extranjero de las cosas que ha experimentado. En este caso particular, me interesa como una persona que acaba de ver una película se la cuenta a gente que no la ha visto. Debes asumir que no he visto nunca la película que acabas de ver, y que tengo ganas de saber lo que pasó en la película. Cuéntame lo que pasó en inglés.

After completing the personal oral narration in English, the native Spanish speakers were then given the following instructions:

Ahora, dime otra vez lo que pasó, pero en español.
Transcription of the Data

Data was transcribed verbatim and organized into propositional units as specified above. Because the purpose of the analysis was not to determine the relationship between prosody and its relationship to communicative development, but rather the relationship between language experience, language of narration, and communicative development, transcription conventions were kept to a minimum and primarily reflected the propositional units under examination.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This section presents the results of all hypotheses examined in the study. For each hypothesis, the results are presented first for the global analysis, followed by the results of the secondary analysis for types of descriptive and interpretive predicates used.

A factorial design was selected for the study because it allowed the researcher to examine the effects of two independent variables: language experience and language of narration. The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between these independent variables and the frequency of use of rhetorical predicates in novice, advanced non-native, and advanced native college Spanish learners.

There were four planned comparisons for the language experience variable: (a) overall language experience across novice, advanced non-native, and advanced native Spanish speakers (b) native Spanish experience with native English experience (c) non-native Spanish experience with non-native English experience (d) non-native Spanish experience with native Spanish experience. There was one planned comparison for the language of narration variable: foreign language narration versus native language narration.
Twelve criterion measures were used in the study. The first three criterion measures - total rhetorical predicates, total descriptive predicates, and total interpretive predicates - were designed to provide global information about learner use of rhetorical predicates and to provide information about the percentage of interpretive versus descriptive rhetorical predicates used. The other nine criterion measures provided a secondary analysis of the data and consisted of the total number of types of descriptive rhetorical predicates produced (restatement, perspective, circumstance, elaboration/background) and the total number of types of interpretive rhetorical predicates produced (cause/result, opposition/condition, purpose, evaluation, metacommunication). Criteria for determining what constituted a rhetorical predicate may be found in Chapter III. Each rhetorical predicate used was assigned one point, and the points were tabulated for each of the groups prior to the data analysis. Each hypothesis was examined using the Statview program for the Apple computer to derive the analysis of variance. The Neuman-Keuls procedure was used in making all post hoc comparisons (Kennedy, 1985).

Table 1 presents a summary of the means and standard deviations for each of the dependent variables. The ANOVA tables are presented in Appendix A.
Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for All Dependent Measures by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
<th>Restatement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Elaboration/Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>X 4.7 19.1</td>
<td>3 12.3</td>
<td>1.7 6.8</td>
<td>.4 .5</td>
<td>.4 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 3.3 9.0</td>
<td>2.1 5.8</td>
<td>1.4 3.7</td>
<td>.7 1.0</td>
<td>.7 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>X 31.5 39.1</td>
<td>15.4 18.7</td>
<td>16.1 20.4</td>
<td>1.1 2.2</td>
<td>3.2 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 14.5 20.8</td>
<td>9.2 11.4</td>
<td>8.5 11.9</td>
<td>1.4 2.7</td>
<td>2.4 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>X 47.9 50.7</td>
<td>17.7 24.1</td>
<td>30.2 26.6</td>
<td>1.3 2.5</td>
<td>3.4 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 36.5 30</td>
<td>9.0 12.7</td>
<td>28.4 18.0</td>
<td>1.1 2.4</td>
<td>5.8 5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Opposition/Condition</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cause/Result</th>
<th>Metacommunication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 X 1.3 7.0</td>
<td>1.2 1.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>.6 .4</td>
<td>.3 4.1</td>
<td>0 .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 1.4 3.9</td>
<td>1.3 1.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1.2 1.0</td>
<td>.7 2.3</td>
<td>0 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 X 6.8 7.9</td>
<td>6.0 7.5</td>
<td>1.3 1</td>
<td>1.3 1.2</td>
<td>5.7 8.0</td>
<td>2.8 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 4.5 4.7</td>
<td>4.9 5.3</td>
<td>2.3 2.5</td>
<td>1.4 1.3</td>
<td>16.1 5.5</td>
<td>2.3 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 X 7.3 7.4</td>
<td>12.5 12.2</td>
<td>3.1 3.2</td>
<td>.9 2.4</td>
<td>6.3 8.7</td>
<td>7.4 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 4.9 4.6</td>
<td>13.4 9.3</td>
<td>5.3 5.4</td>
<td>.8 1.8</td>
<td>5.3 6.3</td>
<td>8.6 2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 1: There will be no differences attributable to language experience on the total frequency and types of rhetorical predicates produced.

This hypothesis examined the relationship between the combined performance of native and non-native narrations across language experience groups.

Rhetorical Predicates: Macroanalysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for total rhetorical predicates produced were 11.9, 35.3, and 48.9. An analysis of variance performed on the data yielded a significant main effect $F (2, 54) = 13.38, p < .0001$.

Means recorded for descriptive predicates were 7.65, 17.05, and 20.9. An analysis of variance performed on the data yielded a significant main effect $F (2, 54) = 11.64, p < .0001$. 
Means recorded for interpretive rhetorical predicates were 4.25, 18.25, and 28.4. An analysis of variance performed on the data was significant $F (2, 54) = 12.8$, $p < .0001$.

In sum, when performance on non-native and native narrations was combined across groups, significant differences were found for all global measures beyond the .01 level. It should also be noted that, when the means on the descriptive and interpretive measures are compared, the results indicate that novice speakers used 28% more descriptions than interpretations, advanced speakers used 4% more interpretations than descriptions, and native speakers used 16% more interpretations than descriptions. Table 3 documents the inverse relationship between use of descriptions and language experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhetorical Predicates: Secondary Analysis
Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates

Table 4. Secondary Analysis of Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Restatement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Elab/Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .02</td>
<td>p &lt; .002</td>
<td>p &lt; .02</td>
<td>p &lt; .0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for the restatement variable were .45, 1.65, and 1.9. An analysis of variance revealed a significant main effect $F (2, 54) = 4.00, p < .02$.

Means recorded for the perspective variable were .75, 3.1, and 4.6. An analysis of variance revealed significant differences between groups $F (2, 54) = 6.8, p < .002$.

Means recorded for the circumstance variable were 4.1, 7.4, and 7.4. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated a significant effect $F (2, 54) = 3.8, p < .02$.

Means recorded for the elaboration/background variable were 2.1, 4.6, and 6.5. An analysis of variance performed on the
data revealed significant differences between groups $F (2, 54) = 9.68, p < .0003$.

In sum, significant main effects were found for the restatement (.02), circumstance (.02), perspective (.002), and elaboration/background (.0003) variables.

**Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Meta</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Oppos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for the evaluation variable were 1.2, 6.8, and 12.4. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between groups $F (2, 54) = 6.8, p < .002$.

Means recorded for the metacommunication variable were .45, 2.7, and 4.8. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated a significant difference between groups $F (2, 54) = 5.76, p < .005$. 

---

**Table 5. Secondary Analysis of Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Meta</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Oppos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for the evaluation variable were 1.2, 6.8, and 12.4. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between groups $F (2, 54) = 6.8, p < .002$.

Means recorded for the metacommunication variable were .45, 2.7, and 4.8. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated a significant difference between groups $F (2, 54) = 5.76, p < .005$. 

---
Means recorded for cause/result were 2.2, 6.8, and 7.5. An analysis of variance performed on the data yielded significant differences between groups $F (2, 54) = 8.3, p < .0007$.

Means recorded for the purpose variable were .5, 1.3, and 1.7. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between groups $F (2, 54) = 3.92, p < .02$.

Means recorded for the opposition/condition variable were 0, 1.2, and 3.2. An analysis of variance yielded a significant main effect $F (2, 54) = 4.3, p < .017$.

In sum, significant differences were found for all interpretive rhetorical predicates with the exception of the opposition/condition variable.

Based on the above data, the hypothesis of no difference between levels of language experience is therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no differences attributable to native Spanish experience versus native English experience on the total quantity and quality of rhetorical predicates produced.

This hypothesis was designed to examine the degree of significant variability that could be attributed to native language experience groups.
Rhetorical Predicates: Macroanalysis

Table 6. Macroanalysis of Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for total number of rhetorical predicates produced were 19.1, 39.1, and 50.7. An analysis of variance, however, yielded significant differences between novice and native groups only (p < .05).

Means recorded for total number of descriptive predicates were 12.3, 18.7, and 24.1. An analysis of variance conducted on the data revealed significant differences between novice and native groups only (p < .05).

Means recorded for total interpretive rhetorical predicates used were 6.8, 20.4, and 26.6. An analysis of variance performed on the data yielded significant differences between novice and native groups only (p < .05).

In sum, the significant differences found in Hypothesis 1 can be partially attributed to significant differences between the
native language of novice and native groups on all global measures (p < .05). Surprisingly, no significant differences were found between advanced and novice groups. It should also be noted that comparison of the means on the descriptive and interpretive measures indicates that the novice group used 28% more descriptions than interpretation in their native language. The advanced group used 4% more interpretations than descriptions. Native speakers used 4% more interpretations than descriptions. Table 7 shows how advanced and native speakers are comparable on these measures in their native language, whereas the novice group uses a greater proportion of the descriptive over the interpretive predicates.

Table 7. Percentages of Descriptive and Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates Used Across Native Language Experience Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rhetorical Predicates: Secondary Analysis

### Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Restatement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Elab/Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for the restatement variable were .5, 2.2, and 2.5. An analysis of variance revealed no significant main effects between groups.

Means recorded for the perspective variable were 1.1, 3.0, and 5.8. An analysis of variance revealed significant differences between novice and native groups $F (2, 54) = 6.8, p < .05$.

Means recorded for the circumstance variable were 7.0, 7.9 and 7.4. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated no significant effect between groups.
Means recorded for the elaboration/background variable were 3.6, 5.0, and 8.2. An analysis of variance performed on the data revealed significant differences between novice and native groups \((p < .05)\) and between advanced and native groups \((p < .05)\).

In sum, the secondary data for descriptive rhetorical predicates indicates significant differences for native language experience between novice and native groups on the perspective measure \((p < .05)\) and the elaboration/background measure \((p < .05)\) and significant differences for native language experience between advanced and native groups on the elaboration measure \((p < .05)\). On the other hand, the circumstance and restatement variables did not produce any significant differences across native language experience groups.
Means recorded for the evaluation variable were 1.2, 7.5, and 12.2. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between novice and native groups $p < .05$.

Means recorded for the metacommunication variable were .9, 2.5, and 2.1. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated, however, no significant difference between groups.

Means recorded for cause/result were 4.1, 8 and 8.7. An analysis of variance performed on the data yielded, however, no significant differences between groups.

Means recorded for the purpose variable were .4, 1.2, and 2.4. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between novice and native groups ($p < .05$).
Means recorded for the opposition/condition variable were 0, 1.2, and 3.2. An analysis of variance yielded no significant main effects between groups.

In sum, significant differences were found for across native language experience groups between native and novice groups on the evaluation measure ($p < .05$) and purpose measure ($p < .05$). No significant differences were found for native language experience on the cause/result and metacommunication measure.

The above data provides sufficient evidence for rejection of the null hypothesis. The hypothesis of no difference between native language experience groups on the use of rhetorical predicates is therefore rejected.

**Hypothesis 3:** There will be no differences attributable to non-native Spanish experience versus non-native English experience on the quantity of rhetorical predicates produced.

This hypothesis was designed to examine the degree of significant variability between non-native language experience groups.
Rhetorical Predicates: Macroanalysis

Table 10. Macroanalysis of Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for total number of rhetorical predicates produced were 4.7, 31.5, and 47.9. An analysis of variance yielded significant differences between novice and native groups only ($p < .01$).

Means recorded for total number of descriptive predicates were 3, 15.4, and 17.7. An analysis of variance conducted on the data revealed significant differences between novice and native groups ($p < .01$) and between advanced and novice groups ($p < .01$).

Means recorded for total interpretive rhetorical predicates used were 1.7, 16.1, and 30.2. An analysis of variance performed on the data yielded significant differences between novice and native groups only ($p < .01$).
In sum, the significant differences found in Hypothesis 1 can be partially attributed to significant differences between the non-native language experience between novice and native groups on all global measures (p < .01) and between advanced and novice groups on only the descriptive measure (p < .01). It should also be noted that comparison of the means on the descriptive and interpretive measures indicates that the novice group used 28% more descriptions than interpretation in their native language. Native speakers, however used 28% more interpretations than descriptions. Table 11 documents the relationship between descriptive and interpretive predicates used across non-native language experience groups.

Table 11. Percentages of Descriptive and Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates Used Across Non-Native Language Experience Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhetorical Predicates: Secondary Analysis

Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates

Table 12. Secondary Analysis of Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Restatement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Elab/Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for the restatement variable were .4, 1.1 and 1.3. An analysis of variance revealed no significant main effects between groups.

Means recorded for the perspective variable were .4, 3.2, and 3.4. An analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between groups.

Means recorded for the circumstance variable were 1.3, 6.8, and 7.3. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated a significant effect between novice and native groups (p < .05) and between novice and advanced groups (p < .01).
Means recorded for the elaboration/background variable were .6, 4.2, and 4.9. An analysis of variance performed on the data revealed significant differences between novice and native groups ($p < .05$) and between novice and advanced groups ($p < .05$).

In sum, the secondary data for descriptive rhetorical predicates used across non-native groups indicates significant differences between novice and native groups on the circumstance measure ($p < .05$) and the elaboration/background measure ($p < .05$) and significant differences between advanced and novice groups on the elaboration measure/background ($p < .05$) and circumstance variables ($p < .01$). No significant differences were discovered for the restatement and perspective variables.
Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates

Table 13. Secondary Analysis of Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Meta</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Oppos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for evaluations were 1.2, 6, and 12.5. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between the native and novice groups (p < .05).

Means recorded for metacommunications were 0, 2.8, and 7.4. An analysis of variance yielded significant results between the native and advanced groups (p < .05) and between the native and novice groups (p < .01).

Means recorded for cause/result were .3, 5.7, and 6.3. An analysis of variance performed on the data revealed significant differences between the novice and advanced groups (p < .05) and between the novice and native groups (p < .05).
Means recorded for the purpose variable were .6, 1.3, and .9. An analysis of variance yielded no significant differences between groups.

Means recorded for opposition/condition were 0, 1.3, and 3.1. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated no significant differences between groups.

In sum, a secondary analysis for interpretive rhetorical predicates across non-native language experience groups indicates significant differences between novice and native groups for evaluation (p ≤ .05), cause/result (p < .05), and metacommunication (p < .05); significant differences between novice and advanced groups for cause/result (p < .05), and significant differences between advanced and native groups on metacommunication (p < .05). No significant differences were found across non-native language experience groups for purpose.

Based on the above data, the hypothesis that there is no difference between non-native experience group on use of rhetorical predicates is therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no differences attributable to non-native Spanish language experience versus native Spanish experience on the quantity of rhetorical predicates produced within the Spanish narrations.

This hypothesis was designed to examine whether foreign language Spanish experience groups differed significantly from the native Spanish experience group in the Spanish narrations.
**Rhetorical Predicates: Macroanalysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for total rhetorical produced were 4.7, 31.5, and 50.7. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between novice and native groups (p < .01).

Means recorded for descriptive predicates were 3, 15.4, and 24.1. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between novice and native groups (p < .01).

Means recorded for interpretive predicates were 1.7, 16.1, and 26.6. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated, again, significant differences between novice and native groups (p < .01).

The findings indicate that novice speakers used 16% more descriptions than interpretations, advanced speakers used 4%
more interpretations than descriptions, and native speakers used 4% more interpretations than descriptions. Interestingly, when the non-native advanced group was compared with the native Spanish group, no overall differences were found between use of descriptive and interpretive predicates. Table 15 documents the relationship between use of descriptive and rhetorical predicates when non-native and native groups are compared within the Spanish narrations.

Table 15. Percentages of Descriptive and Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates by Non-Native versus Native Language Experience within the Spanish Narrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhetorical Predicates: Secondary Analysis

Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates

Table 16. Secondary Analysis of Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Restatement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Elab/Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for the restatement variable were .4, 1.1, and 2.5. An analysis of variance produced significant differences between novice and native groups (p < .05).

Means recorded for the perspective variable were .4, 3.2, and 5.8. An analysis of variance produced no significant differences between groups.

Means recorded for the circumstance variable were 1.3, 6.8, and 7.4. An analysis of variance revealed significant differences between novice and native groups (p < .05).

Means recorded for elaboration/background were .6, 4.2, and 8.2. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated
significant differences between the novice and native groups (.01) and between the advanced and native groups (.05).

In sum, the data indicates that, when non-native Spanish narrations are compared with native Spanish narrations, significant differences are found between novice and native groups on circumstance \((p < .05)\), perspective \((p < .01)\), elaboration/background \((p < .05)\) and restatement \((p < .05)\) and between advanced and native groups on elaboration/background \((p < .05)\).

**Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Meta</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Oppos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for evaluations were 1.2, 6.0, and 12.2. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicates significant results between the novice and native groups \((p < .05)\).
Means recorded for metacommunications were 0, 2.8, and 2.1. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated no significant differences between groups.

Means recorded for cause/result were 3, 5.7, and 8.7. An analysis of variance performed on the data revealed significant differences between novice and native groups (p < .01).

Means recorded for purpose were .6, 1.3, and 2.4. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated significant differences between the novice and native groups (p < .05).

Means recorded for opposition/condition were 0, 1.3, and 3.2. An analysis of variance performed on the data revealed no significant differences between groups.

In sum, when the non-native Spanish narrations are compared with the native Spanish narrations for use of interpretive rhetorical predicates, there are significant differences between the novice and native groups on use of the evaluation (p < .05), cause/result (p < .05), and purpose (p < .05) rhetorical predicates.
Hypothesis 5: There will be no differences attributable to language of narration on the total frequency of rhetorical predicates produced within the novice, advanced non-native, and advanced native groups.

**Rhetorical Predicates: Macroanalysis**

Table 18. Macroanalysis of Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Interpretive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Native Narration</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Narration</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05*

Means recorded for total rhetorical predicates produced were 27.8 and 37.1. An analysis of variance performed on the data was not significant $F(2, 54) = 2.61$, ($p < .111$).

Means recorded for descriptive predicates were 11.8 and 18.4. An analysis of variance revealed a significant main effect $F(2, 54) = 7.6$ ($p < .007$). A post hoc comparison revealed significant differences within the novice group only ($p < .05$).

Means recorded for interpretive rhetorical predicates were 16 and 17.9. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated a non-significant main effect $F(2, 54) = .255$ ($p < .615$).
In sum, the data indicates that there are no significant differences for language of narration on the total or interpretive measures. On the other hand, significant differences were found for the descriptive measure within the novice group (p < .05).

**Rhetorical Predicates: Secondary Analysis**

**Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates**

Table 19. Secondary Analysis of Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates for Hypothesis 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Restatement</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Circumstance</th>
<th>Elab/Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Native Narration</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Narration</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for the restatement variable were .93, and 1.7. An analysis of variance performed on the data indicated no significant main effect for this variable F (2, 54) = 3.2 (p < .07).

Means recorded for perspective were 2.3 and 3.3. An analysis of variance indicated a non-significant main effect for this variable F (2, 54) = 1.26 (p < .265).

Means recorded for circumstance were 5.13 and 7.43. An analysis of variance indicated significant differences between groups F (2, 54) = 4.46 (p < .03). A post hoc comparison performed
on the data indicated significant differences between the novice Spanish group only (\( p < .05 \)).

Means recorded for elaboration/background were 3.2 and 5.6. An analysis of variance produced a significant main effect \( F (2, 54) = 8.1, \ ( p < .006 ) \). A post hoc comparison on the data revealed significant differences in the novice Spanish group only (\( p < .05 \)).

In sum, the data indicates a significant effect for language of narration within the novice group on the circumstance (\( p < .05 \)) and elaboration/background (\( p < .05 \)) variables. There is no significant effect, however, for the perspective and restatement variables.

**Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Experience</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Meta</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Oppos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Native Narration</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Narration</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means recorded for evaluation were 6.6 and 7.0. An analysis of variance performed on the data revealed a non-significant main effect for this variable \( F (2, 54) = .045 \ ( p < .833 ) \).
Means recorded for metacommunications were 3.4 and 1.8. Interestingly, more metacommunications were produced in the non-native narrations than in the native narrations. An analysis of variance performed on the data revealed a non-significant main effect $F(2, 54) = 2.29$ ($p < .135$).

Means recorded for cause/result were 4.1 and 6.9. An analysis of variance performed on the data yielded a significant main effect $F(2, 54) = 5.9$ ($p < .01$). A post hoc comparison performed on the data yielded no significant differences for the groups germane to Hypothesis 5.

Means recorded for purpose were .933 and 1.33. An analysis of variance yielded a non-significant main effect $F(2, 54) = 1.3$ ($p < .24$).

Means recorded for opposition/condition were 1.4 and 1.4. As expected an analysis of variance produced a non-significant main effect $F(2, 54) = .006$ ($p < .940$).

In sum, there are no significant main effects for language of narration on interpretive rhetorical predicates.

The above data permits rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no difference attributable to language of narration on the use of rhetorical predicates. It should be noted, however, that the rejection is based on two descriptive variables only, and only within the novice language experience group.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter consists of five major parts and accompanying subdivisions. The summary of findings examines and interprets the research questions in light of communicative development. The implications for research and implications for teaching sections relate the findings to the issues presented in earlier chapters of the study. The limitations of the study highlight various conditions or restrictions that should be considered when looking at the results. The recommendations for future research provide suggestions for future investigations.

The primary purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between language experience, language of narration, and the use of rhetorical predicates within an extended response task in order to yield information about communicative development. Rhetorical predicates were examined through global and secondary analyses that yielded information about the quantity and type of interpretive and descriptive rhetorical predicates used.

The study was conducted using novice, non-native advanced, and native advanced college Spanish students. Three groups of subjects participated in the study (N=30). Each group performed a personal oral narrative task in both native and foreign languages.
This yielded six groups for statistical analysis. Subjects were instructed in their native language to watch a seven-minute silent film and, then, to tell the researcher everything that they could remember about the film. Subjects were instructed to tell about the film in their non-native language prior to re-telling the film in their native language. The subjects were in no way instructed to interpret or to narrate the film but, simply, to assume that the researcher had not seen the film and needed to be told what happened. After all personal oral narratives were collected, they were transcribed and scored according to type. The data was then submitted to a two-way analysis of variance.

Summary of the Findings
The purpose of this study was to examine the quantity and type of rhetorical predicates used on an extended response task in order to gain information about communicative development of college Spanish language learners. Table 21 presents a summary of the statistical findings concerning the five research hypotheses posited in Chapter III:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
<th>Novice-Advanced-Native</th>
<th>Novice-Advanced</th>
<th>Novice-Native</th>
<th>Advanced-Native</th>
<th>Novice</th>
<th>Adv</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ho1: L1 + L2</td>
<td>total (.0001)</td>
<td>descr (.0001)</td>
<td>restate (.02)</td>
<td>circum (.02)</td>
<td>perspect (.0002)</td>
<td>elab/back (.0003)</td>
<td>interp (.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho2: L1</td>
<td>total (.05)</td>
<td>descr (.05)</td>
<td>perspect (.05)</td>
<td>elab/back (.05)</td>
<td>interp (.05)</td>
<td>evaluation (.05)</td>
<td>purpose (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho3: L2</td>
<td>descr (.01)</td>
<td>circum (.01)</td>
<td>elab/back (.05)</td>
<td>cause (.05)</td>
<td>total (.01)</td>
<td>metacomm (.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Summary of Statistical Findings for All Hypotheses
Table 21. Summary of Statistical Findings for All Hypotheses (cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
<th>Novice-Advanced-Native</th>
<th>Novice-Advanced</th>
<th>Novice-Native</th>
<th>Advanced-Native</th>
<th>Novice Adv</th>
<th>Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H04: L2 Sp vs. L1 Sp</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total (.01)</td>
<td>descr (.01)</td>
<td>circum (.05)</td>
<td>elab/back (.05)</td>
<td>interp (.01)</td>
<td>evaluation (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H05: L2 vs. L1 Within</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descr (.05)</td>
<td>circum (.05)</td>
<td>elab/back (.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study found that, when L1 and L2 narrations were combined and the average score taken, highly significant differences were found for this variable.

When the native languages of all subjects were compared, it was found that native Spanish speakers performed better in the L1 Spanish narrations than novice Spanish speakers in the L1 English narrations. This suggests cultural differences as to the nature of language instruction within Hispanic and American classrooms. Hispanic classrooms, for example, might emphasize more context building than American classrooms.

The finding that native Spanish speakers also performed significantly better in L2 English narrations than novice Spanish speakers in L2 Spanish narrations raises the issue of how L2 discourse is acquired and the relationship between manner of acquisition and rhetorical predicate use. The demographic data presented in Chapter III indicates that the native Spanish speakers spent an average of seven years in a country where English was spoken. Thus, clarification of message content and interpretation of events might be more readily acquired through a long period of exposure to the L2 in non-academic contexts. It would be interesting to examine in future research whether Hispanic and American speakers use rhetorical predicates comparably across spoken and written mediums and, then, to compare this performance with rhetorical predicates used by
L2 subjects in natural L2 contexts and in L2 classrooms.

The study found no overall significant differences between languages of narration. The most reasonable explanation for this finding is that both advanced and native Spanish speakers had sufficient rhetorical experience in both languages to produce a negligible difference on the total overall score. This is supported by an examination of the means of Table 1, which show only a seven point difference between L1 and L2 for advanced non-native Spanish speakers and a difference of less than one point between the means of native Spanish speakers.

**Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates**

The study found that, when L1 and L2 narrations were combined and the average score taken, significant differences were obtained for this measure. Within the comparisons that are the focus of this study, the variability occurred within five comparison groups: (a) novice Spanish speakers vs. advanced Spanish speakers in the L2 Spanish narrations (b) novice Spanish speakers versus native Spanish speakers in L1, L2, and L2 Spanish vs. L1 Spanish narrations (c) L2 Spanish vs. L1 English within the novice Spanish group. This means that there were significant differences between groups regarding the use of subordinate clauses to supply additional details of the film to the listener and the use of clarificatory strategies to make the narration and the narrator's position towards the narration more coherent for the listener.
The highly significant differences between novice and advanced Spanish speakers within the L2 Spanish narrations was anticipated because advanced Spanish learners generally say more than novice Spanish learners. For the same reason, it is not surprising that native Spanish speakers performed significantly better in the L1 Spanish narrations than novice Spanish speakers in the L2 Spanish narrations.

Native Spanish speakers produced significantly more descriptive predicates in the L1 Spanish narration than novice Spanish speakers produced in the L1 English narrations. Again, this may suggest cultural differences as to the manner in which language instruction is administered within American and Hispanic academic contexts.

The finding that native Spanish speakers used significantly more descriptions in L2 English than the novice Spanish speakers in L2 Spanish may, again, be due to the greater exposure of the Hispanic subjects to English language use within natural contexts. Other factors subsumed under the L2 language experience concept, such as exposure to a variety of text types, quantity of L2 literature courses, quantity and types of academic papers written, etc., may also be relevant here.

The study also found, not surprisingly, that novice Spanish speakers used more descriptive rhetorical predicates in their native English language than in their non-native Spanish language. It is reasonable to assume that this is clearly a function of
saying less in the target language more than any other extra-linguistic factor.

Types of Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates

The study found highly significant differences between groups for the average score of combined L1 and L2 narrations for the elaboration/background and perspective measures and, to a lesser extent, for the circumstance and restatement variables.

Elaboration/Background

The elaboration/background measure was found to be significant between novice and advanced Spanish speakers in L2 and between novice and native Spanish speakers in L2. This means that significant differences were found between the groups in the frequency with which subjects specified previously reported events or expressed, in the past tense, any information that occurred prior to the time frame of a narrated statement. The finding suggests that native Spanish speakers and advanced Spanish speakers are more sensitive to the discourse needs of their audience than novice Spanish speakers and are more proficient in knowing what the audience needs to know. The finding also supports Scarcella's (1984) research, which found that novice L2 learners used minimal elaboration in constructing L2 text.

This variable was also found to be significant when the native languages of novice Spanish and native Spanish speakers were compared and, also, when the native languages of advanced Spanish speakers and native Spanish speakers were compared.
Novice Spanish speakers used significantly fewer of this measure, even when given the opportunity to utilize the full communicative resources of their native language. It appears that the novice Spanish speakers were too concerned with providing the correct sequence of events and, as a result, virtually ignored the communicative effect of their message.

The significant differences found between advanced Spanish and native Spanish speakers on this measure suggest, again, the cultural issue. Possibly, the advanced speakers felt compelled to stick primarily to the facts of the film without going into excessive detail. Yet, from a communicative perspective within an extended response context, lack of background information and/or elaboration can cause potential coherence problems.

The study also found that, when L2 Spanish narrations of novice Spanish and advanced Spanish groups were compared with the L1 Spanish narrations of the native Spanish speakers, significant differences occurred, again, between the novice Spanish and native Spanish groups and between the advanced Spanish and native Spanish groups. It is especially interesting to note the finding that native Spanish speakers performed significantly better on this measure than advanced Spanish speakers. The finding cannot be attributed to greater linguistic proficiency. Both groups were roughly comparable in this respect. Nor can the difference be attributed to familiarity with the interlocutor. All subjects were professional colleagues of the researcher. The finding suggests, rather, that L2 advanced
Spanish speakers, while equipped with L2 linguistic repertoire, do not always know how to utilize that repertoire to achieve its full communicative potential. That is, advanced L2 speakers have learned the linguistic knowledge but not necessarily the variety of types of discourse knowledge required for an L2 communicative extended response task.

Significant differences were also found for the elaboration/background measure within the novice Spanish group when native and non-native languages were compared for each group. This suggests, perhaps, a lack of instructional emphasis on this particular type of rhetorical predicate and lack of integration between grammar and communicative purpose within the elementary foreign language curriculum.

Perspective

The study found that when the average score was taken for combined L1 and L2 narrations on this measure, highly significant differences resulted. Further examination of the comparisons of interest to this investigation revealed significant differences between novice Spanish and native Spanish groups in the L1 native narrations and between novice Spanish and native Spanish groups in the L2 non-native narrations.

The finding of significant differences between novice Spanish and native Spanish speakers for this variable within the L1 narrations contradicts the findings of Tannen's (1980) study, which found that American subjects used more perspective (references to the film or the process of viewing the film) than
Greek subjects in a native language task based on the same silent film used in this study. Tannen explained the differences on cultural grounds. Americans, she claims, draw upon the literate continuum of discourse. Greeks, on the other hand, draw upon the oral continuum and incorporate many more involvement features into their discourse than Americans.

The findings of this study indicate that Tannen's conclusions may have been premature. The current study was conducted within an academic context. Therefore, given Tannen's conclusions, it might have been a foregone conclusion that American subjects would use more perspective in their native narrations or, at the very least, a comparable frequency of perspective when compared on this variable to native Hispanics. This did not prove to be the case. Lack of discourse knowledge on the part of novice Spanish speakers, even within their native language, appears to be a more adequate explanation.

The findings on perspective within the current study also raise the important issue concerning the relationship between context and performance on a given measure. Tannen's findings were derived outside on an academic context. When one of the measures used in her study was replicated within the academic context, different findings occurred.

The finding that native Spanish subjects produced more perspective in the English non-native narrations than novice Spanish subjects in their non-native Spanish narrations reflects,
again, the lack of discourse knowledge on the part of novice Spanish speakers. Novice Spanish speakers were unable, on the whole, to articulate the boundaries between their narration of the story and the material being narrated. The finding, in turn, points to the uni-dimensional focus of language instruction which does not, in turn, reflect actual language use.

_Circumstance_

When the average score was taken for combined L1 and L2 narrations on this variable for each group, significant differences were obtained. This means that the groups differed as to the degree with which they expressed details that occurred within the film in subordinate form. It also means that groups differed in terms of the degree to which they attributed possession in the film. There were no significant differences in the native L1 narration between any of the groups for this variable, indicating that when subjects were given the opportunity to use the linguistic resources of their native language, all groups used this type of rhetorical predicate with comparable frequency.

The study found significant differences, however, for L2 non-native language comparisons, L2 non-native Spanish vs. L1 native Spanish comparisons, and L2 non-native vs. L1 native comparisons within the novice Spanish group. Within the non-native L2 narrations, significant differences were found between novice Spanish and advanced Spanish groups and between novice Spanish and native Spanish groups. The findings are expected,
given the fact that greater language experience in L1 and L2 generally yields greater use of subordinate clauses.

**Restatement**

When L1 and L2 narrations were combined and the average score taken between groups, the restatement variable proved to be significant. Examination of the findings for the comparisons under consideration revealed, however, no significant differences for these comparisons. A post hoc comparison was performed on the average score taken between groups and revealed significant differences between novice Spanish and native Spanish groups. In other words, native Spanish and novice Spanish speakers differed as to the frequency with which a proposition was a literal or modified repetition of an original proposition. The finding is somewhat surprising because, even with this most simple rhetorical predicate, use within the novice Spanish group was minimal. The finding is, perhaps, a function of lack of extended response tasks within L2 academic contexts. Because novice Spanish learners do not have sufficient opportunity to convey the importance of a point, to emphasize, or to persuade an audience towards a particular point of view, they do not perform well on this variable.

**Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates**

When the average score for combined L1 and L2 narrations was taken across groups, significant differences were found for the overall interpretive measure. This means that there were significant differences between groups in the use of extensions
that expanded beyond the literal content of the film to include the narrator's thoughts and feelings about the film and about his/her narration of the film.

The findings indicate that the significant differences occurred between the novice Spanish and native Spanish groups in the L1 native, L2 non-native, and L2 non-native Spanish vs. L1 native Spanish comparison groups. Because all subjects were only instructed to "tell" the research "what happened in the film," a brief synopsis of the central events of the film independent of any significant interpretive response was a possible result. The fact that the interpretive measure did produce highly significant differences suggests, at the very least, that native Spanish speakers are more knowledgeable about the communicative needs of their audience in both L1 and L2 than novice Spanish learners. In other words, native Spanish speakers realize that interpretation is an important factor in achieving coherence in discourse and, thus, include it in their L1 and L2 narrations.

**Types of Interpretive Rhetorical Predicates**

**Evaluation**

Highly significant differences were found for the average score taken on the combined L1 and L2 narrations for this measure. Further examination of the findings indicates that, for the groups under investigation, significant differences occurred only between the novice Spanish and native Spanish groups within the L1 native, L2 non-native, and L2 non-native Spanish vs.
L1 native Spanish narration comparison groups. That is, native Spanish speakers attributed motives to events and voiced their expectations and opinions about events depicted in the film significantly more than novice Spanish learners in both the native and non-native languages.

The finding that native Spanish speakers used more evaluations in the Spanish narrations than novice Spanish speakers in their English narrations suggests, again, the issue of cultural differences in academic language instruction. All three findings suggest that, within the novice Spanish group in both L1 and L2, the "listing" phenomena is the predominant means of retelling. In other words, novice Spanish subjects focus on recounting the facts presented in the film rather than on meaningfully interpreting and clarifying the material for the listener.

The findings from this research support those of Applebee (1978) and Collins (1985) in narrative research. Furthermore, recent ethnographic research (Brooks, 1989) found that within one intensive Spanish class, speaking was indeed equated with listing. Soter (personal communication, July 7, 1989) has gone as far as to say that this phenomena may be pervasive across all academic levels. All of this research points to a lack of development of the spectator function of language use within native and foreign language classes. Especially within foreign language contexts, learners are expected to produce utterances but not to use language to reflect upon and evaluate events.
Interestingly, L1 research has shown that there is a correlation between use of cognitive verbs (think, wonder, know) and academic achievement (Olson & Torrance, 1985). Thus evaluatory rhetorical predicates, because they often include cognitive verbs, might potentially have a direct bearing on academic achievement within L2 contexts. Clearly, evaluatory rhetorical predicates should receive greater attention within L2 academic language instruction.

**Metacommunication**

The study found that when the average score was taken for L1 and L2 combined narrations on this measure, highly significant differences were obtained. When this overall finding was applied to the groups under investigation, significant differences were found for the novice-native Spanish groups within the L2 comparison and for the advanced-native Spanish groups within the L2 comparison.

The finding that native Spanish speakers performed significantly better in the L2 English narrations than novice Spanish speakers in the L2 Spanish narrations means that native Spanish speakers expressed significantly more opinions and/or doubts about the events that they were narrating. The finding cannot be attributed to linguistic deficiency on the part of the novice Spanish speakers. Metacommunicative phrases are part of the linguistic repertoire by Spanish 103. The finding reflects a lack of instructional emphasis on the communicative function of
metacommunication within elementary Spanish classrooms. Opinions or doubts that narrators express while communicating facts or events help listeners to understand the shape of that which is being narrated. In addition, they help the listener to understand how the narrator feels about the events he or she is reporting. By understanding the opinions and doubts of the narrator concerning the validity of the information being reported, the listener becomes a co-spectator and not just a consumer of information.

It is interesting to note that significant differences were reported for this variable between advanced Spanish and native Spanish speakers within the L2 comparison group but that no significant findings were reported for the variable within the L1 comparison group. The fact that significant differences were found between advanced Spanish and native Spanish speakers in the L2 suggests that advanced Spanish speakers may not be aware of the communicative function of this rhetorical predicate. Although linguistically capable of producing the function, advanced Spanish learners choose not to do so because they feel it is unimportant or irrelevant to the needs of the audience.

The finding that native Spanish speakers used more metacommunications in L2 than in L1 raises the issue of the retelling task and its effect on results. It is possible that native Spanish speakers used more metacommunications in L2 because they were more tentative during the first retelling. By the time of the second retelling in the native language, native Spanish
speakers had already fleshed out their thoughts about events and therefore saw no need to remain tentative in reporting them. The pattern of significant differences in the first retelling without significant differences in the second retelling occurs also with the cause/result variable. It should be mentioned, however, that these are the only variables where this pattern occurs. Future research--through counterbalancing, delays, tasks that interrupt the two retellings--could determine whether the factor of immediate retelling produces an underestimation of results in the second set of scores.

No significant differences were found in this study for this variable between novice Spanish and advanced Spanish groups. This finding conflicts with Kramsch's study (1983), which found metacommunications to be one index of communicative development between beginning and advanced German language learners. One possible explanation for the contradiction is the small sample size reported in the Kramsch study. If more subjects had been used, different results might have been obtained.

**Cause/Result**

The study found that, when the average score was taken for combined L1 and L2 retellings on this variable, highly significant differences were achieved between groups.

Further examination of the findings indicates that significant differences occurred between the novice and advanced Spanish groups within the L2 non-native comparison, between the
novice Spanish and native Spanish groups within the L2 non-native comparison, and between the novice Spanish and native Spanish groups within the L2 Spanish vs. L1 Spanish comparison.

The finding that advanced Spanish speakers used more cause/result than novice Spanish speakers is interesting because it proved to be the only type of interpretive rhetorical predicate that was significant within this comparison group. On the one hand, the findings suggests that novice Spanish speakers do not use enough positive or negative mental states to explain narrative events. Thus, coherence suffers. On the other hand, the finding that advanced Spanish speakers used significantly more cause than other types of interpretive predicates may raise, again, the cultural issue. The logical, linear approach to text has often been documented as characteristic of American subjects, as opposed to the evaluatory preference of other cultures.

The finding that native Spanish speakers also performed better on this measure in L1 and L2 than novice Spanish speakers in L2, however, weakens the cultural explanation. A more adequate explanation is, simply, that advanced Spanish and native Spanish speakers are more aware than novice Spanish speakers of the need to provide meaningful connections between events for their listeners.

**Purpose**

The study found a slight main effect for purpose when the average score was taken for the combined L1 and L2 retellings on this variable.
Further examination of the findings indicates that significant differences occurred between the novice and native Spanish groups within the L1 retelling and between novice and native Spanish groups within the L2 Spanish vs. L1 Spanish retelling comparisons. It is interesting to note that the purpose variable was not significant between novice and native Spanish speakers in the L2 initial non-native retelling. One possible explanation is that the native Spanish speakers tried to achieve coherence in different ways within the second, native retelling in order to avoid sounding repetitious. Therefore, more of this type of rhetorical predicate was produced within the second retelling to provide variety and interest for the listener. The finding that novice Spanish speakers produced little of this rhetorical predicate in either L1 or L2 suggests, again, that novice Spanish speakers did not perceive the "purpose" function to be important or relevant to the task at hand.

**Opposition/Condition**

When the average score was taken for combined L1 and L2 narrations for this variable, significant differences were found between groups. Although the specific groups under investigation in this study did not yield significant differences with this variable, one can claim that, when a repeated measure was taken (the retelling in the native language), the average scores yielded significant differences between the native and novice groups. This means that, when compared with novice Spanish speakers, native Spanish speakers, on the average, produced significantly
more statements that contrasted with events actually depicted in the film. In other words, native Spanish speakers were able to articulate abstract concepts more readily than the novice Spanish speakers.

The finding points to the advantage of repeated measure designs within research in order to provide increased measurement reliability. Had only one score been taken on two of the measures in this study, no significant differences would have been detected. With a repeated measure, however, it was possible to at least claim significant differences for average performance. In so doing, it was possible to add to the findings concerning variability in communicative performance between novice Spanish and native Spanish speakers.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations should be considered when looking at the results of the study:

1. Controlled academic setting. This study focused on student extended response of educated middle-class Spanish students within a classrooms setting, independent of contextual factors that could have affected the response. These include the culture of the groups represented, the ethnicity of the interlocutor, cross-cultural differences in Hispanic-American educational systems, etc. The study can therefore not be generalized to account for cross-
cultural differences in Spanish/English discourse style.

2. Extended response task. A seven-minute ambiguous silent film was used to elicit descriptive and interpretive rhetorical predicates. Because almost no research has been conducted on the relationship between extended response and other more traditional academic tasks, it is not possible to generalize the findings to other types of academic discourse such as expository research. The findings do suggest, however, that there might be a basis for pursuing such a relationship. The findings for the elaboration and perspective measure, for example, were consistent with findings in expository research. At the present moment, the findings should only be generalized to other similar extended response tasks.

3. Instrument. Discourse development was measured at the propositional level. Other components of discourse development such as non-verbal contextualization cues, prosody, and the negotiation of meaning were not factors in the study. Nor did the study measure grammatical, sociolinguistic, or strategic aspects of communicative development. The study should therefore only be generalized to communicative development at the rhetorical propositional discourse level.
Implications for Research

The findings indicate that context is an important factor that determined the nature of the findings of this study. The findings from the current study, which occurred in an academic context, contrasted with those of Tannen (1980), who conducted a similar task outside of an academic context. Research must continue to specify the context that surrounds a task in order for the results to be meaningfully interpreted.

The type of task used in this study also affected the findings. The nature of the film used in the current study produced findings which might have been different had the film been less accessible to the subjects (Cole & Keyssar, 1985).

The study was designed to elicit the most difficult task first - that of retelling a film in the non-native language. The fact that subjects were then required to retell the same film in their native language might have produced an underestimation of scores in the second retelling. However, close examination of the findings revealed that only the metacomunication and cause variables produced significant results in L2, while producing no significant results in L1. Future research - through counter-balancing, delays, or interrupted tasks - could determine more precisely the degree to which order of task affects results.

This investigation demonstrated, through empirical research, that spoken discourse is cognitively complex. The argument that cognitive development occurs when oral strategies are replaced with written ones should be reformulated to convey
the relationship between cognitive development and reflective processing that can occur in either spoken or written mediums. Future research should not restrict itself to written texts, but also concern itself with the relationship between various forms of talk and cognitive development.

Implications for Teaching

The three language experience groups examined in this study differed in terms of their discourse proficiency. That is, they differed in terms of knowing what the audience needed to know in a personal oral narrative task, in their ability to make relevant conceptual connections within an extended response task, and in their proficiency with the spectator function of language use.

Novice Spanish speakers display minimal discourse proficiency in both foreign and native languages. Within L2, novice Spanish speakers use significantly fewer quantities of circumstance, elaboration/background, cause, metacommunication, and evaluation when compared to the other two groups. In other words, these learners do not reflect concern for providing listeners with detail, motive, personal opinions about narrative content, or explanations for narrative actions. The findings indicate that the novice Spanish speakers perceive the main purpose of a personal oral narrative task to be that of providing listeners with a sequence of events. Other additions are perceived as of minor importance.

Within the L1, discourse proficiency is also minimal. Significantly fewer quantities of perspective, evaluation,
elaboration/background, and purpose were found for this group when compared to the native Spanish speaker group. The findings suggest that teachers of Spanish should encourage novice Spanish language learners to implement specific interpretive and descriptive rhetorical predicates in their discourse in order to produce greater coherence for themselves and for their audiences.

Although advanced Spanish speakers may be compared to native Spanish speakers in terms of the total number of rhetorical predicates used, advanced Spanish speakers used significantly less elaboration/background in the L1 than native Spanish speakers and significantly less metacommunication in the L2 than native Spanish speakers. Furthermore, the study found no significant differences between advanced Spanish and novice Spanish speakers on interpretive measures. The study also found no significant differences for language of narration within the advanced Spanish group. That is, there were no significant differences for use of quantity and types of rhetorical predicates in English versus Spanish. One might have expected greater use of rhetorical predicates in the native language.

The findings suggest that advanced Spanish speakers are not equally proficient in use of all types of discourse strategies in the L2. More articulation of mental thought processes and greater communicative explicitness is needed at this level. The findings also suggest that advanced Spanish speakers follow a descriptive rather than an interpretive model of language use in both L1 and L2.
More attention must be given, at this level, to the use of language to reflect upon and interpret events.

The findings raise important issues concerning the present state of academic instruction in both native and foreign languages. The finding that novice Spanish speakers did not perform well on the rhetorical predicate measures suggests a lack of opportunity to practice extended response tasks within language classrooms. Brooks (1989) found that students in one elementary intensive Spanish class followed a "listing" protocol for speaking tasks. When instruction projects a conceptually superficial view of L2 speaking as acceptable, students learn to perform superficially in the L2.

The findings suggest that it is unlikely that much attention is given to the spectator function of language use. In other words, the concept of language that is presented within American academic contexts is narrow. It excludes systematic attention to the use of language to reflect upon and evaluate events. The surprising finding that at the advanced non-native Spanish level there were no significant differences on interpretive rhetorical predicates when compared to novice Spanish speakers suggests that lack of the spectator function of language use is not an exclusive phenomena of elementary L2 classrooms.

The findings indicate that, within elementary language classrooms, language instruction still operates, in practice, from a text-based rather than from a discourse perspective. The finding that novice Spanish students produced, by and large,
recalls of main events that occurred in the film may reflect classroom practice that emphasizes recall of text over the meaningful integration of learner with text. The finding that advanced Spanish speakers did not produce significantly more interpretations than novice Spanish learners also suggests that, from a discourse perspective, even advanced Spanish speakers may be tied to a recall-based perspective of text more than might be desireable.

The findings also suggest that variability in discourse proficiency, as operationalized by quantity and type of rhetorical predicate use, may be a cultural issue. Hispanic and American classrooms may differ, for example, as to the amount of interpretation that is acceptable within academic tasks. The findings suggest that variability in rhetorical predicate use can also be a function of the manner in which L2 is acquired. Native Spanish speakers do significantly better, perhaps, because they have spent more time a country where English is spoken. This exposure to natural L2 language use might effect the total and types of rhetorical predicates used.

As interesting as these issues are, it is perhaps more germaine, given the academic context of this study, to examine what is lost when the spectator function of language use, extended response tasks, and rhetorical predicates are not used within native and foreign language classrooms. It appears that development of abilities to reflect and evaluate upon events may
be stunted. Reflection is accomplished by integrating one's prior knowledge with unfamiliar material so as to construct meaning. Prior knowledge is perhaps the most important factor in comprehension (Ausubel, et. al., 1978; Bernhardt, 1983). If comprehension occurs through reflective extended response and enables communication (see Figure 1), then the repression of reflective extended response tasks within academic contexts can only inhibit communicative development.

Torrance and Olson (1985) examined literate skills in kindergarten through grade two. They found that the use of cognitive verbs (think, know, decide, wonder) was more closely related to literacy than any other measure of structural complexity. These other measures of structural complexity included general skills and ability measures, structural features of clauses, and conversational measures. The evaluation and metacommunication measures explored in this study very much necessitate the use of such cognitive verbs. By discouraging or ignoring these types of rhetorical predicates within foreign language classes, one may be inhibiting literate development.

When extended response tasks and the spectator function of language use are repressed within academic contexts, other related tasks that facilitate communicative development are repressed. Extended talk, for example, has been show to have a facilitative effect on language learning (Britton, 1982; Day, 1984). Through extended classroom talk, learners flesh out ideas
and thoughts, modify their positions, suggest alternative ideas, and speculate on the value of events. This, in turn, leads to a more comprehensive and more fully integrated concept of the event than would otherwise be possible.

This study found, within personal oral narrative talk, a lack of communicative development in non-native Spanish learners regarding the integration of reflective components of language use with transactional components. The findings of the study suggest that native and foreign language teachers would do well to operate from a communicative paradigm that includes opportunities for spoken and written extended response within language classrooms. "Communicative" classrooms that focus only on use of personalized questions, situational role plays, and survival tactics may provide learners with useful linguistic products but deprive them of a meaningful learning process that promotes coherence and facilitates the development of more complex forms of communication.

Foreign and native language teachers must consistently struggle to project a concept of language as discourse and communication from the beginning levels of language instruction. Furthermore, the concept of response to language tasks as a reflective rather than as a regurgitative activity must be emphasized. Extended response tasks and the reflective process manifest in the spectator function of language use can no longer be ignored within foreign language academic contexts. The
"subjective" concept of extended response should, perhaps more appropriately, be replaced by a "reflective" concept of extended response that includes subjective and objective dimensions. It is only through this reflection that learners can recognize and accept the relevance of an event to their own lives. It is only through reflective processing that learners are able to reformulate and, so, communicate.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The current study attempted to integrate research in cognitive psychology, reading and composition, foreign language learning, and communication theory in order to defend the importance of a synthetic perspective in foreign language research. Future studies should continue to pursue synthetic, multi-disciplinary perspectives in foreign language investigations so that educators may have a coherent, integrated knowledge of language use.

Future research should pursue the role of the interlocutor on rhetorical predicate use within extended response tasks as well as the relationship between rhetorical predicate use and coherence ratings of the interlocutor.

In addition, studies should be conducted that use multiple operations within extended response tasks so as to provide a more complete concept of communicative development.

Also, more research is needed that includes rich description--such as protocols and interviews--to supplement measures such as those used in this study. Protocol and interview data is important
important because it can help in the correct interpretation of quantitative findings.

Studies should also be conducted that look at language use across types of national and international language programs. Only through such research can educators come to understand better the concept of language that is being articulated in foreign language classrooms. At the international level, such research is important in order to understand how much rhetorical contextualization is considered appropriate from a Hispanic point of view within specified contexts so as to inform sociolinguistic communicative development.

In general, more research is needed that examines Spanish rhetorical predicate use in varied academic and natural contexts and with different groups of learners in native and non-native languages.

It will also be important to conduct studies that examine the relationship between extended response tasks, rhetorical predicate use, and quality of expository writing of intermediate and advanced Spanish language learners. Petrosky (1982) has argued that the kind of thinking involved in extended response is the same type of thinking involved in essay writing. If so, practice and/or instruction in extended response tasks should facilitate performance on essay tasks. The literature also suggests that extended response and expository tasks share common communicative purposes, realized as rhetorical predicates. It would be useful to undertake research that
examines to what extent exposure and instruction in extended response discourse can improve more abstract forms of communication. Such research is important within a foreign language humanistic curriculum that seeks to develop an integrated comprehension of language, literature, and language use.
APPENDIX A
ANOVA TABLES

ANOVA for Total Number of Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13275.1</td>
<td>6637.5</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1297.3</td>
<td>1297.3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>378.7</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.6845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26787.7</td>
<td>496.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOVA for Total Number of Descriptive Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language of Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1934.6</td>
<td>967.3</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>633.7</td>
<td>633.7</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>.0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.5331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4484.1</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA for Total Number of Interpretative Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language of Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5896.2</td>
<td>2928.1</td>
<td>112.85</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.01</td>
<td>58.01</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.6159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>234.43</td>
<td>117.21</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.6007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12302.3</td>
<td>227.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANOVA for Circumstance Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language of Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>68.26</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>79.35</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>959.1</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA for Restatement Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language of Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANOVA for Perspective Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150.63</td>
<td>73.31</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>596.9</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA for Elaboration/Background Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>199.03</td>
<td>99.51</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>9.317</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.4099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>554.9</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOVA for Cause/Result Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>334.23</td>
<td>167.11</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120.41</td>
<td>120.41</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>.0177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A x B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.033</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1085.3</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA for Evaluation Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1243.23</td>
<td>621.6</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A x B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2911.8</td>
<td>53.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101.63</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>632.6</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANOVA for Metacommunication Rhetorical Predicates by Language Experience and Language of Narration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Experience (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>184.93</td>
<td>92.46</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Narration (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.81</td>
<td>36.81</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>108.13</td>
<td>54.06</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>866.3</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
SAMPLE CODED PERSONAL ORAL NARRATIVES OF
NOVICE, ADVANCED NON-NATIVE, AND NATIVE SPANISH GROUPS

NOVICE GROUP

1.8.2.
1. O.K. There was a man
2. picking fruit (circumstance)
3. and he had a lot of fruit in these baskets (circumstance)
4. and then a man and a goat came by
5. and I heard animal noises (perspective)
6. and the man and the goat did not take any fruit (evaluation)
7. then a boy on a bicycle came
8. and took a basket of fruit
9. and rode away
10. then he saw a girl on a bicycle
11. riding the other direction (circumstance)
12. and he crashed
13. and spilled the fruit
14. and then three other boys coming the other way (circumstance)
15. helped him
16. pick up the fruit (elaboration)
17. he did not give them any fruit (evaluation)
18. but when one of the boys picked up his hat (circumstance)
19. he gave them each a piece of fruit
20. they went their own ways
21. then later the three boys walked by the man
2.2.2.
1. O.K. This movie is really an interesting movie (evaluation)
2. to start with (evaluation)
3. I mean (metacommunication)
4. there's a lot to talk about (cause)
5. and you can really wonder about imagine about this movie (metacommunication)
6. but basically (evaluation)
7. it started with (perspective)
8. seeing a man on top of the tree (perspective)
9. harvesting (circumstance)
10. I think (metacommunication)
11. he's harvesting pears or something like that O.K.
12. and at the beginning we hear (perspective)
13. the cocks crow (perspective)
14. and that gives me the impression (evaluation)
15. that it's either near a house (evaluation)
16. or it's it's in the morning in the beginning or dawn or uh something like that (evaluation)
17. and while he's doing that (circumstance)
18. another man passes with a goat
19. pulling a goat by the (circumstance)
20. it looks at him
21. it looks at the fruits
22. and passes by
23. without doing anything (evaluation)
24. then a little boy on a bike stops by
25. and discovered (result)
26. that the man was not paying attention (result)
27. was on top of the tree (result)
28. he wasn't paying attention (restatement)
29. so he decided (result)
30. that he was going to pick one fruit (result)
31. O.K. he put his bike down
32. and decided to (restatement)
33. pick one (restatement)
34. then I think (metacommunication)
35. he decided (cause)
36. that one wasn't enough (cause)
37. so he went for two fruits (result)
38. and in the end, seeing (cause)
39. that the man was not paying attention at all (cause)
40. to what was happening down there (cause)
41. he decided (result)
42. to take the whole basket full of fruits (result)
42. put it on his bike
43. and took off
44. O.K. meanwhile the man was still up there
45. not paying any attention (evaluation)
46. and picking his fruits (circumstance)
47. the fruits which he really loves (evaluation)
48. because by the way he treats them (cause)
49. like when he brought them down (background)
and one fell to the floor (background)
he took it (background)
and cleaned it (background)
carefully with his scarf (evaluation)
so I think (metacommunication)
he really cherished his those fruits (evaluation)
O.K. so the boy on the bike was going
and he met a girl on a bike
going the opposite direction (circumstance)
when the girl passed (circumstance)
he decided (result)
to look back at the girl (result)
when he did that (circumstance)
he knocked a stone
hit a stone on the road
and fell
and all the fruits went out of the basket and all that
there were three boys standing by
the youngest of the three helps him
to get up (elaboration)
and helped him (restatement)
to pick all the fruits back into the basket (elaboration)
and they even put them on the bike for him (elaboration)
but he took them
and went away
without saying anything to them (evaluation)
then once he was gone (circumstance)
77. the three boys found a hat O.K.
78. that belonged to the boy (background)
79. that just fell (background)
80. so they called his attention
81. and the eldest of the three boys took the hat to him
82. and he gave them two
83. I think two fruits (metacommunication)
84. O.K. so he went away
85. and the three boys as they were going (circumstance)
86. the man had then got down from the tree (background)
87. and had discovered (result)
88. that one of his baskets of fruit had disappeared (result)
89. so he counted (background)
90. and discovered (restatement)
91. that one had disappeared (restatement)
92. so while he was thinking (evaluation)
93. about what happened (evaluation)
94. these three boys who helped the other boy with the fruits (background)
95. to go (elaboration)
96. I mean (metacommunication)
97. to pick them up (elaboration)
98. these three boys the man from the tree met the three boys
99. and he was looking at them
100. and the way he was looking at them (evaluation)
101. I felt (metacommunication)
102. as if probably he suspected (evaluation)
103. they were the three (evaluation)
104. who had taken his basket full of fruits (evaluation)
105. but he had no proof (cause)
106. so he just looked at them
107. and then let (result)
108. them pass (result)

NATIVE SPANISH GROUP

3.9.2.
1. From what I saw (perspective)
2. there are some things (evaluation)
3. that are really not very realistic (evaluation)
4. I would say (metacommunication)
5. first we have this man (perspective)
6. picking up fruit from his tree (circumstance)
7. so he's very concentrated (evaluation)
8. doing his work toward his job (circumstance)
9. and he has a ladder and fruit (circumstance)
10. as I said before (metacommunication)
11. and then he goes down
12. and he has some baskets there (circumstance)
13. and then he goes down with one basket
14. and and then um he goes again
15. he goes up to to tree again
16. to pick up more and more pears (purpose)
17. and then there is a man with a goat
18. and he passed by the baskets
19. that are there (circumstance)
20. and um there is a kind of I don't know path (metacommunication)
21. that he takes (circumstance)
22. and you can appreciate the scenery behind the mountains (perspective)
23. it's kind of a nice place (evaluation)
24. so then we have the man (perspective)
25. still doing his job in the tree (circumstance)
26. something that I think (metacommunication)
27. I don't know (metacommunication)
28. I think (metacommunication)
29. the ladder is doing something there (evaluation)
30. that shouldn't be there (evaluation)
31. it's it's I don't know (metacommunication)
32. like if we put the scene in South American country like Latin
   American country (condition)
33. I would think (metacommunication)
34. people climbing the tree (condition)
35. not really using a ladder (evaluation)
36. it's another thing (cause)
37. I've seen (cause)
38. when I've been in the country, in the countryside (cause)
39. that's my experience (cause)
40. anyway, so the man with the goat is gone (restatement)
41. and we have the man there with his job (restatement)
42. a boy with a bicycle he's probably a ?teen years old boy (evaluation)
43. riding a bicycle (circumstance)
44. passes by
45. and he stops
46. where the man is (circumstance)
47. at the same time he sees two baskets um with pears
48. and then uh he has the intention (result)
49. to steal (result)
50. to take or to take some of the pears (result)
51. while the man is still doing his job (circumstance)
52. then the child decides (result)
53. not to take only one of the pears (evaluation)
54. but to take the whole basket (result)
55. it's really funny (evaluation)
56. the little boy holding the big basket with (elaboration)
57. and put it in the bicycle
58. and I thought (metacommunication)
59. he was not going to be able (opposition)
60. to ride with the basket (opposition)
61. but anyway he rides away
62. and the man doesn't see the boy (evaluation)
63. he is so concentrated on his job (cause)
64. something that I really think (metacommunication)
65. that is unrealistic (evaluation)
66. I mean (metacommunication)
67. then the boy goes away (restatement)
68. and there is a path
69. where he is riding (circumstance)
70. and then uh a girl passes by
71. riding a bicycle (circumstance)
72. and uh the guy look at the girl
73. pass (circumstance)
74. and they cross
75. they meet
76. and she passes
77. and then he turns
78. and then he doesn't see a rock (cause)
79. and he falls
80. all the fruit spread on the floor
81. and he's a little bit hurt (evaluation)
82. but not really badly (evaluation)
83. and he's looking at his leg
84. or touching his leg
85. but I think (metacommunication)
86. it's just a child's reaction (evaluation)
87. and there are some but I forgot to say the appearance of this boy
88. um he the man picking up the fruit (circumstance)
89. looks like a peasant (evaluation)
90. so the man with the goat (evaluation)
91. but the child is also he looks like a peasant (evaluation)
92. I think (metacommunication)
93. the bicycle is giving him some kind of civilization (evaluation)
94. um I dunno (metacommunication)
95. so but anyway he had one of these what they call "paleocates" (circumstance)
96. so it makes him also kind of peasant (evaluation)
97. O.K. I was in the scene (perspective)
98. where he's down on the ground (circumstance)
99. and then some noise starts
100. clock, clock, clock starts (elaboration)
101. and he don't see the guys (evaluation)
102. that are making that noise (circumstance)
103. then you suddenly see the three guys (perspective)
104. that are really out of place (evaluation)
105. they don't look like peasants (evaluation)
106. or if we're going (condition)
107. to put that scene in the Latin American country (condition)
108. those boys don't have anything to do with that place (evaluation)
109. and um they look like imagined boys (evaluation)
110. or you know really out of place (restatement)
111. and also the have this game (circumstance)
112. I don't know the name this thing (metacommunication)
113. they were playing with (circumstance)
114. and I've never seen this thing in the country (evaluation)
115. and something that is really funny is (evaluation)
116. they start helping the boy (elaboration)
117. to put the fruit back in the basket (elaboration)
118. I thought (metacommunication)
119. they were going (opposition)
120. to take it away (opposition)
121. to take it with them (opposition)
122. to steal it (opposition)
123. is what I thought (metacommunication)
124. but they help him
125. to put it (elaboration)
126. they help him to (restatement)
127. what is really strange (evaluation)
128. and they put it back in the bicycle and (elaboration)
129. then they start walking away
130. and one of them returns goes back
131. and he what he gets what he wanted is some fruit (Cause)
132. so they take the fruit with them
133. and there's something I'll say is (metacommunication)
134. this boy well he stays with the fruit
135. and he stays with his bicycle
136. and he goes away
137. and about that time the man in the tree realized (evaluation)
138. he goes down with the tree on the ladder
139. and then he realizes (result)
140. well what happened with his fruit (result)
141. and he's kind of like surprised (evaluation)
142. or he I don't think (metacommunication)
143. he thought (evaluation)
144. he was dreaming (evaluation)
145. because the look on his face is kind of dumb (cause)
146. and uh so by that time we have the three guys (perspective)
147. eating the pears (circumstance)
148. and they pass by
149. and what I think is (metacommunication)
150. that they take the same road (evaluation)
151. that the guy with the goat took before (evaluation)
152. and then we have the same scenery again (perspective)
153. is what I recall (metacommunication)

154. I'm I'm not sure (metacommunication)
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