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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The study of literature has long constituted the consummate achievement of students of modern foreign languages. Although shaken in recent decades by debates concerning the mission of foreign language departments, the proper character and purposes of literary criticism, and even its very nature, literature continues to hold an honored place in the upper strata of the post-secondary foreign language (FL) curriculum. Apprentice scholars are typically inducted into the reading habits and attitudes and the specialized language of literary scholarship only after attaining a presumed level of ability in the foreign language: The high prestige accorded these scholarly pursuits has served to shield from systematic consideration the process by which junior scholars are formed in FL departments and the language abilities that constitute optimum preparedness for literary study.
To an arguably greater extent than FL literary studies, the lower strata of the FL curriculum have been profoundly affected by theoretical debates and research during recent decades. The most time-honored approach to early instruction, the grammar-translation method, which explicitly targeted the development of reading ability, is now famously discredited. Its rejection ultimately led to the near-total abdication of literature and neglect of literacy development and the widespread adoption of more "communicative" models of language instruction that are grounded in speech act theory and the sociolinguistic study of native speech patterns.

These developments in language pedagogy resulted in the emergence of a divergent set of goals for foreign language study, with literary study the unique purview of advanced levels and the development of functional proficiency the primary goal of beginning and intermediate levels. As a consequence of this disjunction, an uneasy coexistence between these two broad divisions obtains in language departments. Students in language courses are in effect sheltered from a body of authentic cultural and linguistic resources of which literature is a diverse and readily available part, and the goal of learning to read and write
has come to be implicitly subordinate to the development of basic speaking proficiency.

This segregation of the functional and the literate and critical necessitates in some cases a post-intermediate set of essentially remedial composition and reading courses whose charge it is to hurriedly foster the development of the literacy skills that remain the core of advanced courses. Students who choose to move up the curricular ladder suddenly confront a new set of demands which thus abruptly add to the need for oral proficiency the exigencies of literary scholarship.

Critical reading and discussion of literary texts and extended analytic writing in the FL are extreme demands to place on students who in the previous course were practicing new verb tenses, learning vocabulary lists, or discussing their personal lives in conversation groups or short compositions. At another level, however, in addition to nascent FL abilities, intermediate students bring to these new tasks literacy skills and other social and cognitive strategies and abilities and an array of world knowledge and experiences as yet largely untapped in the FL classroom. It is assumed that students can and do use their repertories of knowledge and skills in conjunction with their newly acquired and typically modest functional knowledge of the FL
in order to make meaning from the multiple codes of literary texts and ultimately to adopt a critical stance towards those codes. This crucial transition has not been well studied, however, and it is the intention of this study to question how it is construed and enacted by the members and instructor of an introductory French literature course.

Statement of the Problem

The present study builds upon advances in the understanding of second language (L2) reading by investigating the hitherto largely neglected area of L2 literary understanding and response. The study rests on the contention that the division within the FL profession between literary scholarship and language instruction is profoundly inscribed in every level of the FL curriculum, as well as in the dearth of research into this important aspect of second-language literacy development. A fuller understanding of the dilemmas faced by learners and teachers as they traverse this gap can, in addition to adding to the knowledge base in second language reading, constructively inform intermediate level instruction and curriculum planning in FL departments.

Although much contemporary literary theory specifically addresses the interaction between reader and text and
accords a determinant role to the reader (Freund, 1987), with few exceptions the reader is a solitary and even idealized entity assumed already to possess "literary competence" (Culler 1975). The inexpert reader or the developing second language reader clearly cannot be accounted for by theories that do not address real readers in actual educational contexts.

Nor can empirical second language reading research (which, although focusing on actual readers and contexts, typically views reading as a quest for information) account for the social, aesthetic or inter-subjective dimensions of reading and discussing literature in a FL classroom. In the gray area between the divisions in the curriculum, the research base, and the profession as a whole, aspiring students of FL literature struggle to adapt to the extraordinarily difficult demands that are placed upon them.

It is clear from the above discussion that research is needed that offers insights into the adaptation of FL learners as they negotiate the transition from language instruction to literature study. There is little specific precedent for such research, but a comprehension study (Bernhardt, 1985), case studies (Juracek, 1988), an attitude survey (Davis et al., 1992), and a pilot study of students in two university French departments (Davis, 1989) are
instructive both for their findings and their conceptual underpinnings. The present study is consistent with the principles laid down by these studies and propounded by a long line of advocates of the inclusion of FL and SL literature in language classes (e.g., Brumfit, 1985; Markwardt, 1978; Widdowson, 1975) as either an end in itself or as a vehicle for language learning. But no studies of which the researcher is aware have systematically investigated the multi-dimensional nature of literary response and language learning in the FL context.

The following outline of the classroom context of these literature lessons is based upon the researcher's preliminary observations of the introductory literature course that is the object of the study, and is intended to make explicit the framework within which the data collection and analysis was conducted.

**Conceptual Considerations**

From the learner's perspective, there are several dimensions of difficulty inherent in initial confrontations with unedited, authentic FL literary texts and the necessity of responding to them in the FL either publicly by speaking or privately in writing. Although no adequate description of these dimensions is available, it may be surmised that,
at a minimum, they include knowledge of the target culture and of the fundamental literary conventions of the learner’s own and the target culture. In addition, learners are traditionally assumed to possess a “threshold” level of proficiency in each of the “four skills”—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—demanded by the integrative nature of classroom literary study. Furthermore, the learner may be untutored in, or even developmentally unready for, the reflective reading stances, rhetorical practices, and specialized language of literary analysis and interpretation in either language, thus compounding an already taxing undertaking. In short, it is obvious that the need to speak and write meaningfully in a still-new language about an unfamiliar body of texts using critical and literary terms and modes of argumentation and possibly unpracticed intellectual skills is a daunting challenge.

In order to analyze so close-knit a cluster of problems, it is necessary to outline the salient features of a prototypical interaction between intermediate FL readers and a literary text in a classroom setting. Although interrelated and not necessarily linear in character, it is a useful heuristic to conceptualize an individual encounter as a sequence of stages, the totality of which comprises a literary episode or “event”. This study examines two such
events in slow motion, as it were, by characterizing the stages individually and analyzing the manner in which each stage contributes to the overall dynamics and outcome of the literary event.

The most obvious and yet least transparent of these stages is the initial interaction between reader and text. The intermediate FL reader's immediate problem at this stage is to achieve a degree of comprehension of the "objective" surface meaning of the text that is adequate for reflection, interpretation, or "subjective" response. It should be noted that, although theorists generally decline to consider these modes of response necessarily separate (e.g., Rosenblatt, 1978; Applebee, 1978), problems of comprehension have special significance in the FL educational context and may constitute an obstacle to interpretation, whether private or public (Davis, 1989). As second language reading research has demonstrated, the outcome of this comprehension phase, even with informational or expository texts, is influenced by a broad range of reader factors, including linguistic ability, knowledge of the topic, genre, and target culture, as well as the context and purposes for reading (Bernhardt, 1991).
Beyond the problem of surface meaning, members of a particular literature class share certain norms and assumptions about the interpretive dimension of their initial private encounter with and subsequent treatment of the text (Bartholmae, 1985). As they "govern" the literature lessons of a given class, these "rules" derive from a combination of individual prior literary experiences and attitudes, social and cultural expectations of what it means to "do" literature, and the specific reading attitude or stance promulgated or sanctioned by the teacher. This latter, "local" set of rules has typically been found to be the chief determiner of the stance adopted by students in reading and responding to literary texts (Marshall, 1987, 1989).

Among the broadly social and local determinants of reading attitude is that, unlike pleasure reading, the reading of literature in an academic context is never response-free (Nell, 1988). While this fact unquestionably motivates the private reading process, it typically receives its first public expression in the second stage of a classroom literary event. This entails either active or receptive participation in a generally teacher-directed, dialogic "lesson" which, for the purposes of the study, was considered a publicly constructed, collaborative response
that was available to all members of the group or "interpretive community" (Fish, 1980).

In the FL literature classroom, this stage necessarily includes the negotiation of a consensus concerning the surface meaning of the text as a prerequisite to interpretation or analysis. How this dimension—essentially a public re-reading of the narrative structure and concrete details of the text—is embedded in the literature lesson as a whole is clearly a crucial feature of the event and depends on several factors. These include the genre and relative "difficulty" of the text, the abilities, attentiveness, and interactive styles of the learners, the teacher's expectations, attitudes, and teaching style, and the culturally and academically accepted conventions of literary interpretation and analysis.

The substance and structure of the FL literature lesson—the patterns of interaction and the relative weight accorded to objective and subjective modes of interpretation—may also be conceived of as mediating between the initial, private stage of the event and the presumptive final stage. In a broader and idealized sense, this can be viewed as a process of convergence of the "naive" or uninstructed readings of the students with the interpretive
agenda of the teacher that crystallizes in a final written product.

In an academic FL setting, this final stage of a literary event customarily involves an out-of-class analytic writing task in the FL. This final stage is then a synthesis of the response process that will bear the marks of the previous two stages but also may be more likely than the public context of the lesson to evoke personal and subjective response modes.

**Theoretical Considerations**

The study adopts as its principal theoretical framework three separate but conceptually related theoretical strands, each of which is associated with a particular body of empirical research in educational settings: 1) reader-response literary theory and first language literary response research; 2) second language literacy research and Bernhardt’s (1991) sociocognitive theory of second-language reading; and 3) social-interactionist perspectives on literacy learning and classroom interaction. The study is more indirectly grounded in work in the development of literary competence from childhood to adulthood (e.g., Applebee, 1978; Appleyard, 1990) and second and foreign language curriculum such as Nunan’s (1988) learner-centered
curriculum and the content-based instructional movement (e.g., Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989).

From each of these theoretical and empirical domains, the study seeks to draw those features that are most relevant to the analysis of the responses to literature of young adults enrolled in an introductory literature course in French. The following is a brief review of these areas, which are discussed in greater detail in the review of the literature.

**Reader Response Theory and L1 Literacy**

The perspective of reader-response theorists such as Rosenblatt (1938, 1978) and Iser (1978) has proven fruitful as a basis for the study of response to literature in first-language literacy research. Reader-response theory sees the text not as a repository of meaning, but as only one factor in the reader's construction of meaning.

Reader response theory has informed investigations of readers' responses to literature which have sought to describe and understand the reading acts and response processes of actual readers in educational settings. I. A. Richards' Practical Criticism (1929) is widely considered the seminal study of this kind, and has served as the backdrop for numerous subsequent studies of untutored
literary response. Both reader-response theories and the studies inspired by them constitute a movement away from traditional literary criticism and teaching that see meaning as residing in the text and devalorize naive or inexpert readings and towards a more humane and developmentally appropriate pedagogy of literature.

**Sociocognitive Theory and L2 Reading**

A growing number of researchers has called for a reevaluation of the neglected literacy component of second and foreign language study (Arens & Swaffar, 1987; Benseler, 1991; Bernhardt, 1991; Mohan, 1986). Bernhardt has proposed a synthesis of cognitive and social theoretical perspectives on second language reading in light of findings indicating the complex interaction of reader- and text-based factors in L2 reading. Research and instructional practices reflect this renewed attention to the development of reading and writing abilities. Most L2 reading studies, however, focus on diverse populations of English as a Second Language (ESL) learners, perpetuate the preference for informational texts, and are purely product-oriented.

Of most importance in the context of the present study are L2 reading studies that focus on the role of reader factors--L2 proficiency, cultural background knowledge,
knowledge of topic or passage structure, in particular--as significant determiners of reading comprehension. These studies indirectly but firmly corroborate reader-response theories by according the reader a central role in meaning construction, but construe the social dimension of reading and responding to texts as a stable set of factors influencing a purely private act.

**Social-interactionist Perspectives on Literacy**

Social-interactionist perspectives on literacy development, on the other hand, view "literacy events" (Heath, 1988) within the context of the construction of meaning by members of a community or classroom (Hynds, 1990; Galda, 1990; Golden, 1988). Rather than a solitary, decontextualized interaction between a reader and a text, literacy events are situated within webs of social meanings and interactions. Reading comprehension is an essential initial stage of this process, rather than an end in itself, and the solitary experience of the reader is the point of departure, not the destination, for a process of socialization through negotiation and collaborative meaning construction.
It is noteworthy that this perspective has been limited predominantly to research into the development of L1 reading in children and adolescents (Dyson 1989; Galda, 1990; Golden, 1988; Hynds, 1989). At some ill-defined transitional level, researchers, like the curriculum and the profession as a whole, often unconsciously cease to acknowledge the socially constructed character of knowledge.

Development of Literary Competence

In addition to the above primary framework, the present study is anchored in theories and findings concerning the centrality of narrative in human social, cognitive, and linguistic development (Applebee, 1978; Appleyard, 1990; Bruner, 1986). According to this view, the development of literary competence parallels, contributes to, or is even a crucial determiner of intellectual development and socialization. Along the way, a child and adolescent accumulates knowledge of how the world works, of the role of fantasy and play (Nell, 1988), and, more concretely, of the literary genres, “story grammars” (Stein & Glenn, 1979), and other tropes specific to their culture.

In the case of readers of FL literature (or any FL text), their knowledge and individual tastes and experiences constitute the presumptive (and largely unacknowledged)
background for a process of engagement with the literary conventions of the target culture. Some of the attributes of literature may be common to narratives or other genres in both cultures, particularly if they share significant aspects of historical and cultural evolution. These common points may thus serve as bridges for comprehension and interpretation by non-native readers.

Alternative Models of FL Curricula

A final conceptual thread is the concept of the learner-centered curriculum (Nunan 1988) and the content-based instructional movement (e.g., Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989). Each of these curricular models is associated with successful examples of their implementation and offers a rationale for authentic target culture materials such as literature as the core of a language curriculum. The concepts embodied in the models are consistent with the notion of a response-based pedagogy of literature that focuses simultaneously on language development and on literary study as a proper and socially accepted critical pursuit.
Purpose of the Study

The proposed study traced the evolution of responses to French-language literary texts in an intact classroom setting. The purpose of the study is to provide insights into the content and the context of literary response as it unfolded from an initial, private comprehension stage through a public, teacher-led literature lesson and culminated in an analytic essay in French.

The hybrid nature of the study, which was methodologically a blend of L1 literary response research, conventional SL reading research, and classroom ethnography, mirrors the tensions inherent in the setting. The intermediate level introductory FL literature class is fundamentally ambiguous in nature; it is quite literally in the middle of the FL curriculum and constitutes an ill-understood "black box" for the profession. It is expected, for example, that the encounter of (if not the tension between) two competing curricular paradigms at this level--language learning and literary scholarship--is inscribed in the "work" of students and teacher as they negotiate the dialectical process of literary response and analysis in an educational setting. It is the purpose of the present study to describe these tensions and ambiguities as they
manifested themselves in the day-to-day work of a single classroom.

The sixteen participating students were enrolled in an intermediate level class the purpose of which was to introduce them to reading, discussing, and writing about French-language literary and cultural texts. They were asked to read and respond to two French-language literary texts at intervals of two to three weeks during the regular ten-week academic quarter. In addition to written recall protocols, personal responses, and analytic essays, the data consist of video-recordings of the lessons and student questionnaires concerning their past literary experiences and their expectations and attitudes regarding the reading and interpretation of literature.

**Research Questions**

In broad terms, the study is framed around the following questions:

1. What does it mean to the learners and the teacher (as an instantiation of the institution) to "do" literature in an intermediate level, introductory French literature classroom? Are the official curriculum and this "local" curriculum at odds with one another and, if so, how is the conflict between them negotiated?
2. What are the forces that shape, define, or constrain the evolution (from private reading through the public forum of a lesson) of the formal, written, academic literary responses of intermediate level learners of French?
3. What does the variation among learners reveal about the problems that they confront in encountering and responding to authentic French-language literary texts?
4. What insights may be drawn from the answers to the above questions concerning FL pedagogy and curricula?

The study will explore the above issues by endeavoring to answer the following specific research questions:

**Stage One**

Immediate recall protocol

1. What proportion of the propositions of the texts do students recall? According to this measure, how much do students comprehend of the texts? Is there a significant difference in this measure across texts?
2. What do patterns in the frequency of weighted propositions recalled indicate about which elements of the texts are most salient to the students?
Initial response

1. What patterns in the frequency of response statements are evident in the initial literary responses?
2. What do these patterns suggest about the pre-instructional interpretive process and how students construe this process?

Stage Two--Literature Lessons

1. What do the overall structure, patterns of interaction, and content of the lessons reveal in terms of the existence of rival curricula for literature discussions in French at this level?
2. What are the ratio of teacher talk to student talk and the predominant turn-taking patterns of this talk?
3. What is the content of the lessons in terms of attention to language forms, personal response, text content, and literary analysis?
   a. What does the lesson content suggest concerning the teacher's and students' construal of publicly "doing" literature at this level?
   b. How does the content of the lessons compare to the content of the initial written responses and the essays as indicated by the Newell, et al. (1989) system for analyzing the content of written literary responses?
4. What is the overall "route" of the lessons? (e.g., how does it proceed from "objective" language and narrative features towards literary interpretation?) What insights does this route offer into the nature of the local literature curriculum? Are these literature lessons or language lessons?

**Stage Three--Essays**

1. What are the patterns in the content of the essays as indicated by the frequency of response statement types?
   a. How do these patterns compare with the patterns in the content of the personal responses and the lessons?
   b. How are these patterns indicative of students’ construal of the essay task, e.g., what “stance” do the students adopt toward the texts in the essays?

2. What is the quality of the students’ writing in French as measured by bilingual raters, who will rank order them according to grammatical and rhetorical norm reference.

**Student Questionnaires**

1. Is there a relationship between students’ self-reported literary attitudes, tastes, and experiences and self-assessment of knowledge of French culture and proficiency in French and the patterns of their individual responses?
2. Are there trends in the questionnaire responses that elucidate the nature of the students' written responses and the lessons? Do the trends suggest the existence of a learner curriculum in terms of expectations and purposes for literary study at the intermediate level? How does this curriculum compare with that evident in teacher interviews and the patterns of the literature lessons?

Conclusion

In broad terms and from the standpoint of FL pedagogy and curricula, the purpose of the study is to raise questions about the articulation of two divergent paradigms in post-secondary FL programs: literary scholarship and language instruction. Research that informs this articulation process could enable a smoother transition for students through the ordeal of intermediate level FL courses. In raising these questions, the study asks how the dichotomous character of typical college-level FL programs shapes the opportunities for learners' cognitive, social, and linguistic knowledge and skills to aid them either in learning the FL, or in learning to study literature in the FL, or ultimately in becoming critical and above all autonomous readers and thinkers.
From the perspective of FL education research, the study seeks to contribute to the knowledge base in the domain of second language literacy acquisition by extending the limited understanding of the processes involved in responding to FL literary texts in the classroom context. A large number of researchers have proposed literature as a vehicle for language study that is consistent with communicative language teaching (Birckbichler & Muyskens, 1980; Bretz & Persin, 1987; Davis, 1989; Kramsch, 1985; Ryder, 1986), but few if any classroom studies appear in the data-base. This void is all the more striking given the prevailing dominance of literature in the upper-level FL curriculum.

Finally, from the perspective of this researcher as a FL learner and teacher, the study is grounded in the contention that reading and talking about literary texts can provide a rich and challenging matrix for FL learning and foster a more profound version of communicative (and cultural) competence both inside and outside the FL classroom. Both communicative FL teaching and FL literary scholarship stand to learn from each other, and findings in second language reading and literary response may aid in the development of alternatives to the rift and even friction between these two fundamentally allied entities.
Assumptions

The study rests upon the following assumptions:

1. Literary response in an educational setting is a complex cluster of phenomena that is best understood as a socially and culturally situated process with both private and public dimensions.

2. In the educational context of the intermediate level FL literature class, the process of comprehending a text is fundamentally contiguous with the public and private dimensions of textual interpretation. Reading in any context is interpretation.

3. The "text" of the literature lesson is a collaboratively constructed, dialogic response that is available to all participants, whether active or not, as a resource for the processes of literary understanding and response.

4. The texts, elicitation tasks, and teacher-led lessons deviated minimally from the day-to-day tasks of the class.

5. The written responses submitted by the participating students were an accurate indication of their responses to the texts and represent a reasonable effort on their part.

6. The patterns of interaction during the literature lessons were not unduly influenced by the presence of the researcher and the video-recorder.
7. The questionnaire responses are an accurate indication of student attitudes, expectations, and experiences concerning the study of literature.

Limitations

Although the texts and response tasks deviated as little as possible from the routine of this classroom, the study cannot claim to be naturalistic. Further, because the study focuses on an intact group, it makes no claim to representativeness.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of relevant literature begins with an overview of reading research, perspectives on literacy, and contemporary literary theory. Subsequent sections will discuss in greater detail than in the previous chapter the following three areas: 1) Theories of literacy and literary theory; 2) L2 reading theory and research; and 3) L1 literary response theory and research. Each of these areas contributes to the framework of the study, which attempts to synthesize these perspectives through a contextualized examination of literary response processes in a particular FL classroom community.

The study will seek to answer the fundamental question of what it means to "do" literature in an introductory, intermediate level French literature classroom. Few studies in L2 or FL research have investigated how students make meaning from literary texts, either as solitary readers or in the public context of literature lessons. The
theoretical and methodological antecedents are consequently limited to an extensive body of studies of responses to literature by L1 readers. The underlying questions are derived, moreover, from arguments and assumptions that belong to wider debates about the nature, value, and purposes of literacy and the practice and outcomes of literary study and instruction.

FL and L2 research and teaching have generally not participated in these debates since the 1960's and 1970's, when the grammar-translation approach, in which literary texts were central, gave way to the audio-lingual approach, which concentrated almost exclusively on the development of speaking and listening abilities (Brumfit, 1986). Although the emphasis on spoken communication persists, there has been a recent resurgence of interest in literacy- and literature-related activities as worthwhile in their own right, as well as supportive of language learning, particularly in English as a Second Language (ESL) (Brumfit, 1986; Collie & Slater, 1987).

In addition, literature in L2 classrooms has come to be seen as instrumental in the development of cross-cultural awareness (Steffenson & Joag-Dev, 1979), as a factor in language learner motivation (Collie & Slater, 1987), and as a means of exposing language learners to patterns of
stylistic variation in authentic language (Marckwardt, 1978; Widdowson, 1975). Despite a proliferation of teaching suggestions and rationales for the uses of literature in language classes, research has failed to adequately contribute to an understanding of how literature interacts with the language development of FL and L2 learners.

**Trends in Reading and Literacy Research**

Within the context of L1 literacy research, the growing body of enquiry into literary response is part of a fundamental shift away from traditional views of reading as a solitary interaction between reader and text whose end-point is some measurable demonstration of comprehension (Beach & Hynds 1991; Bogdan & Straw, 1990). According to this traditional view, a text constitutes a repository of information which a successful or competent reader is able to integrate and reproduce in some performance of comprehension. As a consequence, divergences from a normative response or "right answer" among readers of a given text are ascribed to individual variations in knowledge and abilities the remediation of which is the proper function of instruction. This view has long dominated reading comprehension research as well as reading
instruction and has by extension influenced conceptualizations of literary response.

A progressively more complex view of the act of reading has emerged (Beach & Hynds, 1991; Bogdan & Straw, 1990) that sees individual readings and the variables that contribute to them as objects of enquiry and even celebration rather than as obstacles to a faultless reading. It has become apparent that the product of each "transaction" between readers and texts is unique (Rosenblatt, 1978; Straw, 1990), and that the reading of informational texts is not as sharply distinguishable from that of literary texts as was previously thought; any text is susceptible to multiple readings even by the same reader, and every act of reading is a process which involves the extraordinarily complex interaction of cognitive, attitudinal, social, and contextual variables, only one of which is the text itself.

**Perspectives on Literacy**

Shifts in research orientations toward the reader's and the society's roles in meaning construction have evolved in tandem with changes in theories of literacy and in literary theory. Becoming literate no longer is considered a purely linguistic or cognitive phenomenon, but is synonymous with socialization into the modes of thinking, knowing, and
communicating of literate societies (Goody, 1977; Ong, 1989; Straw, 1990). Reading and writing are thus intimately bound into the structures and institutions of society and the individual's roles within them (Erickson, 1988).

The advent of the concept of "functional literacy" in North America and the concomitant development of "scientific" methods of literacy instruction (de Castrelle & Luke, 1988) was paralleled by an indictment of the humanist legacy of literary study as elitist and outdated (Szwed, 1988). Moreover, alternative views of the uses of literacy hold that the promotion of only functional or basic reading and writing abilities for the masses reflects at best a utilitarian view of language and at worst a sinister maintenance of an oppressive status quo (McLaren, 1991).

Advocates of "cultural literacy" (Hirsch, 1987) and "critical literacy" justify literary and cultural studies on various grounds, but concur on the necessity of focusing on interpretive processes. Heath (1985), in a humanist vein, asserts that the literacy activities of reading and writing are meaningless unless accompanied by some form of cultural exploration. Stopping well short of the kind of prescriptive list and interpretive agenda proposed by Hirsch (1987), however, Heath calls for a pluralist approach to cultural literacy that would seek to narrow the division
between the traditional élite holders of culture and the functionally literate masses.

Other theorists (e.g., Paolo Freire, Harvey Graff, Henry Giroux), taking a more anti-humanist position, advocate the development of "critical literacy" as the sole means of openly involving learners and teachers in the political struggle to uncover and combat the ideological operations behind all forms of discourse (McLaren, 1991). From this perspective, the educational value of cultural and literary texts resides in the interpretive and analytic activity of revealing how such texts reflect the historic privileging of some discourses over others. Framed in this way, the debate centers on how and why texts and interpretation structure--and are structured by--power relations in society and the social and political consequences of this structure rather than focusing on the meaning of the text itself.

**Literary Theory**

Contemporary literary criticism has served to undergird the critical literacy movement and, paralleling shifts in reading research, increasingly has tended to valorize the reader's and society's role in the construction of meaning (Straw, 1990). Traditional views of reading as a solitary
quest for objective meaning find parallels in the stubbornly persistent New Critical notion that literary texts hold valid and stable truths available only to the practiced eye and scientific mind of an informed reader. This belief in the absolute authority of the text led to the notorious view articulated by Wimsatt and Beardsley (1954) that attention to an actual individual reader’s responses to a story or poem constituted an “affective fallacy”: only the skilled critic using precise and objective procedures of “close reading” was competent to derive the correct interpretation of a literary work. Underlying the New Critical negation of subjective processes of interpretation was an unease concerning individual readers’ contributions. As Freund (1987) notes that the “inherent privacy and silence of reading have no doubt encouraged a tendency to suppress the embarrassment of subjectivity, placing it beyond the pale of a critical decorum which aspires to be objective” (p. 3).

The rigorous focus on purportedly objective features of the text was thus able to exclude the “embarrassment” and inherently indeterminate social and psychological dimensions of reading by holding them to be fallacious and by promoting what Scholes (1989) describes as a “fundamentalist” approach to interpretation. The subsequent admission of the validity of these facets of reading and interpretation has unleashed
a fertile but often acrimonious series of debates while eroding the authority of the text, the author, and the teacher (Appleyard, 1990).

Although they differ significantly concerning the locus and character of meaning and the purposes of reading, interpretation, and criticism, Marxist literary criticism, feminism, reader-response theory, and deconstructionism have variously contributed to the re-valorization of the reader's experience (Bogdan, 1990; Hunt, 1990). In most instances, however, literary theory has assumed an idealized, "competent" reader who is presumed to be a fellow literary critic or academic and whose purpose in reading is critical interpretation. This assumption has largely disallowed consideration of the question of how readers become competent in the first place, not to mention other purposes for reading such as pleasure or "ludic" reading (Nell, 1988).

Loosely grouped under the rubric of reader-response theory are a number of critics who have sought to re-situate the production of literary meaning in the reader. Although conceptually diverse, reader-response theorists and critics seek to revalorize the subjective and experiential dimensions of literary response by refusing to consider a
literary work separately from its effects on the reader (Tompkins, 1980).

An increasing emphasis on reader(s) as participant(s) in meaning construction and on the experiential, subjective, and social dimensions of response is thus reflected in much contemporary literary theory and criticism (see Freund, 1987 for a review) and is specifically foregrounded by the various proponents of reader response theory. According to Iser (1978), texts provide readers with inherently incomplete sets of "instructions" that they must somehow complete or construct. Other reader-response theorists and critics assert that the reader of a literary text must draw upon personal experiences (Bleich, 1978; Holland, 1975) to complete the work in what Rosenblatt (1978) describes as a transactional process between the reader and the text; the product of this transaction is the literary work.

Contemporary literary theory and the debates about interpretation and meaning are thus potentially profoundly unsettling for instruction and research. Teaching for literal comprehension and for "fundamentalist" interpretation appears by contrast to be safe and easily programmed or even "teacher-proofed"; if the text itself is but one of several contextual catalysts for a reaction, its outcomes are necessarily indeterminate, potentially
uncontrollable, and even dangerous to the educational status quo. If comprehension is contiguous with a process of interpretation that is not bound within the individual reader but is socially mediated and constructed, authors, texts, critics, and teachers recede into the background of an endless series of interpretive conversations that have a life of their own in the classroom (Marshall, 1989). "Stepping into" and "stepping out of" (Langer, 1990) literary texts and the conversations about them thus involves the "recursive operation of engagement and detachment" that is "one long and continuous dialectical process" (Bogdan, 1990).

Responding to a work entails the conscious adoption of what Applebee (1978) (after Harding, 1968) terms the "spectator" stance. The educational setting of literature instruction typically formalizes two roles for readers: the individual reader engaged in the private process of reading as "participant" and the secondary, public reader as interpreter or "spectator" who, by articulating a response, engages in a social process with others. According to this somewhat idealized view, the audience of the response is thereby engaged in the reader's initial, private interpretive "reading" as well as its re-representation: the response is validated through the negotiation of a the
consensus among members of the "interpretive community" (Fish, 1980), a much-criticized notion that is nevertheless directly relevant to the context of literature lessons.

**L2 Reading Theory and Research**

The above theoretical insights concerning literacy and literary study and interpretation are not wholly applicable to the reading of literary texts in a FL classroom setting, in part because the members of an FL classroom community, whether "competent" in literary terms or not, may possess an inherently incomplete knowledge of the target culture and language. Clearly, this incompleteness places a particular order of constraints on the private and public processes of understanding and responding to literary texts in the FL setting. Moreover, as debates in literary theory illustrate, the distinction between understanding the language on the page, literary understanding, and interpretation is far from settled. In conjunction with what is known about second language literacy, however, these perspectives are suggestive of directions that enquiry into literary response in the L2 setting might usefully take.
The Threshold Question

Second language literacy studies indicate the relative contributions of language, text, and reader variables to comprehension, some degree of which is an obvious precondition to response to a text. L2 and FL readers do use L1 linguistic and literacy skills and general background knowledge in interacting with and understanding L2 texts (Bernhardt, 1991; Carson, et al., 1990; Eisterhold, 1990; Odlin, 1989). Whether what the reader brings to the L2 literacy task is facilitative or results in undesirable "interference" is a question of focus, and part of a wider and historic debate within the profession (Jarvis, 1991).

Cummins' (1981) interdependence hypothesis, for example, offers a strong general argument for the positive transfer of L1 knowledge and skills by positing an underlying cognitive/academic proficiency that is common across languages and permits the transfer of literacy-related skills.

The extent and mechanisms of the transfer of literacy skills are unclear (Eisterhold, 1990; McLaughlin, 1987) and the process of transfer problematic due to differences among languages and learners as well as learning contexts. McLaughlin found that even advanced learners who had presumably reached a "proficiency threshold" were unable to
use effective reading skills and continued to use the
glanguage decoding strategies that are characteristic of less
able L1 readers.

Swaffar (1991) holds that the persistence of reader
reliance on decoding strategies at advanced levels is a
consequence of instructional focus and materials, an
intriguing and troubling charge that suggests that texts and
instruction actually block literacy transfer. Swaffar bases
this assertion on a review of the reading passages in major
textbooks, but the problem of readers' inability or
unwillingness to fully deploy their L1 reading strategies
may equally derive from teaching practices that
systematically hold accuracy in comprehension or production
to be prerequisite to meaningful L2 reading or expression.

The contribution of FL literature students' knowledge
and experience of academic conventions of "doing" L1
literature--their "literary competence" (Culler, 1975)--may
thus be similarly subject to contextual and psychological
constraints. For example, the FL language classroom
setting, in which accuracy of comprehension, speaking and
writing in the FL may take precedence--whether overtly or
covertly--over true communication, may impede or even
discourage transfer by suppressing learners' L1 literacy
skills. In the introductory FL literature classroom,
students' general literary competence and personal experiences may be similarly suppressed.

In summary, research indicates that transfer is not necessarily automatic, and it remains unclear to what extent the transfer of successful reading strategies and related literacy skills from L1 to L2 involves a threshold level of interplay between cognitive processes and proficiency before transfer processes come into play. Eisterhold (1990) affirms the existence of such a threshold, but the work of McLaughlin (1987) appears to suggest that the threshold concept over-simplifies a complex and highly variable cluster of phenomena. It is likely that the threshold—and the failure of many FL learners to cross it successfully—is in fact a self-fulfilling artifact of its institutionalization in the division between language courses and literary study in post-secondary FL departments (Swaffar, 1993). Unsuccessful transfer of crucial prior knowledge and skills across some mythic threshold level may thus constitute an unwitting outcome of a language learning environment that "disengages" language skills from one another (Swaffar, 1991) and considers morpho-syntactic accuracy a precondition to expression and experimentation (Swaffar, 1993).
Whether instructional and curricular practice are obstacles to or agents in promoting literacy transfer and whether or not the process entails a threshold level, it has been the focus of considerable research and theory. Bernhardt's (1991) constructivist model of L2 reading suggests how a reader's knowledge of the L2 and background knowledge--"language-based" and "knowledge-driven" factors--contribute differentially to reading comprehension as proficiency increases. The model posits that reliance on background knowledge decreases proportionately as knowledge of specific L2 features increases. The result of the changing interaction between these two bodies of reader knowledge and L2 texts is progressively fewer "errors" of comprehension (with the paradoxical exception of syntax, in which error frequency increases as L2 knowledge increases).

The language-based and knowledge-driven factors in Bernhardt's constructivist model are consistent with the older concept of bottom-up and top-down processing (Carrell, 1987). According to a schema-based theory of reading, readers interact with a text via schemata, cognitive structures that facilitate and guide the reading process. Schemata may also distort comprehension through a "mismatch" (Johnston, 1983).
Active monitoring by the reader using metacognitive strategies provides the reader with information regarding errors in comprehension and governs the on-going selection of schemata (Barnett, 1989; Winograd & Johnston, 1980) and construction of a mental reconstruction or model of the text (Bernhardt, 1985). There is increasing evidence in L2 reading research that background knowledge and metacognitive strategies may be as great a factor in comprehension as language level and that even beginning adult L2 students are able to comprehend authentic texts (Bernhardt, 1985; Bernhardt & Berkemeyer, 1988; Carrell, 1988).

It is apparent from the above discussion that neither the notion of a threshold level of language ability nor the linear, lock-step conception of literacy transfer that underlies the "language-mastery" prerequisite to interaction with literary and other authentic texts has been well substantiated by research. A number of researchers cite this failure as support for a far-reaching restructuring of the post-secondary curriculum that would include an expanded role for authentic texts, including literary texts (Brumfit & Carter, 1986; McKay, 1986; Muyskens, 1991; Swaffar et al., 1991) from the beginning of the basic language sequence.
L2 Empirical Reading Research

Reading research has typically proceeded by isolating and manipulating variables in order to investigate their influence on comprehension. This nomothetic method has proven a powerful tool in testing and developing models of the reading process. An assumption of the present study, however, is that, in order to explain the processes of reading and interpretation of literary texts in an educational setting, research needs to consider the crucial educational question of what happens after comprehension in the FL classroom: The private processes of comprehension are only the beginning of broader social processes of both language learning and literary interpretation. Nevertheless, despite confounding factors in the ways that L2 reading studies have defined and assessed comprehension, patterns in L2 reading research suggest the general psychological parameters of L2 reading comprehension, the initial hurdle faced by the L2 reader in any context.

Interaction of L2 Reader Knowledge and Text

In order to achieve an adequate degree of comprehension, readers of texts who are not members of the linguistic and cultural community for which the texts were intended clearly must draw both on their linguistic
knowledge, so-called "bottom-up" schemata, and on conceptual or "top-down" sources such as world knowledge and knowledge of genre and other conventions of written discourse. In the case of L1-literate adults' initial encounters with L2 literary texts, this process of extrapolation from existing knowledge holds the potential for inappropriate understandings due to a "mismatch" between the readers' knowledge and the fundamental tropes of the L2 culture and texts (Carrell, 1984b; Bernhardt, 1985).

A number of studies have illustrated the importance of "knowledge-driven" or "top-down" schemata in guiding the interaction with L2 texts and thus determining reading comprehension outcomes. Bernhardt (1991) divides these studies of reader knowledge variables into three broad areas: cultural background, topic knowledge, and background knowledge.

The most clearly relevant of these areas of investigation to the present study is cultural knowledge, of which a landmark study using texts with different cultural content, Steffenson, Joag-Dev, and Anderson (1979) was among the earliest. As in subsequent studies by Johnson (1981), Campbell (1981), and Carrell (1987), readers were found to comprehend most accurately texts that most closely matched their cultural backgrounds and/or experiences.
Topic knowledge has similarly been shown to significantly affect comprehension of informational texts in a number of studies (e.g., Alderson & Urquhart, 1988; Johnson, 1982; Mohammed & Swales, 1984). These studies have shown that L2 readers comprehend most accurately texts about their own fields of academic specialization. To what extent the concept of topic is coextensive with narratives or other literary genres is an open question, but it is clear that literate adult L2 readers possess repertoires of knowledge and strategies concerning what texts may be about and how they work.

Knowledge of different kinds--cultural, topic, and general background among them--appears to interact with features of the texts such as rhetorical form, text structure, or story grammars (Carrell, 1984; 1987). Both studies conducted by Carrell compared the recall of conventionally ordered stories and “interleaved” versions stories by ESL learners. Passage recall of “story nodes” in was most accurate when story structure conformed to reader expectations. Like these studies, all of those cited in Bernhardt (1991) that concern this interaction have used artificially constructed and manipulated texts and are therefore of limited validity concerning comprehension of authentic L2 texts. They do nevertheless highlight the
importance of the interaction between text structure and reader knowledge and expectations as a support for comprehension. This suggests that comprehension of L2 literary texts may be facilitated when readers' L1 and the L2 share significant genre traits and narrative structures. It has even been claimed (Mandler, et. al., 1980) that narrative schemata are in fact more cross-culturally universal than expository schemata, an assertion that suggests that literary texts may even be easier for L2 readers to understand than expository texts.

The findings cited above suggest that text structure and reader knowledge of text structure interact to help readers make meaning from texts. This "top-down" process operates in tandem with "bottom-up" knowledge and text features such as syntactic knowledge. The reader-text interaction of knowledge and text micro-features was illustrated in a study by Nunan (1985) in which topic knowledge was found to contribute to ESL readers' use of cohesive devices in comprehending text.

In one of relatively few FL studies using literary texts, Barnett (1986), using multiple measures of comprehension, found a positive relationship between intermediate level French learners' grammar and vocabulary knowledge and recall of two French-language short stories.
This study appears to offer some evidence in favor of a linguistic threshold for comprehension in finding that the contribution of syntactic knowledge was less uniform among learners with higher proficiency than among those at lower levels. It is equally likely, however, that this finding is consistent with Bernhardt's (1991) suggestion that syntactic features become a progressively greater source of error as proficiency increases. The author of the study oddly dismisses the interaction of background knowledge and the cultural and literary aspects of the stories even while acknowledging the possibility that they may have contributed to the students' "confusion."

Guarino and Perkins (1986) concluded that factors other than syntactic knowledge might explain variation in comprehension across levels. Studies by Bhatia (1984) and Blau (1982) confirm L1 findings by indicating that the inherent syntactic complexity of authentic texts may actually help low proficiency learners comprehend. Lee and Musumeci (1988) similarly failed to find a linear relationship between putative text difficulty (based upon the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines for reading) and comprehension across four levels of adult learners of Italian. Although the study used discrete point questions to assess comprehension rather than the more sensitive
recall procedure, its findings roughly confirm that comprehension is not merely a function of text-based factors.

In light of the above-cited findings, the application of readability formulas to "simplify" authentic texts or create graded pedagogical readers may in fact impede comprehension by L1 or L2 readers. As Nunan (1988) has argued, it is preferable to adapt pedagogical tasks rather than to alter texts or other materials; sheltering students from authentic L2 texts, literary texts in particular, may be a disservice to them in cognitive as well as educational and even humanist terms. Factors that contribute to a generalized reluctance to promote L2 literacy from an early stage may include: the belief that a threshold level of proficiency is necessary before learners can meaningfully interact with and respond to L2 texts; the belief that spoken communication and basic language functions are of primary importance to beginning language learners; and the persistence of discrete-point, ostensibly objective means of assessment. The mythology that underlies these beliefs and practices and the division within the language teaching profession that mirrors them appear increasingly suspect in light of findings that L1-literate adult readers are
sufficiently well-equipped to read and respond to authentic L2 texts.

**L2 Classroom Research**

There have been repeated calls for ethnographic and descriptive study of L2 classrooms (Ellis, 1990; Jarvis, 1980) and of L2 classroom literacy events (Bernhardt, 1991; Bernhardt & Tedick, 1991; Krapels, 1990; Swaffar, 1993). Few studies of actual day-to-day affairs in language classrooms have been conducted, however. Chaudron contends that the dearth of L2 classroom process research is explained by the high degree of observer training and time required by such studies. It is equally likely that other factors include the relative youth of the field of L2 classroom research and its historic domination by quantitative and experimental paradigms of enquiry. Kramsch (1987) affirms that the social-interactionist perspective on language learning has been little heard in North America and that studies of L2 and FL learning have been "more interested in the biological and psychological foundations of language than in its social roots" (p. 243). Ellis (1990) maintains that L2 classroom research has lagged behind other domains of educational research due to the
persistence of comparative teaching method studies and an overall emphasis on teaching as opposed to learning.

Study of the FL and SL classroom context has generally focused on specific features of classroom interaction rather than following the qualitative, process-oriented tradition of L1 classroom ethnography (Chaudron, 1988). The studies reviewed by Chaudron and Ellis are primarily concerned with the teacher's role, and include teacher awareness of student performance (Carrasco, 1981), error treatment (Chaudron, 1977; Nystrom, 1983), turn-taking and repair (van Lier, 1982), and teacher management of turns (Enright, 1984).

These studies have shown that pedagogic discourse in L2 classrooms is structured like that found in other classrooms (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) in following a prototypical three-phase cycle involving a teacher elicitation, a student response, and teacher feedback, abbreviated as "IRF." The vast majority of L2 learner contributions are responses to teacher questions (Brock, 1986; Politzer, Ramirez, & Lewis, 1981) that tend to be brief, leading to an extraordinarily lop-sided "dialogue" in which topics and modes of discourse are heavily dominated by the teacher.
Given the special nature of the communicative language classroom, in which the medium of instruction is also its subject matter and interaction is presumed to be the matrix of language learning (Allwright, 1984), some researchers (e.g., Riley, 1977) conclude that the IRF structure sharply constrains learners' opportunities to learn to communicate and hence inhibits language learning. On the other hand, Mitchell (1988), offers evidence in a study of French-language classrooms in Scotland that the teachers whom she observed did support language learning by modeling a variety of communicative functions and strategies through their management of classroom discourse. She notes that learners, too, successfully used these strategies once they had learned them in order to participate in the academic and social activities of the classroom.

It might be expected that, in classrooms in which the predominant focus is on use of the language rather than on learning its structure, the character of the interaction would be qualitatively different and possibly more like naturally occurring conversations than in elementary classrooms. In a study that corroborates the view that such ostensibly communicative classrooms may in fact offer few opportunities to communicate, however, Brooks (1992) found that intermediate level learners in a Spanish conversation
classroom were essentially denied occasions to learn or practice the rules of native Spanish speaker interaction. Macro-analysis of "maps" of classroom discourse revealed recurrent patterns of discourse events that included small-group and teacher-fronted events. Subsequent, detailed examination of prototypical events showed that at no time did students learn or use the simplest elements of natural conversation such as openings, closures, and negotiation of topic.

Despite the nominal intent of the intermediate Spanish conversation course to "extend" learners' communicative competence, Brooks found that the instructor's control of student small-group conversations (through the pre-selection of topics and determination of the time that groups spent discussing them) prevented learners from making social decisions of any kind. Brooks' analysis exposed a kind of paradox, in which the structuring of the interaction by the teacher maximized opportunities for students to participate but simultaneously hindered their learning to converse or "chit-chat" in Spanish. This paradox is even more intriguing in light of the fact that both the learners and the instructor expressed satisfaction with the course and the belief that it accomplished its stated purpose. Brooks' study ultimately shows that there are two intertwined
communicative pathways at work in the classroom, the social and the academic, and that, even in a course explicitly intended to foster the former, the latter, under the governance of the teacher and with the assent of the learners, took precedence.

The conspicuous absence in reviews of L2 classroom studies (e.g., Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1990; Seliger & Long, 1983) of studies that examine literacy events as they are embedded in L2 classroom discourse appears to reflect the low prominence of literacy-related activities in the beginning level language classes in which most L2 classroom studies have been conducted. This in turn belies a widespread but largely unstated assumption within the profession that the primary objective of L2 teaching and learning is to learn only spoken communication. Given the renewed focus on L2 reading and writing skill acquisition as inherently worthwhile as well as supportive of the development of what Kramsch (1987) terms "a new kind of literacy in second language and culture", studies are needed that extend what is known about the psychological dimensions of L2 literacy into the social arena of the classroom.
L2 Literary Response

In addition to its obvious and relatively secure position at the apex of the humanist FL curriculum, the potential contributions of literature to language learning in beginning and intermediate FL and L2 language classroom have been much discussed. Little actual research has informed the discussion, however (Muyskens, 1991) and, as a result, proposals for the integration of literature into the language curriculum rest largely upon informed conjecture. Literary texts have been promoted as broadly useful as authentic and meaningful input for language acquisition (Krashen, 1985), more narrowly as a source for the study of comparative stylistics (Widdowson, 1975), as repositories of cultural information (Valdes, 1986), and as a context for teaching composition (Brumfit, 1985).

There have been a large number of appeals for a reconsideration of the role of literature in L2 and FL curricula (Adelson, 1988; Bretz & Persin, 1987; Davis, 1989; Davis et al., 1992; Kramsch, 1985; Muyskens, 1983, 1991; Parsons, 1985). Several writers (Benseler, 1991; Herr, 1982; James, 1989, Muyskens, 1983; Schulz, 1981) have specifically signaled the disparity between the treatment of literature in lower and upper division FL curricula and the problems of attrition and transition caused by this
division. There appears to be a broad consensus within the profession that the uneasy coexistence of the language-learning curriculum and the literature curriculum needs to be addressed and that the most obvious victims of the gap between them are intermediate level students. Suggested remedies have included teaching hints (Adelson, 1988; Birckbichler and Muyskens, 1980; Kramsch, 1985), a review of successful curricular reform at an individual institution (James, 1989), suggestions for teacher preparation (Bretz & Persin, 1987; Bernhardt & Hammadou, 1987; Muyskens, 1991) and a training manual for teachers of English as a Second Language (Collie & Slater, 1987).

In the L2 classroom, literary comprehension is the background for the educational and social processes of negotiating divergent understandings, interpreting, and responding to literary texts. In addition to the indirect insights into L2 reading comprehension offered by the L2 reading data-base, research into the comprehension of literary texts by adult L2 readers and the factors that cause their understandings to vary similarly offers a background against which to study L2 literary response.

In one such study, Bernhardt (1985) sought to explain both how and why 12 second-year learners of German arrived at their understandings of two short stories. The study was
grounded in the view that the mental reconstructions or models of texts that L2 readers build as they read are frequently flawed due to an "inherent mismatch" between readers and texts. Bernhardt contends that this clash between readers and texts is typically mirrored in the classroom, in which the instructor's own mental representation of the text and the programmed lesson that is based upon it fail to coincide with or take into account the students' understandings. Specifically, the study traced text- and extratext-based sources of understandings and misunderstandings of the literary texts as they were revealed in immediate recall protocols and follow-up oral recall and introspective interviews.

Employing a qualitative method of analysis, Bernhardt found that factors traceable to the text (phonemic/graphemic features, syntactic feature recognition, and word recognition) interacted differently for each reader and text with extratext factors (prior knowledge, intratextual perceptions, and metacognition) in a dynamic and variable process. She concludes that the existence of a mismatch between readers, text, and instructor confirmed by the study suggests that more effective literature lessons could be achieved through a redefinition of the teacher's role.
Rather than basing the lesson on their own mental representations of literary texts, teachers should use the understandings arrived at by the learners and recorded using the recall protocol technique as the point of departure for their lessons. In principle, teaching based on students' understandings would enhance the students'--and teachers'--involvement in their own literate behaviors in reading and comprehending literary texts. Bernhardt concludes her report by calling for further study of the processes of L2 literary understanding in a variety of contexts.

More broad-based information concerning adult L2 readers of literature was obtained by a survey of intermediate level students of French conducted by Davis et al. (1992) in which the researchers sought to identify the variables in students' backgrounds and literary experiences that are formative of their attitudes towards FL literature. More than two thirds of respondents reported favorable attitudes (not surprising since the respondents were enrolled in introductory literature classes at three colleges at the time of the survey). Among the seven independent variables examined (two indicators of attitude were considered dependent variables), two--preferred learning style and amount of pleasure reading--were found to be significantly related to attitudes toward FL literature
study and to recommendation of FL literature study, and a third--self-rated FL speaking ability--"approached significance" in being negatively correlated to attitude.

Significantly, Davis et al. conclude that students with positive attitudes preferred to be able to express their personal opinions, look for the underlying meaning of the text, and read about people and experiences different from their own. They further attribute the negative correlation of self-evaluation of speaking ability and attitude to the possibility that students most favorably disposed towards literature felt that their FL speaking needs were not or had not been met by their courses. The researchers note that much FL literature instruction concentrates on "literal comprehension and unfamiliar cultural referents" (p.325) and that a pedagogy that valorized personal interpretations and responses might allow students to see literature as more relevant to their lives and hence more favorably. Davis et al. conclude by recommending further research into foreign language literature reading and suggesting that modification of the FL curriculum to include exposure to a range of FL texts well before advanced levels could positively influence student attitudes.
In addition to the above-cited research, two studies have sought to describe the interactions between intermediate level FL students and literary texts in terms of literary response. Using a case study method within a reader response framework, Juracek (1988) documented the unique ways in which four students approached and interpreted German-language texts. These individual approaches appeared to flow logically from the students' differing self-reported purposes in reading and studying literature, which ranged from language learning to personal engagement and critical techniques.

Echoing Davis et al., Juracek observes in her conclusion that her study appeared to confirm the frequent disparity between the expected public outcome of reading literature—a "detached, objective reading"—and the private reading dispositions of students; Juracek's attempts to tap into the more private realms of students' reading revealed that, regardless of their linguistic or literary competence, her students were capable of engaging the text in a variety of ways. Moreover, she notes, this disparity is often exacerbated by the nature of the question/answer lesson format and pencil/paper tests that characterize literature instruction. Ultimately, the L2 literary experience is inherently different from the L1 experience because L2
readers’ purposes for reading inevitably include “increasing one’s own vocabulary, deepening one’s knowledge of grammar, and gaining insight into the target culture.” (p. 178)

Less direct insights into the response processes of 55 intermediate level FL learners are provided by a study (Davis, 1989) that was nominally framed around Iser’s (1978) notion of the “implied reader” and used the recall protocol technique to examine literal comprehension of literary texts. The report does not describe the scoring method used in analyzing the recall protocols, but the researcher appears to have used an ad hoc, qualitative method to focus on selected examples of evidence of “defective strategies” that led to lexical and broader cultural misunderstandings by the readers. Davis notes the near-total absence of an aesthetic reading stance in the recalls; this is unsurprising given the memory-driven nature of the recall task. Citing the fact that, for Iser, linguistic competence is a “given” but cannot be assumed for L2 readers, Davis reports significant evidence of “misreadings” in some readers that, for him, blocked “access to the literary world” of the text. Davis then proceeds to propose a sample lesson plan that would theoretically remediate the flaws in comprehension that he observed in the recall protocols.
By considering comprehension a precondition for higher level interpretation (presumably what he means by the "literary world") and the purpose of instruction to remediate "misreadings", Davis' methodology and findings are seemingly at odds with his own reader response theoretical framework and do little to illuminate the processes of FL literary response. Unlike Juracek, Davis does not really entertain the possibility that even flawed comprehension can result in important and relevant interpretive insights into the less literal and more personal aspects of literary meaning. Research and teaching that disallow the potential value of such insights to the social life of the classroom merely perpetuate a threshold-based, linear, and solitary view of reading and of the problematic relationship between comprehension and response in L2 literature reading. From a learning-as-process perspective, the occasional misunderstanding could represent more a resource for classroom interaction and negotiation of meaning--and language learning--than a danger to the orderly progression of a lesson under the bipartite authority of the teacher and a stable and objective text. The section that follows will review L1 research that questions the normative view of literary response through the adoption of a reader response framework.
L1 Literary Response

Reading as Transaction and as Social Process

Although many L1 reading studies have shared the predilection of L2 reading studies for informational texts and a tacit assumption that understanding is synonymous with literal comprehension, a major strand of L1 research involving literary texts has departed from it. Rather than viewing meaning as decontextualized, static, and determinate and individual subjective reactions to text as irrelevant, studies of literary response construe the reader-text interaction as a "transaction" (Rosenblatt, 1983), with meaning-making a negotiation between the life and language of the reader, the text, and the social or educational context.

The view that unites L1 literary response studies holds that comprehension is the beginning of educationally and socially constituted processes of interpretation that are confined neither to the classroom (Appleyard, 1990; Hynds, 1990b; Moffett, 1990) nor to interactions concerning print media. Not only is reading a socially embedded act involving communication between readers and writers (Hunt & Vipond, 1986), it is only one facet of the communicative
acts in which readers interact with other readers. Literacy events (Heath, 1988) are situated within webs of social meanings and interactions of which reading comprehension is an essential feature but not an end in itself: the solitary experience of the reader or the audience of any aesthetic event or object is only one of many stimuli of social interaction.

In literacy research, this perspective has been limited predominately to the development of literacy in children and adolescents (Bruner, 1986; Dyson 1989; Galda, 1990, Golden, 1988; Hynds, 1989). Bruner (1986), in particular, criticizes the view, derivative of Piaget's thinking, of the child "going it alone" in the development of ways of making sense of the world (e.g., Applebee, 1978), arguing instead for a Vygostyian view of the social context as mediator and facilitator of development.

Children's early school literary experiences have been found to be generally consistent with their preschool encounters with narratives (Appleyard, 1990; Nell, 1988; Wells, 1986), which typically consist of listening and responding to and, later, collaborating in the construction of oral and written--and filmed--narratives (Graves, 1983; Heath, 1988). These experiences form an integral part of learning to be participants in a literate society. With the
progressively greater demands of formal literacy instruction, however, a tacit transformation of the role of stories begins: what was once a predominately collaborative activity becomes a private, even competitive quest for the "facts" within the text that are subsequently demonstrated in pencil-and-paper tests. This transition is mirrored by the concentration of research on the private dimensions of older learners' responses.

The focus on the processes and products of literary response is rooted in the assumption that the responses of developing readers to literary texts offer clues to the bettering of literature teaching and ultimately to the cultivation of autonomous, critical readers and thinkers. The reader response perspective is thus simultaneously an analytic and a pedagogic stance which seeks to link theory to practice. This position opposes research and teaching which see the text and the teacher as the primary sources of meaning and relegates learners to a receptive function that is punctuated by periodic performances of reading competence such as classroom tests (Hynds, 1990b; Dias, 1990).

An overview of several models of literary response follows. A subsequent section will summarize the principle strands of empirical research that these models have inspired.
Models of Literary Response

A number of related models of the response process have informed studies of this array of phenomena both within and outside of specific educational settings.

Rosenblatt's (1983) Transactional Theory sees the reader and the text as active agents in the construction of the "poem" or literary work, transforming and being transformed by the transaction. The transaction is governed by the reading attitude or stance adopted by the reader, which Rosenblatt describes as moving along a continuum between "efferent" or informational and "aesthetic" or artistic. The reader's stance is in turn a function of the interplay between his or her "internalized culture" and the "culture" or set of ideas and values encoded in the text.

In earlier work (1938), Rosenblatt argued against the notion that meaning resides in the text based on subjects' responses to unfamiliar works of literature. These responses revealed rudimentary interpretive frameworks based on background knowledge and expectations which were renegotiated or transformed as the text unfolded. Rosenblatt emphasized the two-fold nature of this negotiation by characterizing reader expectations and initial responses as the personal element, and the text which was shared and interpreted as the social element. The interplay between
the personal and social constitutes a transaction through which meaning is created by readers under the guidance of the text.

In his Literature-as-Transformation model, Holland (1975) employs a psychoanalytic framework to describe how five students reading a short story responded in ways that were consistent with their personality profiles as established through psychological tests and interviews. Holland posits that the meaning-making process is motivated by a psychological "identity theme" by which readers match their own ways of understanding and coping with the world with elements of the text.

Bleich's (1978) Subjective Paradigm emphasizes the critical role of the community of readers in negotiations between a reader's initial response and the new knowledge that is created when responses are shared and discussed. Bleich, like Rosenblatt, believes that comprehension is demonstrated and confirmed or modified through transactions within an interpretive community of readers. These transactions, he asserts, determine what the text is about and what it is important to know, think, and feel about it.

Culler (1975) and Fish (1980) examine reader response in terms of linguistic and literary competence, each, like both Bleich and Rosenblatt, invoking the importance of the
community or culture in determining appropriate reading
atitudes and modes of response. Culler contends that a set
of reading conventions which are based on community notions
of appropriateness (which he terms "literary competences")
guide readers in making meaning. Similarly, Fish's
Competency Model is based on the belief that the
interpretive strategies used by "informed" readers are
determined by the norms, values, and language system that
readers in a given community share. For Fish, there is thus
no inherent meaning in a text; meaning resides rather within
the continually re-negotiated and evolving consensus of the
community.

Iser (1972) proposes a phenomenological theory of
reading in which a reader responds with creativity and
imagination to fill in gaps in the inherently incomplete
"instructions" that a text provides the reader, yielding a
"gestalt" of the text. The result is far more creative than
the original, for the reader's response joins those of other
readers in a negotiation whose result is the literary
text/experience. As Iser (1980) states:

The convergence of text and reader
brings the literary work into existence,
and this convergence can never be
precisely pinpointed, but must always
remain virtual, as it is not to be
identified either with the reality of
the text or with the individual disposition of the reader. (p. 50)

Actual studies of readers responding to literature inevitably are less poetic and pure in their outcomes than theory and models. According to Bleich (1980), empirical studies of response also vary subtly but importantly in the ways in which they construe what it means to gain or possess literary knowledge. Moreover, studies of actual readers tend most often to consider only the factors influencing individual responses rather than the complex dialectic between individual experience and social context that is crucial to the models of Culler, Fish, and Bleich.

**Studies of Reader’s Responses**

The composite picture of L1 literary response suggests that it is a cluster of phenomena and factors whose influence may to some extent be traced separately for the purposes of individual studies. Broadly stated, these factors include reader variables such as stance, age or development, and gender; text variables such as genre, intertextuality, tone, and structure; response processes and characteristics; and the social and/or instructional context.
Notably, problems of comprehension and actual language learning figure rarely if at all in the considerations of these studies; the entire concept of literary understanding as it relates to purely linguistic understanding has more complicated connotations in an L2 setting than in an L1 setting. It is nevertheless the case that the public negotiation of the literal meaning of the text and its private analog in recall and retelling are linked, if somewhat differently, to processes of comprehension in either setting.

**Reading Stance**

Readers' interpretive behaviors in responding to texts have been found to be systematic and to depend, among other things, on a variety of psychological and attitudinal factors termed, following Harding (1968) "stance". As is the case for descriptions of the content of response statements, each researcher's descriptive system adopts a subtly different stance on stance, hindering precise comparison of studies but offering a variety of perspectives and a global view of the character, content, and structure of literary responses.
Dillon (1982), for example, found that secondary school readers' written responses to a story revealed three basic styles of reading--Character-Action-Moral, Digger for Secrets and Anthropologist--and that readers showed evidence of understanding life and literature in similar ways.

Hunt and Vipond (1986) discovered that college students' reading stance was influenced by their understanding of the text, their approval or, frequently, their disapproval of character behavior, and whether or not they read the text with a "story-driven" or a "point-driven" orientation. These stances appear loosely to correspond to Applebee's (1978) "spectator" and "participant" stances and to Langer's (1990) "stepping into" and "stepping out of" stances relative to the text.

Galda (1982) conducted a case study of three fifth grade girls' individual and group responses to two novels. Using nine categories of response, she found that, although each subject had her own predominant style of response, perspective and concept of story most influenced the ability to maintain a spectator stance. In a subsequent longitudinal study of the oral responses of thirty-five fourth, sixth, and eighth grade students, Galda (1990) examined the spectator stance as a function of age and
genre. Her findings indicate that stance changes across developmental level, genre, and classroom context.

In an international study of fourteen and seventeen year olds' response preferences across ten countries and different literary texts, Purves, Foshay, and Hansson (1973) found that differences in preferred responses reflected the particular response emphasis of the literature curriculum of the individual countries.

Langer (1990) describes the stances that readers adopt toward literary and informational texts in a study whose structure echoes Rosenblatt's (1978) "efferent" versus "aesthetic" stances. Literary meaning-making among seventh and eighth graders entailed students' explorations of a "horizon of possibilities", whereas in reading informational texts, students maintained a "dogmatic" point of reference, adding new details to clarify rather than to change or transform meaning. Langer's four stances--being in and stepping into, being in and moving through, stepping back and re-thinking, and stepping out and objectifying--suggest a wide range of possible shifts in the relationship between reader, text, and audience of response that may be factors in the evolution of a reader's understanding.
Development of Literary Response

Appleyard (1990) provides a broad overview of what it means to become a reader of literature from childhood through adulthood by synthesizing theory and empirical studies. He proposes a system for characterizing the "roles" that readers take in what he terms a "fairly predictable sequence" as they progress through and go beyond the educational process to become mature, autonomous readers.

In the preschool years, the child is "The Reader as Player", a listener and player in a fantasy world in which confidence in actually molding stories is emergent. The school-age child is "The Reader as Hero or Heroine", a period marked by the child's placing him- or herself at the center of stories, which constitute an escape from everyday experience. Adolescent readers are "Readers as Thinkers", regarding stories as sources of insights into "the meaning of life, values, and beliefs worthy of commitment, and authentic role models for imitation". For "The Reader as Interpreter", literature becomes the object of systematic study. Typically an English major, graduate student, or teacher, this reader approaches literature as a body of knowledge with its own rules, principles, and theories. In a final developmental stage, "The Pragmatic Reader" may read
in several ways that combine or adapt the previous roles; the key element of this role is that the reader is conscious of (and controls) the purposes and reasons for which he or she reads.

Examinations of the relationship between response and developmental level and/or age are relevant to the present study because they provide a portrait of the evolution of the literary competence of readers some of whom eventually find themselves in FL literature classrooms. Moreover, there is a strong possibility that L2 readers either partially revert--or are induced to revert by instructional practice--to response modes and strategies that are characteristic of earlier developmental stages under the multiple burdens of responding accurately in the L2 to unfamiliar and difficult TL texts. It is likely that the combination of the demand for linguistic accuracy and for intelligent response fosters a regression of this kind, limiting the range of response that L2 students of literature exhibit when responding in the L2 and resulting in a hybrid instructional environment.

Applebee (1978) found that, as children mature, they explore stories with patterns of behavior that are progressively further removed from daily experience. Applebee asserts that such distancing from narrative content
may facilitate complex problem solving among children by reducing problems to manageable, patterned levels. He found that gradual mastery of the formal characteristics of narratives paralleled the emergent ability to separate fact from fiction, a finding echoed in findings by Galda (1990, cited in previous section).

Applebee (1976), studying six, nine, and sixteen year-olds' responses to television, comics, stories, and film, found developmental differences but no effect for genre or medium. Of the three age groups, the oldest readers were most likely to distance themselves from the work, more concerned with complexity than readability, and most tolerant of works whose point of view differed from their own. Younger children, by contrast, tended to consider isolated events rather than the story as a whole, and nine year-olds expressed a preference for happy endings and were preoccupied as to whether the story was real or made up. Applebee's 1978 study sought to link these developmental patterns to Piaget's stages in cognitive development. Bunbury (1985) reported similar developmental trends, finding that literal responses declined and inferential responses increased with age among students aged seven, nine, and eleven. Fusco (1983) likewise found parallels
between the cognitive developmental levels (as opposed to age) of middle school children and their literary responses.

Developmental differences have also been found among older learners. Beach and Brunetti (1976) studied the differences between high school and college students, finding that high school students more often projected their self-concept into the characters in the texts. Hynds (1985) found that eleventh graders' cognitive development was positively correlated to their perceptions of character complexity. A relationship was also found between these perceptions of character and inferential comprehension, interest in behavior and motives of characters, and ability to relate a work to other stories.

Parnell (1984) found that cognitive developmental structures evident in the aesthetic responses of children in grades three, six, nine, and twelve and in college tended to follow Piagetian developmental stages, confirming the notion of a cumulative progression of stages posited by Applebee (1978). Svensson (1987) also noted a relationship between age and level of interpretation in the literary responses of eleven, fourteen, and eighteen year-olds.
Reader Knowledge and Attitudes

Knowledge of formal literary conventions has been consistently found to increase with age in tandem with complexity or range of response levels (Svensson, 1985). Meek, et. al. (1983) found that prior knowledge of literary conventions was linked to the students’ ability to understand literary texts. (Readers of L2 literature have also been found to exhibit a relationship between understanding and knowledge of literary conventions [Carrell, 1984; 1987]).

Background experiences, attitudes, interests, and social and cultural differences among readers play a role in literary understanding and in the interpretive characteristics and elaborateness of written literary responses. Beach (1990) found a positive correlation between the level of interpretation and the degree of elaboration in written, responses to short stories among college students. Petrosky (1981) similarly found that those students who elaborated on autobiographical responses were more likely to incorporate personal experiences into their interpretation of novels.
Instructional Context

The effects of curricular emphasis, teaching style and method, mode of response, and the role of collaboration on literary responses have been studied extensively in L1 literature classrooms. The findings in these areas illustrate how appropriate ways of responding to literature are influenced and molded by the instructional environment. For example, among studies examining the influences of instruction on literary response, a number have demonstrated that the overall curricular emphasis of a country or culture was reflected in responses (Purves, Foshay, & Hansson, 1973; Purves, 1975).

Other studies have looked more closely at the nature of literature instruction. Barnes, Barnes, & Clarke (1984) found that, in the United States, the domination of literature lessons by the teacher may interfere with or inhibit the range of response statement types. Purves (1981), Walmsey and Walp (1989), and Applebee (1989) found that less able readers were given fewer opportunities to respond and interpret literature than were better readers. It appears that teachers in these studies felt that weaker students should demonstrate basic comprehension of the objective content of the texts before proceeding to interpretation or more subjective response. The teachers'
belief in a prerequisite level of comprehension revealed by these studies resembles beliefs and practices underlying much FL reading instruction and the FL curriculum as a whole.

The problematics of the distinction between comprehension and response surfaced in a study by Wilson (1966) that examined the responses to three novels of fifty-four college freshmen and showed that classroom discussion of responses tended to increase readers' "interpretive fluency" and that initial self-involvement is necessary to prime the processes of interpretation. In reaching these conclusions, Wilson posed a fundamental question of how to distinguish between a "misreading" or misinterpretation stemming from difficulties of comprehension or inattentive reading from legitimate interpretation. This uncertainty about what constitutes valid interpretation moved Wilson to consider even seemingly flawed interpretive statements as analytically interesting and psychologically valid in their own right.

The interpretive stances that teachers take in literature lessons and the response tasks performed by students appear to define appropriateness locally and to structure significantly how students respond to texts. This was among the findings of Hickman's (1981) study of three
elementary school classrooms. Hillocks (1989) found in a comparative case-study of two teachers' that their quite different assumptions about effective teaching shaped the interpretations and responses of their respective students.

Rogers (1988) found that ninth-grade students tended to prefer to read critical responses to stories they had read that were written from a personal point of view but to adopt retelling and drawing conclusions in think-aloud protocols and, notably, in classroom discussions. The students explained the difference by stating the belief that, in classroom discussions, they should "stick to the text." This disparity between private engagement and publicly shared response appears to be a common consequence of instructional practices that discourage public airing of subjective or personal responses to aesthetic experiences.


The former, an experimental study, explored the effects of three different writing tasks--restricted, personal, and formal analytic--and a no-writing condition on subsequent demonstrations of literary understanding.
For the study, 80 secondary students read, wrote about, and were later tested on four short stories. The delayed "testing" consisted of two parts. For the first post-test, students answered three questions for each story that were intended to elicit description, interpretation, and generalization three days following the reading of the story and the initial writing tasks. For the final post-test, students wrote more extended free essays during the fifth week of the study.

Marshall found that students assigned to the two initial extensive writing groups--personal and formal analytic--were able to write more extensively using a wider variety of interpretive modes than those in the no writing and restricted writing conditions. Most significantly, the free essays showed that both extended writing tasks encouraged not only interpretation but also the citation of evidence from the texts. It was found that the personal response tasks allowed students to draw more on their own experiences and values and to be more tentative and exploratory than the formal task, which encouraged the adoption of a more authoritative tone. Marshall concluded that the choice of a more formal or a more personal approach to students' responses to literature depends upon which one chooses to emphasize and that his study illustrated that
each, in differing ways, helped students to reflect upon and interpret literature.

A related study conducted by Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) examined the differences between personal and formal written responses to two short stories and a variety of dependent variables that included quality of response, audience, function, syntactic complexity, fluency, and types of response statements. The study found that the 65 tenth-grade students who participated in the study tended to write responses that were judged to be of higher quality and more fluent and contained a wider variety of response statements when they were writing in the personal mode than when they wrote in the formal mode. The personal tasks, moreover, appeared to allow the students to adopt a more tentative and hence less authoritative voice that the authors conclude may be more conducive to exploration and experimentation than the narrower and more constraining formal mode. The researchers conclude that their analysis does not suggest that the formal mode of written response is always inappropriate. They point out, however, that the fact that the personal mode resulted in "richer, more compelling top-down interpretations" (p. 51) suggests that the personal mode might have a place as a "bridge" to other forms of discourse and that the very tentativeness that it
evokes might constitute a resource or "tool" for readers as they try to understand and interpret literary texts.

The contrast between the more-or-less private realm of written responses and the public forum of literature lessons and the conflicting "curricula" that they might represent was brought into relief in a study (Marshall, 1989) which sought to uncover the "tacit curriculum" of the literature classroom and to contrast this with students' and teachers' perspectives. The study corroborated Purves' (Purves et al., 1981) finding that description and interpretation of the text characterized a canonical, "academic" approach to literary analysis and appeared to be derived from a New Critical, "close reading" stance. Students' contributions to the lesson were brief and functioned largely to fill in the blanks in the "interpretive agenda" implied by the teachers' questions; the lessons rarely allowed students to help shape this "curriculum".

In the conclusions to the study, Marshall calls for research that compares the differences between the large-group discussion format and written responses in terms of opportunities to develop and explore autonomous and wide-ranging literary responses. Taken together, the two studies conducted by Marshall and the Newell, et al. study suggest that opportunities to write and talk about literature in a
personal mode could serve to complement a more academic, teacher-driven, and analytic mode in promoting full-scale interpretation and literary understanding.

Some studies of the effect of mode of response--written or spoken, private or public--have tended to confirm the above insights by revealing differences in the ways that readers talk about texts depending on the nature of the task. Harste (1986) examined private aspects of the written journal responses of graduate students to a novel. He found that connections to other texts, background knowledge, and life situations were made in private reflection before writing or "off the page" but were not perceived as relevant to academic discussions about literature. Petrosky (1981) compared college students' personal journal responses to formal essays about the same texts, finding that students who elaborated more in their personal writing had a higher degree of interpretation in their essays. This was echoed in Marshall's (1987, cited above) study of the influence of writing on students' literary understanding, which showed that extended personal writing and formal analytic writing tasks evoked different authorial voices but were both conducive to more and deeper written discussion several weeks after the initial writing.
Other studies have examined the collaborative learning environment that characterizes elementary school classrooms and, to a lesser extent, secondary and college level classrooms. Social interaction, which, as previously noted, virtually vanishes from the sanctioned curriculum—and from the research base—after elementary school, has been found to contribute to interest and amount and quality of response (Cullinan, Harwood, & Galda, 1983; Wilson, 1976). Studies by Dyson (1991), McPhail (1979), and Taylor (1986) also corroborated the importance of social interaction with peers in promoting participation and engagement in narratives. In adolescent and college-aged populations, collaborative meaning-making in small groups without direct mediation by an instructor has likewise been found to promote interest and a broader range of response to literature (Ericson, 1984; Petrosky, 1975; Straw, 1986).

**Synthesis**

The L2 reading data-base offers an understanding mostly of the psychological parameters of the comprehension of L2 texts by individual readers; the social and contextual dimensions, as well as the educational processes that follow comprehension in actual classrooms, are less well represented.
There is evidence that the product of each encounter between a reader and an L2 text is a unique interaction of reader factors--cultural and other kinds of knowledge, L2 knowledge and skills, metacognitive strategies--and text factors. But the psychological variables, contexts, and purposes of encounters with texts and the ways in which the various factors interact are different in L2 reading from L1 reading and vary across languages, levels, and individual learners. L2 readers rely upon their prior knowledge of how texts work, the inherent redundancy and complexity of authentic texts, their emergent but incomplete linguistic and cultural knowledge of the L2, and their metacognitive and academically learned strategies to make meaning from texts. If it is adequately "accurate", the meaning that they make resembles the meaning that other L2 readers make of the same texts, but is inevitably different from that made by native readers of the same texts.

Although direct evidence supporting different reading processes for literary texts is lacking, it appears that reader knowledge of narrative conventions facilitates comprehension and may aid readers in overcoming difficulties with linguistic features of L2 literary texts. It is also likely that L2 literature lessons characteristically fail to take into account the emergent understandings of the
students, resulting in teacher-driven discussions of literature that may be over (or under) the students' heads. This "mismatch" between teachers' agendas and students' understandings, coupled with a collaborative effort to "keep the ball rolling", may hinder autonomous meaning-making and learning as well as camouflage real problems of comprehension under a veil of well-intentioned displays of knowledge by learners and acceptance of these displays by teachers as evidence of learning.

The term "procedural display" (Bloome, 1985, cited in Bernhardt, 1991) has been used to describe observed classroom behaviors that result from the tacit social or contract between teachers and learners to "get the lesson done". The procedural display phenomenon is cited as a plausible explanation for learners' ability to "learn to behave appropriately in educational situations without necessarily learning academic content" (Bernhardt, 1991, p. 181) and has been documented in classroom studies that show how students learn to appear literate without learning to use written language to interpret or produce meaning (e.g., DeStefano, Pepinsky, & Sanders, 1982).

What is most evident from L2 reading studies is that, despite great potential for "misreadings" or a "mismatch" of students and texts, students of even modest proficiency
levels are able to make some meaning from authentic L2 texts, whether literary or not. The few studies of actual L2 readers reading literary texts confirm that, when disposed to do so and given the opportunity, they are able to read, recall, and respond meaningfully to literary texts. Much of the tension between what students can do and what they actually display in classroom reading lessons appears to result from the wide-spread practice of conducting the lessons entirely in the target language. This practice may so sharply constrain students' potential contributions that it results in a vast intellectual and linguistic disparity between what they know and what they are able to comprehend or express under the real-time demands of spoken target language discourse.

The contribution of the L1 literary response data-base to the present study is capital due to the dearth of such studies in L2. Taken as a whole, these studies comprise a mosaic view of the nature and developmental and contextual determiners of responses to literature but does not, as Bleich (1980) suggests, succeed wholly in transcending a view of a literary text as a stable object. This limitation appears to stem from the difficulty of translating the abstract principles of reader response theory into the practice of enquiry into the products and processes of
response by actual readers. The following section will attempt to synthesize what may be concluded from a review of the L1 response-centered research data-base.

The study of L1 literary response has focused predominately on individual learner differences. Many studies have been grounded in different ways in the search for an understanding of the phenomenon of “stance”, or how and why readers position themselves relative to texts and to the audience of their responses to texts. Stance has been defined in a variety of ways, but is generally considered to consist of a dynamic continuum ranging from what Rosenblatt terms “efferent” to “aesthetic”. These studies suggest that readers differ in the stances that they adopt towards reading and responding to literary texts and that the instructional context is an important factor in determining stance. In addition, attitude, schooling, background knowledge, and other social, cultural, and psychological factors influence the stances that readers of literature adopt.

Mode of response appears to be a significant variable that is linked to the instructional context and to the individual teacher’s preferred mode, which is in turn a product of the culture of schooling and the kind of response that it values most highly. Children are progressively led
during schooling away from a personal and interactive pattern of response towards a more solitary and analytic pattern. Teacher-led literature lessons appear to follow a pattern that encourages the view that the dual authority of the text and the teacher takes precedence over the personal or experiential contributions of individual readers. When students are allowed the opportunity to respond in less constrained circumstances in small groups or in personal writing, they are readily able to do so. Furthermore, personal and collaborative responses contribute as much as more structured, analytic modes of response to literary understanding and interpretation as well as to improved attitudes about literature. It seems that literature lessons may constitute an inherently more constraining format for responding to literature than discussions among groups of readers or the more reflective, private activity of writing.

It is clear that the theoretical turn away from the quest for the intended meaning of texts and other art objects and towards the effects that they produce in readers and viewers has provided the basis for a rich body of studies that offer a glimpse not only of how students and teachers "do" literature but of what they can do when offered opportunities for "rewriting the text of the work
within the texts of [their] lives" (Barthes, 1985, quoted in Scholes, 1991, p. 1). The most salient single finding that appears to result from a focus on readers and on what readers in school contexts do after reading is that a great deal of instructional energy is expended in channeling students' responses into formal analytic modes and away from personal or impressionistic modes, which appear to be dominant elements of "naïve" or uninstructed responses to aesthetic experiences. This belies an apparent cultural predisposition to view the personal as inherently less valuable or instructive than rigorous and dispassionate argumentation.

The literature-teaching profession claims to promote autonomy and "critical thinking" and to value a range of aesthetic responses, but examination of literature instruction casts doubt on such optimism. Studies of the interactive dynamics of classroom lessons beyond elementary school reveal that the practice of literature may ultimately restrain the development of interpretive autonomy by endorsing a normative view of literary texts and of how they fit into broader social, educational, and intellectual purposes. This tension between the declared curriculum and the functioning curriculum observed in literature lessons inevitably frustrates the disposition to personal and other
kinds of engagement with literature--a potential third, student curriculum--that surfaces in studies of response that allow students to express themselves more freely. This may in turn ultimately hinder literary understanding and engender or abet the perpetuation of negative attitudes towards the study of literature.

Finally, when the study of response is framed in a non-judgmental way, the question of what constitutes an ideal relationship between readers, texts, and teachers (not to mention critics) and what the outcome of developing readers' encounters with literature ought to be becomes highly problematic. With the gradual erosion of a belief in the stability of texts and the concomitant decline of the view that the purpose of studying literature is to absorb the best of what has been thought and said across the ages, it seems useful to ask whether prevailing interpretive practices continue to be optimal for promoting literary understanding, for the broader curriculum, or for the development of critical readers and thinkers. And, although this same set of questions is relevant to the L2 setting, subtle--and less subtle--differences between the L1 and L2 contexts suggest that the answers and the implications that they might hold for instruction are likely to be different as well.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Participants and Setting

The participants comprised a single intact group of approximately fifteen intermediate level college learners of French enrolled in an introductory literature class. The students are all native English speakers with little or no prior exposure to French-language literature and are either French majors or minors in the Department of French and Italian at a large Mid-western land-grant institution. The few exceptions were taking the class to fulfill a fifth quarter language requirement for the major of International Studies. The students in the class were either second, third, or fourth year university students who have completed the basic four-quarter language sequence. With the few exceptions mentioned, the group was assumed to have been successful in the four-quarter basic language sequence (French 101-104) or its equivalent and to be motivated to pursue their study of French beyond the intermediate level.
The instructor is a proficient non-native speaker of French who has a doctorate in French literature and is experienced in teaching the course.

The stated objectives of the course are to introduce students to literary, thematic, and analytic vocabulary that they will need in subsequent French studies and to familiarize them with selected French-language literary and cultural readings. In curricular terms, therefore, the course serves in principle to bridge the two divisions within the department: language study and literary scholarship. Because it is considered both a language and a literature class, discussions are intended to elicit as much student participation as possible, are held entirely in French, and habitually include both small-group and frontal, teacher-led lessons.

The course readings consists of well-known, authentic French-language literary and cultural texts, the majority of which are poems, essays, and excerpts from longer works of prose fiction contained in an anthology intended for third-year French classes. In addition to the principal readings from the anthology, students also read, discuss, and write about one full-length play and one short full-length novel. In the course syllabus, the anthology readings are described
as "intensive reading" and the two complete works as "extensive reading."

Written work for the course, all in French, consists of two modes: Students write three formal, out-of-class compositions during the quarter and keep a less formal but structured "critical journal" which they submit each week for the instructor's response. The instructor does not explicitly evaluate the journals but includes them as a small percentage of the course grade.

This was the third year that the department had offered this intermediate level introductory literature course. The course is in large part designed to address problems of student preparedness reported by faculty responsible for teaching upper division undergraduate literature courses. In addition to this primary function, by serving as a prerequisite for further French studies, the course functions as a potential "filter" for future majors.

As discussed in the statement of the problem, the course, the make-up of the student population, and the problems of student preparedness for further literature study that the course addresses are emblematic of a generally recognized problem within the profession (Benseler, 1991; Davis, 1992; James, 1989; Kramsch, 1985; Swaffar, 1991) and appear to be typical of post-secondary
foreign language departments. The study seeks to explain in what ways students' French language development interacts with their literary competence and initial exposure to the demands of literary scholarship as they respond to authentic French-language literary texts privately and publicly. The procedures are as follows.

**Research Design and Data Collection**

The study is structured around three phases of data collection which spanned the length of the ten-week duration of the course. The purpose of the first phase was to observe and describe the ambient features of the day-to-day proceedings of the class and desensitize participants to the presence of the researcher. The second phase involved data collection of two literary events. The purpose of the third phase, a student questionnaire and teacher interview, was to elicit student profiles and student and teacher attitudes.

**Phase I**

The method of data collection is classroom observation with video-recordings and accompanying observational fieldnotes. The researcher observed two complete class meetings of the same class. One of these meetings was
video-recorded for comparison to subsequent class meetings and as needed to aid in analyzing them.

The rationale for this period of observation is threefold. First, it provides the descriptive backdrop against which the literary events that are the focus of the study took place and confirms that their structure reflects that of the routine proceedings of this classroom. Second, the initial observation period informed the validation and amendment of the analytic systems that was used to examine and compare public and private modes of response. Third, this period permitted the learners and instructor to become accustomed to the presence of the observer and of the video-recorder.

**Phase II**

The second phase of the study consisted of two complete literary events, one in the sixth week of the quarter, and one in the eighth week. Data collection for the events involved a two-part initial written response following the in-class reading of a short prose literary text in French, the video-recording and transcription of a teacher-led discussion about the text, and an out-of-class interpretive/analytic essay. The readings for the events were approximately one to one and a half pages in length and
were determined to be of similar difficulty by three instructors who have taught the course. The initial written responses included a recall protocol task in which students wrote down in the language with which they are most comfortable everything that they remembered about the text, and an initial response in paragraph form (see Appendix for prompts). The formal essay was a formal one-page written response in French for which the teacher supplied a prompt or question.

The structure of the literary events is derived from a prototypical literature lesson as observed and experienced by the researcher, who has taught the course, and corroborated by two other instructors of the course and the L1 literary response research base. The prototype on which the study is based involved three phases: (1) a private reading phase, customarily preceded by introductory information about the text, author, and theme; (2) a public lesson phase, characterized by teacher guidance, mediation, and modeling of interpretation/response in a large-group discussion format (Golden, 1988; Marshall, 1989); and (3) a private, written response that may or may not approximate formal academic/critical writing.
The text genres, themes, and content as well as the lesson and essay task that are the focus of the study are thus consistent with the typical proceedings of the intermediate level FL literature class. The structure of the events was slightly modified, however, for the purpose of the study. First, the texts were read in class rather than prior to class. Second, due to time and reader memory constraints, the readings were restricted to short prose literary texts. Third, although the teacher customarily includes a small-group segment "somewhere around the middle" of her lessons, the events featured by the study were large-group discussions with a brief small-group task at the beginning of the lesson. The small-group interactions do not figure in the analysis of the lesson because, as Marshall (1989) also found, they tend to be inaudible.

The rationale for the two-part initial written response is as follows. The recall task yields a measure of literal comprehension and hence provides a base-line for subsequent analysis of private and public literary response. The rationale for the initial response is that it constitutes an informal context that has been found to evoke autobiographical and engagement type response statements (Beach, 1972; Juracek, 1988; Monseau, 1986) and is roughly consistent with the critical journal mode of writing used in
the class. The two-part initial response offers an indication of the literary text both as a source of "objective" information and of a "subjective," aesthetic experience.

The rationale for the small-group discussion that preceded the teacher-led lesson is that, according to the teacher, such tasks serve to build student confidence, reinforce literal comprehension through group negotiation, and focus their attention on problematic linguistic features of the texts prior to the lesson proper. Because literature lessons are predominately teacher-led in general and certainly were in this teacher's classroom, the focus of the study was on the teacher-led segments of the lesson.

The rationale for the writing task is that it conforms to expectations of what it means to "do" literature in an academic setting and provides training in the analytic mode that is the core of upper level literature study. In terms of the study, the essay is considered to represent the culmination of private and public processes of comprehension and response. More globally, extended writing has been posited by Marshall (1987, 1989) as an equal opportunity for all students to participate in the interpretive process that promotes literary understanding and is not provided by the public lesson.
As mentioned, the two events were integrated as unobtrusively as possible into the course syllabus. The first event served to further desensitize the students and teacher to the presence of the researcher and video-camera as well as to provide information about appropriateness of procedures and methods of analysis of written and video-recorded data.

The researcher believes that the degree of intrusiveness of the events was minimal partly because they followed the customary pattern of lessons and partly because the texts used were chosen by the course instructor for contiguity with the genres and themes around which the course is organized and the lessons were planned by the instructor with no input from the researcher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Procedure for Each Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;Une famille&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>- Teacher introduced and distributed text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Students read the text, taking necessary time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Students responded in writing to 2 prompts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Recall Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher led lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher assigned essay as homework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Description of Procedures
Phase III

During the final week of the course, students completed an open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix) regarding their literary preferences, attitudes, and experiences and French-language backgrounds. In addition, they were asked to describe their perceptions of the purposes of studying French-language literature and to evaluate their own performance in the class and abilities in producing and understanding written and spoken French.

The rationale for the questionnaire is to gain additional information as an aid in analyzing and interpreting the event data. The questionnaire responses provided information about student perceptions and evaluations of their own learning, as well as debriefed them and provided them with a sense of closure in their participation in the study.

The teacher was debriefed following each of the events in order to verify the researcher's global impressions about the lesson. More importantly, the debriefings aided in interpretation and provided insights into her perceptions of the "curriculum" (Marshall, 1989) represented by her course and instruction.
| PHASE I          | Observation of two class meetings | Observational field notes of two class meetings  
|                 |                                  | Video recording of one class meeting              |
| PHASE II        | Two literary events              | Two-part written response for each event: Recall Protocol  
|                 |                                  | Personal Response                                
|                 |                                  | Video-recording and written transcript of class discussion  
|                 |                                  | Formal out-of-class interpretive/analytic essays for each event |
| PHASE III       | Student questionnaire  
Teacher interview | Open-ended student questionnaire data and notes from interview with the teacher |

Figure 2. *Summary of Research Design and Data Collection*
Response behaviors—generally the content of written or spoken response statements—have been found to vary systematically according to individual factors such as developmental traits, gender, age, background, and knowledge of conventions of literature. These patterns have given rise to a number of taxonomies, although Applebee (1978) warns that such systems may oversimplify the complex processes that they seek to explain.

Richards (1929), in a widely cited study of the literary responses of university students, developed a taxonomy comprised of eleven types of statements. His categories are laden, however, with judgmental terms like "oversentimentality, mnemonic irrelevancies, inhibition" that undermine the system's usefulness as an analytic tool that is free of prejudice towards particular kinds of response.

Squire (1964) used a six-category system for coding statements in responses to short stories that includes association, prescriptive judgment, self-involvement, narrative reaction, interpretation, evaluation, and miscellaneous. Purves and Rippere (1968) trimmed Squire's system to five categories, substituting engagement and
perception for Squire's first four types. This system appears to be among the most widespread in the study of literary responses and is used in the present study in a form that was slightly modified by Newell, Suszynski, & Weingart (1989; see Appendix).

Applebee (1978) included only four categories in his system for analyzing oral responses: narration, summarization, analysis, and generalization. Kintgen's (1983) and Dias and Hayhoe's (1988) categories were specifically developed for analyzing responses to poetry. Hynds (1987) divided statements according to whether they were "text-invoked" or "reader-invoked", while Nissel (1987) divided them according to the source of the statement in the narrative itself: characters, events, or themes. Hillocks and Ludlow (1984) divide responses by identification (echoing Bleich) and inference. Marshall (1987) employed a six-point system that classified responses according to levels of interpretation and was incorporated into the elaborate system for analyzing literature lessons that will be used in the present study (Marshall, 1989; see Appendix).

The data from the first phase of the study, observational field notes of two class meetings and video-recording of one meeting, were examined by the instructor of the course as a member check to insure that the structure of
the literature lessons and interactive patterns of the events of the study were consistent with other class meetings.

The data from the literary events were analyzed as follows:

1. The recall protocols were scored using the Johnson system (1981) of proposition weighting in order to furnish a base-line measure of comprehension upon which to base the analysis of the public and private literary responses. The separation of the original text and the recall protocols into propositions (operationalized as "breath groups"), the assignation of weight to the propositions in the texts, and the computation of final scores for each recall protocol were performed by three trained bilingual raters. Disagreements between raters were negotiated. The scoring of native language recall protocols using weighted propositions is judged by Bernhardt (1991) to most accurately reflect comprehension of L2 texts.

2. The initial responses were coded using a taxonomy of response statements (Newell, Suszynski, & Weingart, 1989), which were derived from a well-established method for analyzing the content of literary responses and is intended to accommodate the full range of statements that may occur in responses to aesthetic experiences.
It has been found in numerous L1 studies that untutored literary responses (also known as free association responses) differ significantly from responses following large-group discussions and teacher-led lessons and that the differences offer evidence of a process of convergence between a learner/reader "curriculum" and a teacher "curriculum" (Marshall, 1989). Other studies (e.g., Golden, 1988; Kintgen & Holland, 1984; Marshall, 1989; Taylor, 1986) that have examined the dynamics of teacher and student interaction during literature lessons have offered insights into how meaning is constructed and negotiated publicly as well as how this construction mediates between private reading and response and more formal literary behaviors.

Three trained and calibrated raters checked the division of the material into T-units and coded each unit according to the taxonomic system. T-units are a unit of analysis that is associated with the analysis of written discourse and are defined by Hunt (1977) as "a single main clause...plus whatever other subordinate clauses or non-clauses are attached to, or embedded within, that one clause." (pp. 92-93). Disagreements were negotiated. The method of establishing inter-rater agreement through negotiation is recommended by Patton (1990). A further rationale for establishing trustworthiness in this manner is
that coding using the Marshall system (see below) entails such an elaborate, multi-level coding of a single communication unit (as many as four separate hierarchical codings per CU) that statistical methods of computing inter-rater agreement would be excessively unwieldy and impracticable.

The video-recordings of the literature lessons were transcribed and divided into communication units (identifiable utterances on a single subject that range from "sentences" to single words [Marshall, 1989]) and analyzed using Marshall's system for coding classroom discourse. The basic unit of analysis of the Marshall system is the Communication Unit (CU), which he defines as "having the force of a sentence, though they may be as short as one word." CUs further "represent an identifiable remark or utterance on a single subject" (p. 4). CUs are compatible with the T-Unit used in the Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart taxonomy; T-Units and Communication Units share the same semantic boundaries, but the syntactic boundaries are in accordance with written or spoken language respectively. The communication unit (CU) is thus the equivalent in spoken discourse of the T-unit, which will be the term applied in the study for written discourse.
The interactive patterns of the lesson as well as the types of response statements (a correlate of the Purves and Rippere taxonomy used for written responses) are accounted for by Marshall's system, which provides a detailed method of categorizing the language and structure of classroom discussions of literary texts. Amendment of both the Marshall and Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart systems was necessary in order to reflect the language-learning dimension of the FL setting.

The full rationale for using two systems to analyze the lesson is that the Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart system, while providing an analytic framework for written responses, is unable to reflect the dialogic nature and interactional patterns of the lesson. The Marshall system, which incorporates the same categories of response types as the Newell, Suszynski, & Weingart system, is sensitive to these patterns and consequently enables a comprehensive analysis of the ways in which student responses are shaped or modeled by the instructor in the lesson. Analysis of the discourse patterns of the lessons also provides information regarding language learning elements of the lesson, the dynamics of the relationship between surface comprehension and interpretation in the lesson, and the respective roles of
the participants in "constructing" (Golden, 1988) a collective response.

The essays were scored in two ways; first they were rank-ordered by two experienced instructors of the course, who also provided comments on the quality of each essay both in terms of French writing and as a literary response appropriate to the level of the participants.

Second, essays were scored using the Newell, Suszynski, & Weingart (1989) system for coding literary response statements that was used to analyze the initial responses.

The final stage of analysis assumes that the written essay responses constituted the end-products of an evolutionary process that began with the private interaction of readers and texts (of which the recall protocols represent a summary record) and developed during the literature lesson. Treating the events separately, the analysis seeks to document this evolution as it progressed from the immediate recall protocol and initial response through the lesson and culminated in the written essay.

The data from the student questionnaires were used to elucidate interpretation of the other data. The report of the questionnaire responses comprises an account of overall patterns of student literary preferences, interests, and past experiences as factors in their responses to
literature. The teacher debriefings following the lessons served as a member check that aided in the description of the instructional episodes of the lessons by indicating her intentions in organizing and conducting the lessons and providing her assessment of their relative success.

Pilot Study

Introduction

A pilot study was conducted using data collected in a different section of the introductory French literature course that was taught by the same instructor and using one of the same texts as the primary data. There were sixteen students enrolled in the pilot section, all of whom consented in writing to participate in the study and were aware of its nature and purpose and what their participation would entail.

The principal purpose of the pilot analysis was to confirm the appropriateness of the analytic framework to the private/public, process-oriented conceptual framework of the study. The pilot served to develop and test amendments to the Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) and Marshall (1989) systems and to train the researcher and raters in their use. The pilot study did not include assessment of the essays nor analysis of questionnaires.
Phase One of the pilot study, as of the main study, consisted of observations of two routine lessons and a video-recording of one lesson.

Phase Two took place during the fifth week of the Spring Quarter of 1993. The students read and wrote two-part initial responses (a recall protocol and an initial response) to a one and one half page, unedited and unglossed short story by Guy de Maupassant entitled, "Une famille" [A Family]. The instructor then collected the responses and distributed a worksheet that was the stimulus for small-group work. The group task consisted of a list of standard French-language expressions to which the groups were instructed to match less standard synonyms that occurred in the text, and a prompt asking them to identify and list the themes that the text seemed to develop. The thirty-two minute teacher-fronted lesson began after eleven minutes of group work. At the end of the lesson, the students were asked by the instructor to write an out-of-class, one-page essay in French in which they developed a theme of their choice that was related to the text.
Descriptive Data

During the first phase of the pilot study, the researcher and the instructor examined the fieldnotes resulting from the observation of two class meetings and the video-recording of one class meeting and agreed that, except for the fact that students customarily read the texts at home, the design of the literary events was a reasonable approximation of routine lessons in her classroom. Further, all lessons tended to follow strikingly similar patterns of interaction and episodic “routes” and to culminate in an out-of-class writing task. Writing tasks for the class included both personal writing in dialogue journals and more formal essay tasks.

The lessons, although predominately teacher-led, consistently incorporated at least one small group task, often in conjunction with a teacher-prepared worksheet.

In the second analytic phase of the pilot study, the immediate recall protocols were scored using the Johnson (1981) system of proposition weighting. The text contained a total of 121 propositions, which were assigned the following values: 30 were Level 4, 30 were Level 3, 31 were Level 2, and 30 were Level 1. With proposition values assigned, a perfect recall score is 302. The division of the texts into propositions and the assignment of weights to
them was performed by three bilingual raters; the few disagreements were negotiated.

**Summary of Descriptive Data for Recall Protocols**

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and highest (maximum) and lowest (minimum) scores for pilot study participants on the Recall Protocol (n=16). The mean recall score is 79.2 of a possible 302, and the standard deviation is 28.26. The maximum score is 144 and the minimum score is 44. Of the 121 propositions that comprise the text, the mean number of these included in student recalls is 24.6, and the standard deviation is 9.46. The range between maximum and minimum scores is 12 to 49.

Level 4 propositions are those that correspond to the skeleton or plot of the story. Of the 30 Level 4 propositions, 13 is the mean number recalled, and the standard deviation is 3.98. The range is 8 to 18. For the 30 Level 3 propositions, the mean number recalled is 5.7, and the standard deviation is 4.04. The range is 1 to 16. For the 31 Level 2 propositions, 4.37 is the mean number recalled, and the standard deviation is 2.06, with a range of 1 to 9. There are 30 Level 1 propositions, and the mean recall score of them is 1.56 with a standard deviation of 1.59 and a range of 0 to 6.
Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Recall Protocols (n=16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recall Score (of 302)</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number Props Recalled (of 121)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number Props Recalled (by Type)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Level 4 (of 30)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Level 3 (of 30)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Level 2 (of 31)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Level 1 (of 30)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Descriptive Data for Initial Responses

The initial response data were divided into T-units by three bilingual raters, who then applied the modified Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) taxonomy of response statements to each unit. Disagreements between raters were negotiated.

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum scores for the 16 pilot study participants (n=16). The mean length (i.e. number of T-units) of the initial responses is 8.1 and the standard deviation is 3.36. The minimum length is 4, and the maximum length is 16. The response statements were categorized responses into five distinct types, with a sixth for responses that fall outside of the five types.
The first type of response statement is termed "Descriptive", and includes statements that literally re-tell the story, low-level inferences, and descriptive references to the story's form, language, setting, or characters. The mean number of descriptive responses is 1.43, the standard deviation is 1.86, and the range is 0 to 6. Half of the participants made statements that fell into this category.

The second statement type is "Personal". These responses include personal reaction to the way an author has crafted the text, and reaction to content—the world of the story. The mean for personal statements is 1.37, and the standard deviation is 1.02. The responses ranged from 0 to 4. Thirteen of the 16 participants made statements that are categorized as personal.

The third type of response statement is "Associative". These statements involve integration of the text with the reader's world knowledge and experience, and can include autobiographical narrative statements. For this category, the mean is 1.18, and the standard deviation is 1.72. The range is 0 to 5. Half of the participants used statements in this category.
The fourth type of statement is "Interpretive." This category involves statements that are inferences about the stylistic devices, the content, or the meaning of the text as a whole. This is the most widely used category, with a mean of 2.06 and a standard deviation of 2.74. Nine participants gave responses that fall into this category. The range is 0 to 10.

"Evaluative" statements comprise the fifth type of responses. Such statements comment on the affective or aesthetic appeal of the text, or evaluate the author's method and significance of the work. This is the least represented category, with a mean of .5 and a standard deviation of .89. The range is 0 to 3, with five participants using this category.

The final category, "Other," describes responses that refer to the task, self-evaluation, or metastatements such as, "I don't know." Use of this category is relatively high in frequency with a mean of 1.56 and a standard deviation of 1.63. The range is 0 to 5, with 11 students offering responses that fall into this category.
Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Initial Responses
(n=16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of T-Units</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Descriptive</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Personal</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Associative</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpretive</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evaluative</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Descriptive Data for Literature Lesson

The class discussion, which lasted approximately forty-five minutes, was video-recorded and transcribed. The Marshall (1989) system (see Appendix) for analyzing the patterns of discourse in literature lessons was used to analyze the transcript.

In addition to communication units, another common feature of the analysis of spoken interaction is the turn, described by Marshall (1989) as "the most obvious boundary in most oral discourse" and consisting of "one or more CUs spoken by a single participant who holds the floor" (p. 4).
The coding system permits the distinction to be made between three levels of organization--classroom episode, speaker turn, and communication unit--and analysis of each CU for linguistic function, knowledge source, and kind of reasoning. There are five basic categories for coding units of classroom discourse employed by the system. Each refers to the function of a given CU: I. Direct, II. Inform, III. Question, IV. Respond, and V. Other. Many of these categories are further divided into sub-categories. The system was amended to accommodate the language learning dimension by adding a category to include "Language Learning" discourse; this category is labelled Category V. Statements that explicitly had to do with grammar, vocabulary, repair or correction of pronunciation or grammar, or elaboration, are categorized and sub-categorized based on the format of the other Marshall categories. Marshall's fifth category, "Other," is labeled Category VI for this study.

The first unit of analysis examined was the turn. The entire lesson consisted of 302 communication units. The teacher uttered 251 of these, and the students account for 69. During the lesson, the number of turns attributed to the teacher is 86, and to the students, 84. The average
The length of the teacher's turns (in CUs) is 2.9 and of the students' turns is 1.2. Table 3 presents these findings.

Table 3
Patterns of Classroom Discourse--Turn Taking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Communication Units</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Turns by Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Turn (in CUs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

The CUs of the lesson were coded according to general discourse function. Three bilingual raters coded the CUs. Differences in coding were negotiated.

The first category of the Marshall System is "Direct". Statements that fall into this category are intended to move auditors toward an action or shift the attention of the audience or the focus of the discussion. The teacher uttered 19 directive statements during the lesson; the students made no directive statements.

The second category, "Inform", includes any statement that is a fact or opinion and whose purpose is to represent what the speaker believes, knows, or thinks about a topic.
The teacher produced 66 informative statements, and the student total is 47.

The third category is "Question", meaning any verbal or non-verbal gesture that invites or requires a response from an auditor. Fifty-five of the 251 teacher-uttered CUs fall into this category, and none were uttered by the students. (The only question asked by a student concerned clarification of a vocabulary word, which falls into the "Language Learning" category that was added to the system for the study.)

The fourth category, "Respond," is for any verbal or non-verbal gesture that acknowledges, restates, evaluates, or otherwise reacts to the nature, quality, or substance of preceding remarks. Sixty CUs in this category came from the instructor and 3 from the students.

The fifth category was added to account for utterances that concern the usage and meaning of features of the FL and includes vocabulary, syntax, and translation. The teacher uttered 50 CUs in this category, and the students, 14.

The sixth category, "Other," includes utterances that do not fit the other categories. For the most part, these are inaudible utterances. The teacher produced one of these, and the students, 5.
Table 4 shows a summary of the findings for the general discourse function of each of 302 CUs that constitute the lesson. The CUs are presented as number of units by speaker.

Table 4

**General Discourse Function—Number of Units by Speaker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of CUs out of 302</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Direct statements</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Informative statements</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Questions</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Response</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Language learning</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

After CUs were coded by general function, they were examined more specifically for type of statement and nature of information. Categories II (Inform), III (Question), IV (Respond), and V (Language Learning) all have multiple levels of subcategories (see Figure 3). The following are the results of further coding of CUs into these specific types.
Category II (Inform) utterances were first coded for nature of information. Analysis of the lesson showed that 113 CUs fall into this category. Of these, all four that concerned classroom management (Logistics) were uttered by the instructor. Eight utterances were quotations or readings from the text; six of these came from the instructor, and two from students who were directed by the instructor to read specific passages from the text. Most of the CUs (101 of 113), however, are considered instructional in nature (Instruction). Fifty-six came from the instructor, and 45 from the students. The students' instructional statements were without exception in reply to direct questions posed by the instructor.

The instructional statements were further coded for knowledge source and kind of reasoning. The first knowledge source possibilities are personal/autobiographical statements about the speaker's own experience. The teacher made one such utterance, as did one student. The second knowledge source, information drawn from the text, was the most widely represented with an equal number of CUs (41) from the instructor and students; information about the text-in-context (e.g., historical period, genre, or biography of the author) was used in 4 CUs from the instructor and one from a student. The fourth knowledge
source is general knowledge information drawn from widely available contemporary culture; only the instructor used this category for four utterances. Information that refers to a previous class, discussion, or reading assignment was the source of knowledge for one teacher statement and no student statements. Information that did not fit the above five sub-categories was listed as "Other," and included utterances concerning hypothetical situations or references to future assignments or work. Five CUs produced by the teacher and 2 by the students fall into this category. Table 5 shows the distribution of CUs that are in Category II (Inform).

Table 5

Distribution Of Inform Statements (Category II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total of CUs in this Category</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by Type of Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Logistics (classroom management)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reads or quotes from text</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional statement</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Table 6 shows the distribution according to the knowledge sources attributed to the instructional statements of Category II (Inform).
Table 6

Knowledge Source for Instructional Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Source</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number of CUs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by knowledge source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Personal/autobiographical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Text</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Text-in-Context</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Generalization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Previous class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Category II utterances were also coded for five kinds of reasoning. The first, summary/descriptive information, concerns literal features of the text and was used in 20 CUs by the instructor and in 11 from students. The second kind of statement, interpretive, derives from inferences about the meaning or significance of the text and was used in 19 teacher CUs and 24 student CUs. Only one utterance from the teacher was categorized as an evaluative statement, one that focuses on the quality or experience of the text; two student utterances fell into this category. Generalizations that move toward theoretical speculation about the nature of characters, authors, texts, or themes account for eight teacher utterances and five student utterances. Finally, statements that do not fall into any of the above types of
knowledge sources are labeled "other." Eight such utterances came from the teacher and three from students. The content of these involved citing historical facts. Table 7 shows a description of the kinds of reasoning for instructional statements found in Category II (Inform):

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Reasoning for Instructional Statements</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number of CUs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by kind of reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Summary/descriptive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Interpretive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Evaluative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Generalization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Communication units that were classified as Category III (Question) statements were further coded as one of two types of statements: classroom logistics or instructional focus. Throughout the lesson, the teacher made 55 utterances that can be interpreted as instructional questions; none were made by the students. All Category III CUs (55) are instructional questions and all of these are from the instructor.
The instructional questions from Category III were further coded for knowledge source and kind of reasoning. Of the teacher's 55 CUs in this category, 5 have a personal/autobiographical knowledge source, 43 are based on the text under discussion, 4 involve the text-in-context, and 3 are considered "other". No generalizations were made. All instructional questions were also coded by the following kinds of reasoning: 20 CUs are summary/descriptive in nature, 22 are interpretive, 2 are evaluative, 6 are generalizations, and 5 are considered "other." Table 8 shows a description of the teacher's instructional questions.
### Table 8

**Focus of Teacher’s Instructional Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#CUs</th>
<th>1. Total number in lesson</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Classroom logistics</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Instructional questions</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Knowledge source for instructional questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Personal/autobiographical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Information about text</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Text-in-context</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Generalization</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Kinds of reasoning for instructional questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Summary/descriptive</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Interpretive</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Evaluative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Generalization</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication units that were coded under Category IV (Respond) were further coded into seven response statement types. Any verbal or non-verbal gesture that acknowledges, restates, evaluates or otherwise reacts to the nature, quality or substance of a previous remark is considered a response statement. Answers to questions are coded as informative statements. A remark coded as a response to a question would ask for clarification or explanation of the question itself or would comment on the value of the question. There were a total of 63 CUs that fall into Category IV. Of these, 2 that are coded as acknowledgements were confirmations that an utterance was heard. The teacher and one student each made such an utterance. The second type, restatement, is an effort to repeat verbatim a previous remark. There are 21 such utterances by the teacher and none by the students. Positive evaluation response statements are positive comments or agreement with a previous remark. Sixteen such utterances were made by the teacher and 2 by students. One statement by the teacher was a negative evaluation response statement. This statement notified a student that she had misunderstood which character from the story was the focus of the instructor's question (line 112):
T: Alors mais ça c'est le bonheur de Simon, d'accord. [Well, but that's the happiness of Simon, OK.]

Response statements which are requests for explanation, elaboration, or clarification of a previous remark are coded under request for information. The teacher made 7 such requests and the students made none. Remarks that move beyond a simple restatement of a speaker's contribution by substantively changing the original speaker's language or by offering an interpretation of what the speaker is saying are coded as elaboration responses. The teacher made 14 such elaborations and the students made none. Neither student nor teacher utterances fell into the category reserved for responses that do not fit the above categories. Table 9 shows a description of the types and number of CUs that fell into the sub-categories of Category III (Response).
Table 9

**Nature Of Response Statements (Category III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number of CUs in this category</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by type of statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Acknowledgement statements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Restatement of previous remark</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Positive evaluation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Negative evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Request for more information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Elaboration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Category V (Language Learning) was added to the Marshall System to accommodate the many communication units in the lesson transcript that specifically concern grammar rules, vocabulary, translation issues, and synonyms that would not normally be found in an L1 literature discussion. Statements of this nature were further coded as one of three types: informative statements, questions, and responses to previous remarks. These categories are consistent with delineations of other categories in the Marshall System.

Of the 64 CUs of the lesson that fall into Category V (Language Learning), 5 that were uttered by the instructor and 11 by the students were labeled as informative statements. All student statements were answers to questions from the teacher. The teacher made 13 utterances.
that fall into the question category; only one student posed a question. The question concerned the meaning of a word used in the text (line 267):

T: ...un jardin qui est très soigné. [a garden that is very well-cared for]
S: soigné?

The teacher made 31 utterances considered to be responses to previous remarks, and students made two such statements. Only one remark by the teacher is coded as other; it is a metastatement that was spoken very softly: "I don't know how to say this in French."

Table 10 describes the focus of Language Learning statements.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Of Language Learning Statements (Category V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total CUs in this category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by Type of statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Informative statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Response to a previous remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16
Communication units that are considered informative statements in Category V (Language Learning) were further categorized as either citation of a grammar rule or answers to a grammar or vocabulary question. The teacher made 4 remarks that concern grammar rules and 1 that answers a vocabulary question. The students made 11 statements (all teacher-solicited) that were answers to vocabulary or grammar questions. Table 11 describes the nature of information for informative statements in Category V.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature Of Information of Category V (Language Learning) Informative Statements</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total CUs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by nature of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Grammar rule or point</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Answer to grammar question</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Vocabulary item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Category V (Language Learning) statements that are considered responses to previous remarks were further coded into five sub-types. The first, acknowledgement, was used once by the teacher and once by a student. The second type, repeat of a previous remark, was used 11 times by the
teacher only. The third type, repair, involves acknowledging an utterance with a correction. The three repair statements were uttered by the teacher. Another possibility, restatement, which rephrases a previous remark, is used once by the teacher only. Elaboration, the finale type of response statement, involves adding information about a word or phrase in a previous remark. The focus of such information, however, is not grammatical but rather semantic and includes definitions of terms. The teacher made 15 such remarks, as did one student. Table 12 describes the nature of responses to Category V Language Learning statements.

Table 12

Nature of Responses to Category V (Language Learning) Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Response</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total CUs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by nature of response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Acknowledgement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Repeat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Repair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Restatement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Elaboration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16
Summary of Descriptive Data for Essays

The final data set for the pilot study consists of an out-of-class essay on the same text used in the recall protocol, initial response, and teacher-led discussion. At the end of the lesson, the teacher instructed the students to write a one-page essay in French on any one of the themes of the text discussed in class and to submit the essay at the following class meeting. Fourteen students returned essays to the researcher. Each essay was divided into T-units and coded according to the Newell, Suszynski and Weingart (1989) taxonomy of response statements. Although the essays were not assessed for quality of French writing or as literary responses, this was performed for the main analysis.

Table 13 presents the means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum scores for the 14 pilot study participants who submitted essays (n=14). The mean length (i.e. number of T-units) of the essays is 19.35 and the standard deviation is 3.87. The minimum length is 14 and the maximum is 25. The Newell, Suszynski, & Weingart (1989) taxonomy of response statements categorizes responses into five distinct types, with a sixth for responses that do not fall into these categories.
The first category of response statements is Descriptive, and includes statements that literally re-tell the story, low-level inferences, and descriptive references to the story’s form, language, setting, or characters. The mean number of descriptive responses is 2.64 and the standard deviation is 2.84. The range between minimum and maximum is 1-8. Nine of the 14 participants’ T-units fall into this category.

The second statement type is Personal. These include personal reaction to the way an author has crafted the text, and reaction to content. The mean for personal statements is .14 and the standard deviation is .36. The responses ranged from 0 to 2. Only 2 participants wrote statements that fall into this category.

Associative statements comprise the third type. These involve integration of the text with the subject’s world knowledge and experience, and include autobiographical narrative statements. For this category, the mean is 10.07, and the standard deviation is 8.78. The range is 1 to 20. Ten of the fourteen participants wrote statements that fall into this category.

The fourth type of response statement is Interpretive. This category describes statements that are inferences about the stylistic devices, the content, or the meaning of the
text as a whole. The mean is 5.64, and the standard
deviation is 5.09. The range is 1 to 13. Eleven of the 14
participants' T-units were coded as associative.

Evaluative statements comprise the fifth type of
responses. Such statements comment on the affective or
aesthetic appeal of the text, or evaluate the author's
method and significance of the work. One participants'
essay contained all 3 evaluative statements that were used
in the essays. For example: *Ce n'est pas une métaphore
plus charitable.* [This is not a more charitable (sic)
metaphor.] Finally, Other is a category for response
statements that refer to the task, self-evaluation,
metastatements, or any other kind of response that does not
fit the previous five categories. One essay contained the
only two such statements.
Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for Essays (n=14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of T-Units</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Descriptive</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Personal</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Associative</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpretive</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evaluative</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Pilot Study Data

The initial phase of the pilot study, which consisted of observations of two routine lessons and the video-recording of a third lesson, confirmed that, except for the fact that students customarily read the texts at home, the schema of the prototypical literary event upon which the study design is based is accurate.

The lessons were conducted entirely in French and without exception included a small group activity that was organized around a teacher-prepared worksheet or its equivalent written on the blackboard. The small groups, by contrast with the orderly and subdued progression of the teacher-led lessons, were quite animated and even loud and the students seemed accustomed both to operating in the
groups and to speaking to each other in French (although some clandestine use of English in the groups was evident). The instructor circulated among the groups and prompted them to continue talking, asked for a report of their progress, or provided input into their discussions.

Lessons tended to follow strikingly similar patterns of interaction and episodic "route" and to culminate in an out-of-class personal or analytic writing task. Except for the small-group work, the lessons were heavily teacher-dominated (mean length of turn 2.9 CUs), with student input frequently consisting of one or two words, particularly when it was in reply to a vocabulary or grammar question or a request for a single-word citation of the text. Other student contributions to the lessons were generally brief (mean length of turn: 1.2 CUs) and in direct response to a teacher question. Questions requiring short answers were by far predominant over questions necessitating or inviting longer answers.

At no time did student remarks or replies address or concern the contributions of other students, nor did students ask any questions during the observation period except for an occasional request for clarification about a vocabulary item. The "IRF" (Initiate-Respond-Feedback) sequence was thus virtually inviolate, and in many instances
the instructor's feedback to the students contained either an overt or camouflaged attempt to correct grammar, vocabulary, or pronunciation as well as a sometimes quite extensive elaboration of a student's response to the original question before proceeding to the next question. The instructor's attempts to embed the correction in the elaboration made the rather subtle distinction between them difficult to draw. The prominence of issues related to language learning such as questions and corrections concerning grammatical form, vocabulary, and pronunciation, is consistent with the instructor's statement, repeated several times in debriefings after the lessons, that she sees this level as much or even more a language class than a literature class. Her emphasis on vocabulary that equipped students to discuss and analyze literature is equally consistent with both objectives. At times, the instructor's feedback to the students revealed that the content of their utterances was indeed secondary to the accuracy of their French.

The instructor made an attempt to address her questions to various individual students when none volunteered to answer, apparently in an attempt to foster participation during the course of the lesson by the maximum possible number of students. On other occasions, students made a
small gesture or merely looked attentively in the teacher's direction to indicate their willingness to respond to a question. Only about five or six students routinely volunteered in this way, and the other students appeared to communicate their unpreparedness to reply in subtle ways by directing their gaze at the materials on their desks or anywhere but in the teacher's direction.

In terms of "episodes" (Marshall, 1989) or notable segments within the literary events, the lessons focused heavily on vocabulary building and establishing comprehension through re-narration of the texts using a question/answer procedure. A smaller portion of the lessons focused on interpretation, generally towards the end of the lessons. The boundaries between episodes were generally quite abrupt, perhaps revealing that the instructor assumed that the students were accustomed to the pattern and progression of the lesson segments or episodes. The above initial impressions are confirmed by the analysis of a transcription of the pilot lesson, which is discussed in detail in the section that follows.

On the whole, the researcher concluded not only that the event schema of the study design was a reasonable approximation of the day-to-day work of this group of students and their teacher but also that the lessons that
were observed prior to the pilot event itself were remarkably consistent with the pilot event in terms of interactional patterns, content, and structure.

The second phase of the pilot study began with the reading of the text, a one-and-one-half page short story by Guy de Maupassant entitled "Une Famille". This was immediately followed by the two-part initial task, which consisted of a recall protocol and an initial response. Reading times ranged from seven to fifteen minutes, with initial written response times covering approximately the same range.

Because the text used in the study was a chronologically-ordered narrative, the recall of the story propositions provides an indication of whether or not students followed the structure or plot of the story, which generally corresponds to the "top-level" or most important propositions of the story. All sixteen students recited the skeleton of the plot; students included a minimum of 8 Level 4 propositions in their recalls, with some students writing as many as 18. Their recall of the story varied primarily in the amount of detail--"lower-level" or less important propositions--that they opted to include. Some recalls contained no Level 1 propositions. Three of the recalls were written in French and were the shortest of the sixteen.
With proposition values assigned, the scores out of a perfect 302 range from 44 to 144, with a mean of 79.3. The generally high rate of recall of the Level 4 propositions is interpreted as indicating that students understood the plot and much of the rest of the story but may have interpreted the recall task as a summary task and did not provide many details of the texts. The high overall comprehension of the story indicated by the recall scores is confirmed by the initial responses.

The initial response followed the recall protocol. The mean length of the responses, 8.1 T-units, contrasts with 24.6 for the recall task. Students were observed to devote more time to the recalls, perhaps because it was the first task that they were asked to perform or perhaps because they simply had less to say in responding to the more open-ended initial response prompt, which asked simply for their reaction to the story. The range in length of the initial responses, 4 to 16 T-units, however, is much narrower than the 12 to 49 range of the recalls. The three initial responses that were written in French were among the four shortest.

The total number of T-units in all initial responses was 130. The number of different types of literary response statements in the individual responses ranged from 2 to 7.
The most prominent type of response statement was Discussion of Task (11.5% of the total), specifically as it pertains to self-evaluation of preparedness or comments about the relative ease or difficulty of the text (Category 6.4A). For example: S1: "It wasn’t that difficult of reading." S2: "I believe I understood most of it."

The next most common statement type was Reactions to Content (14 T-units or 10.8%), Interpretation of Content (14 T-units or 10.8%), and Descriptive statements (13 T-units or 10%). Reaction to Content statements included moral appraisals, expressing like or dislike of a character, prescriptive statements, and statements which react to the story from an inside perspective (Category 2.2). Interpretive statements specifically dealt with content (Category 4.2), including generalizations about characters and subjective statements expressed with some tentativeness. For example, one student (S3) wrote: "I would think if you are seeing someone who was your best friend, you would be so excited." Descriptive statements were literal retelling of the story (Category 1.1).

Next in frequency were Associative statements and Interpretation of Content Based on Text (12 T-units or 9.2% each), followed by Descriptive statements beyond retelling (10 T-Units or 7.7%). Associative statements involved
integration of the text with the writer's knowledge or world experiences (Category 3.1). Interpretation of Content Based on Text (Category 4.3) involved the adoption of an objective stance toward the work. Descriptive statements (Category 1.2) included describing the form as well as language, characters, and setting of the story.

Lowest in frequency were one Autobiographical statement (Category 3.2), one Interpretation of Form (Category 4.1), and eight Evaluative statements about aesthetic appeal of the text (Category 5.1).

In global terms (e.g., when statements in subcategories are summed under main headings), the responses show a tendency towards interpretation (36 T-units or 27.6%), with significant numbers of Descriptive statements (23 T-units or 17.6%). Personal Reaction statements comprised 22 T-units or 16.9%, and statements about the task or language (Example [Participant 14]: "There were several words I didn't understand.") comprised 21 T-units or 16.2%.

The response task was construed by the students as an opportunity to engage in interpretation, but also to narrate their experience of the text as readers and to exhibit a wide range of strategies for this unusual meta-narrative task. Few of the students adopted a predominately interpretive mode in the response, although in one response
ten of eleven statements fell into this category. Interpretive statements were present in seven of the responses. Although they did not heavily predominate, statements about their own reading ability (Category 6.4A) or the difficulty of the vocabulary (Category 6.4B) of the text were contained in virtually every response. In sharp contrast to the relatively confident tone of the recalls, many of the statements include qualifiers such as "probably" and "I think" or "perhaps," lending a tentative tone to the initial responses that is in keeping with previous research (Marshall, 1987; Newell, Suszynski, & Weingart, 1989).

The initial responses suggest that students understood the story quite well and felt little real difficulty in discussing it in their L1 prior to any instructional intervention. The fluent and systematic nature of both the recalls and the responses suggests that the students not only grasped the structure and content of the story but were readily disposed to view it as a literary object.

The lesson immediately followed the two initial writing tasks. In general terms, the overall structure of the lesson, confirmed by the instructor and evident from the video-recording and transcript, consisted of three of what Marshall (1989) terms "classroom episodes": 1) a follow-up to the small-group task that was principally focused on
vocabulary and grammar and a few cultural asides but also included a listing of the themes of the story identified by the groups; 2) an abrupt transition to a retelling mode that was a reconstruction of the plot with some description; and 3) a more gradual transition to retelling with a more interpretive approach to the characters’ motivations, the setting, and the themes of the story, with interspersed discussion of grammatical, vocabulary, and cultural points.

The lesson was first examined in terms of turn-taking. The interactive patterns consisted of teacher questions, in many cases followed by rather long silences, and very brief student replies which the teacher systematically repeated verbatim before repairing and, in most instances, extensively elaborating upon them. The teacher accounted for approximately 75% of the communication units in the lesson, but took an almost equal number of turns, 86, to students’ 84.

The lesson was overwhelmingly text- and teacher-centered. Its symmetrical turn-taking structure resembled a volley in a tennis match, reinforcing the notion that the teacher is the “owner” of the knowledge in the room in terms of language, text, and interpretation. This pattern was uniform throughout the lesson, showing little or no movement towards a greater degree of interpretive autonomy: The
instructor regained the floor at all times and controlled access to it through questions. There were thus two parties to this "conversation": the instructor and the students.

The pattern of turn-taking in the lesson tends to confirm what has been reported in other studies of classroom discourse (e.g., Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975) as well as Marshall’s (1989) findings. The lesson consisted of either two or three episodes, depending on whether the overlapped retelling of the story with interpretation of characters’ thinking and the cultural aspects of the setting and period are considered separately. The episode boundary between the vocabulary lesson and listing of themes that followed up the small group work and the retelling episode was startlingly abrupt. For example, Lines 1-9 are wholly concerned with the author and period and abruptly shift in Lines 10 and 11 to the vocabulary worksheet used in the small group task:

L.10 T: ...si vous avez regardé le programme nous allons lire une autre nouvelle de Maupassant dans le texte la semaine prochaine. [...if you have looked at the syllabus we are going to read another story by Maupassant in the textbook next week.]
L.11 T: Uhm. Quelles expressions avez-vous trouvées pour uh “je ne l’avais pas vu”? [What expressions did you find for uh “I hadn’t seen him”?]

Lines 10 to 63 concern the vocabulary worksheet, followed by another abrupt transition in Line 64 to a discussion of the “themes” of the story identified by the small groups:

L.63 T: ...on traduit cela par le mot kid en anglais, qui veut dire a little child. [that is translated by the word kid in English, which means a little child.]

L.64 T: Quels thèmes avez-vous trouvés dans ce texte? [What themes did you find in this text?]

Lines 84 to 167 concern a strict question and answer reconstruction or re-telling of the story, which gives way to the more interpretive discussion of character motivations and feelings mingled with vocabulary, cultural, and grammatical asides that characterizes Lines 168 to 312.

The communication units of the lesson were also examined for general discourse function. It is noteworthy and even surprising that the instructor asked 55 instructional questions while the students asked none (the few student questions all concerned vocabulary). Of these
questions, the source of knowledge for the majority (43) was the text, and the kinds of reasoning were predominately either Summary/Descriptive or Interpretive. The source of knowledge and kinds of reasoning used by the students in responding to these questions was, naturally enough, primarily a reflection of the instructor's focus in asking the questions. Slightly more student statements (24) were interpretive in nature than teacher statements (19).

The instructor thus uniformly and repeatedly guided the students' attention to the text and to the language. Typically, she asked a question about either a fact or a low-inference judgment and, after a pause, a student ventured a very brief response. This response would be acknowledged or repeated verbatim and/or repaired (a difficult distinction) and either elaborated upon or followed with the next question. This constituted a kind of hybrid FL version of the well-established "IRF" (Initiate-Respond-Feedback) pattern of much instructional discourse (Mehan, 1979).

The language learning dimension of the lesson mirrored the textual focus in terms of control of knowledge by the teacher. Fifty instructor CUs, the majority of which were responses to students that were repetitions with or without
elaboration, fell into this category and 14 student CUs, mostly replies to teacher vocabulary questions.

The final task of the pilot event consisted of the out-of-class student essays. The essay assignment was to develop a theme from the text in approximately one page; the students were allowed to choose a theme from the class discussion. Themes included change over time, marriage, and friendship. Few essays exceeded the one-page instruction, and they were relatively consistent in the number of T-units, ranging from 14 to 24 with a group mean of 19.

Surprisingly, many students appeared to construe the essay task on the whole as a personal essay in which to relate the text themes to their own experiences, varying only in the amount of interpretation that they wove into this process. For example, one student (S11) wrote “Ma histoire est très similaire à ‘Une famille’ pour j’ai eu une amie qui change beaucoup aussi.” [My story is very similar to “Une famille” for I had a friend who changed a lot, too.] The student’s essay then proceeded to explain how her life resembled that of the narrator of the story.

Viewed more closely, the students appeared to adopt one of two strategies or stances: either their essays were largely interpretive (Categories 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4) or they were highly personalized (Categories 3.1 and,
especially, 3.2 or Autobiographical Narrative). Two of the essays were entirely written as Autobiographical Narratives, and in seven essays this was the predominant mode. This category was by far the most frequently used overall.

In seven of the essays, the majority of statements were Interpretive. The range of statement types used in the essays was variable, with two essays, as mentioned, using only Category 3.2 but the majority (10 essays) using from 4 to 7 statement types. Few evaluative statements were offered, and only two statements in one essay referred to the task itself. Retelling was present in all except the two Autobiographical Narrative essays, but was in no cases the dominant mode and appeared to serve primarily as textual support for Interpretive and Personal Autobiographical statements. Only two statements in two separate essays fell into the Personal Reaction to Content category (Category 2.2).

As mentioned, the pilot essays were not formally assessed for quality. On the whole, however, it is the researcher’s and the raters’ impression that the essays were written in simple but acceptable French with some grammatical and lexical inaccuracies but none that significantly impede understanding. The quality dimension of the essays will be examined in more detail for the main
analysis, both in terms of quality of French writing and for overall quality as essays about literature.

It is apparent from the length of the essays (which ranged from 14 to 25 T-units) and the seeming attention to grammar and coherence that the students addressed the task relatively seriously and interpreted it as an analytic task that nevertheless allowed a personal dimension. With the exception of the two entirely personal/autobiographical essays, all showed some attempt to write essays linking the text to the class discussion but especially to their own lives. This is interesting and potentially significant in that at no time during the lessons observed prior to the pilot event or the pilot event itself was the discussion linked to the personal lives or preferences of either the instructor or the students. It was not evident from discussions between the instructor and the researcher that personal or associative dimensions of response were explicitly encouraged in the formal writing tasks that the students performed, but it is possible that there was some tacit agreement limiting these dimensions to writing assignments.

Only in two cases were statements specifically traceable to the lesson, but in all cases the themes that were developed in the essays had been mentioned in class
during follow-up to the small-group task. All except five essays (9 of 14 total) showed evidence of linking the discussion to the text, one of the modes of talking about literature that was most exhaustively modeled by the teacher during the lesson. One essay (S2) linked the class discussion to an emergent understanding of the text: "Mais en entendant la discussion, j'ai changé d'avis un peu." [But in hearing the discussion, I changed my mind a bit.]

The Autobiographical Narrative category (3.2) of the taxonomy does not adequately reflect the variety of ways in which the students linked the text to their experiences: In several instances statements coded under this heading distinguished themselves as editorial comments that went beyond strictly personal narratives but could not be coded in any other way.

Conclusion

It appears from the analysis of both the private, written responses and public forum of the lesson that this literary event is an example of a hybrid between a language lesson and a literature lesson. In private, the readers understood the story to a relatively high degree and responded to it in writing with reasonable confidence. In public, however, a large number of the students
"participated" silently in the lesson, and those who actively participated did so in a halting manner and took few interpretive risks. In fact, it is difficult to conclude that the lesson in any way built upon or added significantly to the students' understanding, either literal or literary, of the story.

The recall protocols demonstrate a more than adequate understanding of the detail and narrative structure of the story among all students, a finding that is corroborated by the ability of the students to then compose concise but fluent literary responses, also in English (with the three exceptions noted).

Although, as Marshall (1987) and Newell, Suszynski, & Weingart (1989) found in personal as compared to analytic responses, the initial responses were more tentative in tone than the recalls and essays, they nevertheless offered many of the fundamental elements of academic literary interpretation in using the text to support their assertions. Both the tentativeness of many of the initial responses and the intriguing meta-narratives that several of them contain of the students' experiences in encountering an unfamiliar, unedited French-language literary text may offer insights into the psychological dimensions of this encounter. The meta-narratives concern difficulties with
vocabulary, grammar, and cultural references that are analogous to think-aloud protocol data and will be more closely examined for the main study as they are potentially instructive about private reading processes and strategies and are relevant to attempts to understand how students monitor their own reading behaviors. Evidence of similar reader self-awareness of reading strategies and processes has been documented in think-aloud protocols (e.g., Hosenfeld, 1984) and in analysis of recall protocol data (e.g., Bernhardt, 1991) and is posited by Bernhardt to be an important index of student reflection and a factor in the development of reading ability.

In contrast to the private, written demonstrations of comprehension and response in the students’ L1, the French-language lesson appears, to an even greater degree than was noted by Marshall (1989) in L1 literature lessons, strikingly constrained and constraining for teacher and students alike. It is difficult to imagine how the lesson can have promoted reader interpretive autonomy from the text or from the instructor, and it ultimately elicited only a small amount of active participation from a minority of the students. The lesson resembles lower level foreign language classes in its focus on linguistic accuracy and “right answers” and frequently resembled a fill-in-the-blank
exercise that was a near-exclusive emphasis on a normative reading of the objective content of the text. The limited presence of interpretive discussion was also controlled by the instructor, with the exception of the initial small-group listing of themes (which appeared to pose little difficulty and was in any case closely monitored by the instructor). In fact, the teacher controlled the entire process in a rigorously monitored and corrected progression from vocabulary building to retelling and some inference and interpretation of characters and the setting. It is almost as though the text serves more as the pretext for the public, teacher-controlled forum of a language lesson than as its primary focus or as a stimulus for interaction. On the other hand, when allowed the time and occasion to do so in the relative privacy afforded by the writing tasks, the students display a willingness and ability to employ a much wider range of response statements and to experience the text both as an object for analysis and as a stimulus for personal and even moral reflection.

An interesting question to be asked is to what extent literal comprehension of the FL literary text (and the public negotiation of it in the FL) differs from literary interpretation, whether in traditional, text- and author-centered or reader-oriented terms. It is difficult to
determine precisely a point at which comprehension and publicly constructed retelling leave off and interpretation begins in the lesson transcript probably for the very reason that these processes may be less sharply distinguishable in the FL context than in an L1 context (where it is also problematic in contemporary literary critical terms): Why indeed can surface decoding of the narrative not be envisioned—and taught—as part of a socially driven interpretive process?

There appear to be two readers within each of the participants in this pilot study. There are public readers who participate little, if at all, in a literal retelling and language lesson except when they are in small groups working on a well-defined problem and are otherwise under the interpretive domination of the instructor. The brief, halting, and often laborious contributions of the students to the lesson, however, mask private readers and writers who not only understand the text very “accurately” but, when given the opportunity to do so, readily display autonomy as readers and as interpreters of the text both in formal academic terms and as the text relates to their own lives. Also evident are generally fluent and often surprising and sophisticated abilities in composing in French that one
would never surmise from the monosyllabic input of the students during the lesson.

The different ways in which the students construed the essay task illustrates richness but also a degree of variety and some difficulties with grammatical and rhetorical conventions of written French, some of which may need to be modified before they confront the rigors that await them in advanced literary studies. These attributes of richness and diversity need not necessarily be ignored or repressed by instruction, however, for purposes of interpretive "correctness" or linguistic accuracy.

In keeping with the reader response orientation of the study, it appears that these intermediate level students possess literary competence and dispositions towards response and interpretation that were not fully deployed during the public forum of this particular literature lesson. It seems that a pedagogy that undertook to broaden the range of "legitimate" public stances that students may take toward texts and to revalorize their own experiences and competencies could foster both a more satisfying literary experience and a more efficacious language learning experience. These goals cannot be optimally promoted by the New Critical, fundamentalist modes of reading and talking about literature that tend to arise under circumstances in
which full literal comprehension cannot be assumed but is held as the definitive prerequisite to interpretation. The preliminary finding of this pilot study is that the literary event that it examined does not appear to be consistent with the goals either of fostering the development of communicative competence in French or of developing autonomous readers and interpreters who may with confidence—and positive attitudes—approach the advanced study of French literature.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter reports the results of analysis of the "public" and "private" dimensions of two classroom literary events in a single section of an introductory French literature course. All of the sixteen students enrolled in the class consented in writing to participate in the study and were aware of its nature and purpose and what their participation would entail. Only eleven participants, however, completed all of the components of both literary events.

The initial phase of the study involved observation of two routine lessons and video-recording of one lesson. The purpose of the observation phase was to establish a basic understanding of the setting and the character of the tasks and lessons in this particular classroom, as well as to accustom the instructor and participants to the presence of the researcher and video-recorder.
Observation of previous class meetings and discussions with the instructor confirmed that, except for the fact that students customarily read the texts at home, the two events that are the focus of the study were reasonable approximations of the routine in this classroom. Routine lessons tended to follow similar patterns of interaction and "route" and to culminate in an out-of-class personal or analytic writing task. Although the specific content of the lessons and the genre of the texts under discussion varied, there was considerable consistency in their episodic structure and in the relative amount and types of student and instructor input.

As a consequence of preliminary observations and analysis and the pilot study, the two analytic systems, which were developed to study written first language literary responses (Newell, Suszynski, & Weingart, 1989) and classroom literature lessons (Marshall, 1989) were amended to include categories for the language-learning dimension of this classroom. These amendments were piloted during the pilot study and will be discussed in subsequent sections of the report.

The procedures used in the second phase involved the collection of written and video-recorded data during two classroom literary events. The purpose of this procedure
was to trace the evolution of the students' literary understanding and responses as they progressed from initial comprehension through the lessons and culminated in a formal, written response. During each event, students read a brief, unedited literary text and responded to a two-part, English-language protocol that asked them to recall everything they could about what they had just read and to offer an initial response. This was followed by a literature discussion that the instructor conducted according to her customary practice, which was video-recorded by the researcher. At the end of each lesson, students were asked to write a one-page, out-of-class essay in French on a topic of their choice that was related to the text and discussion.

Results of the analysis of the two literary events are presented and discussed separately in the initial sections of this chapter. A discussion of the final phase of the study, the student questionnaires, and a comparison and synthesis of the two literary events comprise the latter sections of the chapter.
Description of Data for Event One

Data collection for the two literary events began during the sixth week of the Spring quarter of 1993 with the first literary event.

For Event One, the students read and wrote a two-part initial response (a recall protocol and an initial response) to a one-and-one-half page, unedited and unglossed short story by Guy de Maupassant, entitled "Une Famille" [A Family]. The recall protocols were scored using the Johnson (1981) system of proposition weighting, which uses native speaker judgement of the relative importance of story propositions to assess reading comprehension by scoring the individual propositions contained in recall protocols.

The text consisted of 134 propositions, which were assigned the following weights or values by two native speakers of French: 33 were Level 4, 33 were Level 3, 35 were Level 2, and 33 were Level 1. With proposition values assigned, a perfect recall score is 334. Inter-rater reliability was 81%. Disagreements were exclusively between Level 1 and Level 2 propositions and were resolved by the researcher.
Summary of Descriptive Data for Recall Protocols for Event One

Table 14 presents the means, standard deviations, percents, and lowest (minimum) and highest (maximum) scores for Event One participants on the Recall Protocol (n=11). The mean recall score is 86.5 of a possible 334, and the standard deviation is 22.62. The minimum score is 60 and the maximum score is 124. Of the 134 propositions that comprise the text, the mean number of these that were included in student recalls is 28.27, and the standard deviation is 9.19. The range between the minimum and maximum propositions recalled is 18 to 46.

Level 4 propositions are those that correspond to the skeleton or plot of the story. Of the 33 Level 4 propositions, 13.90 is the mean number recalled, and the standard deviation is 2.66. These propositions comprise 49.2% of those recalled by participants. The range is 10 to 20.

For the 33 Level 3 propositions, the mean number recalled is 5.54, and the standard deviation is 3.95, with a range of 1 to 13. Level 3 propositions constitute 19.6% of the total number of propositions recalled.
For the 35 Level 2 propositions, the mean number recalled is 5.45, and the standard deviation is 3.44, with a range of 2 to 13. These represent 19.3% of the propositions recalled.

There are 33 Level 1 propositions, and the mean recall score is 3.36 with a standard deviation of 2.11 and a range of 1 to 7. Level 1 propositions comprised 11.9% of the total number of propositions recalled.

Table 14

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percents for Recall Protocols for Event One (n=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recall Scores (of 334)</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Props Recalled (of 134)</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Props Recalled by Type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Level 4 (of 33)</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Level 3 (of 33)</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Level 2 (of 35)</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Level 1 (of 33)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial response data were divided into T-units by two expert raters, who then applied the Newell et. al (1989) taxonomy of response statements to each unit. Inter-rater
reliability was estimated to be 92%; disagreements were negotiated.

**Summary of Descriptive Data for Initial Responses for Event One**

Table 15 presents the means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum occurrences of statement types for the 11 participants (n=11) in Event One. The mean length in number of T-units of the initial responses is 7.50, and the standard deviation is 3.30. The minimum length of initial responses is 4 T-Units and the maximum is 13 T-Units. The Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) taxonomy of response statements categorizes statements into five distinct types, with a sixth category for those that fall outside conventional literary responses.

The first type of response statement is "Descriptive" and includes statements that literally re-tell the plot, make low-level inferences, or make descriptive references to the story's form, language, setting, or characters. Only two participants used this category, with one statement each. This is the least used category, comprising 2.4% of the total number of statements.
The second statement type is "Personal". These responses include personal reactions to the way the author has crafted the text and reaction to content—the world of the story. The mean for personal statements is 1.80, and the standard deviation is 2.05. Personal statements ranged in frequency from 0 to 6. This is the second most frequently used category; it was used by 7 of the 11 participants and accounts for 23.2% of the total number of response statements.

The third type of response statement, "Associative", was the third most frequently used. Such statements involve integration of the text with the reader's world knowledge and experience, and can include autobiographical narrative statements. For this category, the mean is 1.60, and the standard deviation is 2.11. The range is from 0 to 6. These statements account for 20.7% of the total.

The fourth type of statement is "Interpretive". This category involves statements that are inferences about the stylistic devices, content, or meaning of the text as a whole. This is the most widely used category, comprising 35.4% of the total number of statements, with a mean of 2.70 and a standard deviation of 3.32. Eight participants gave responses that fall into this category and the range is 0 to 11.
"Evaluative" statements constitute the fifth response statement category. Such statements might comment on the affective or aesthetic appeal of the text or evaluate the author's method and significance of the work. The mean is .73 and the standard deviation is .90. The range is 0 to 3, with six students using this category. These statements account for 9.7%.

The final category, "Other", applies to statements that refer to the task, self-evaluation, or metastatements such as, "I don't know". The frequency of use of this category yields a mean of .70 and a standard deviation of 1.12. The range is 0-3, with three students using this category. Approximately 9% of the statements fell into this category.
Table 15

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Percents for Initial Responses for Event One (n=11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of T-units</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Descriptive</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Personal</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Associative</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpretive</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evaluative</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the two-part initial response, the instructor collected the responses and distributed a worksheet for small group work. This consisted of a list of standard French-language expressions to which the groups were instructed to match non-standard synonyms present in the text. She also asked them to identify literary themes from the text. A thirty-eight minute instructor-fronted lesson began after ten minutes of group work.
Summary of Descriptive Data for Literature Lesson for Event One

The discussion on "Une Famille" [A Family] was video-recorded and transcribed. The Marshall (1989) system (see Appendix) for analyzing the patterns of discourse in literature lessons was used by two raters to code individual communication units of the transcript.

This report follows the Marshall system in making a distinction between three levels of organization--classroom episode, speaker turn, and communication unit. The basic unit of analysis, the communication unit (CU), is described by Marshall (1989) as having "the force of a sentence, although they may be as short as one word" and as representing "an identifiable remark or utterance on a single subject". (p. 4) In addition to CUs, another feature of the analysis of the lessons is the turn, described by Marshall as "the most obvious boundary in most oral discourse" and consisting of "one or more CUs spoken by a single participant who holds the floor" (p. 4). The broadest unit of analysis used to examine the lessons is the classroom episode, defined by Marshall as representing "a sequence of speaker turns on a single identifiable topic" (p. 4).
The episodic structure of the lesson (see Figure 3) revealed a pattern that was consistent with that observed previously in including language-focused, re-narration, and interpretive episodes. The topical focus of the episodes was controlled by the instructor through sequences of questions in a general progression away from language and literal features of the text towards more interpretive discussion. Although the episode boundaries are occasionally blurred due to overlapping of topics and digressions, this pattern was pronounced during all of the lessons observed in this classroom.

The lesson was closely guided by the instructor through an initial follow-up to the group work, the two parts of which corresponded neatly to the two-part group task. The first, which spanned 61 CUs, focused explicitly on vocabulary building as students reported their findings of non-standard synonyms from the text for a list of standard French expressions on a worksheet. Student findings engendered few elaborations or asides on the part of instructor. Second, the ensuing 32 CUs concerned the “themes” (e.g., marriage, friendship, change) that student groups had found to be present in the story while working in groups; these were expanded upon and listed on the blackboard by the instructor.
During the second instructional episode, which lasted for 159 CUs, the discussion centered on a literal reconstruction of the narrative and a more detailed review of selected descriptive details. This episode also included some speculation about character motivations and states of mind that involved low-level inference, as well as a cultural aside concerning regions of France and a personal anecdote told by the instructor.

The move further away from the literal text was signalled by a directive from the instructor that announced a third major episode: "Préparez-vous à une question dont la réponse n'est pas dans le texte." [Prepare yourselves for a question whose answer is not in the text.] The succeeding 123 CUs fall into four sub-episodes, each of which corresponds to a question posed by the instructor and the ensuing discussion. The first interpretive sub-episode elicited student speculation about the narrator's mental state. The second initially invited them to take the point of view of the main character but digressed to a discussion of the character of parks in France. The third sub-episode was introduced by essentially the same question as the second, but asked students to place themselves and a friend in the position of the narrator and the main character, the narrator's former best friend. These three sub-episodes
were marked by periodic textual references, cultural notes, and vocabulary clarifications.

The fourth interpretive sub-episode occurred with a shift to the question of the extent to which the characterization of the woman (the main character's wife) in the story was indicative of the narrator's attitudes. This lasted approximately 40 CUs and involved some re-telling of the description of the woman, as well as an injunction by the instructor to "penser plus objectivement à cette femme" [think more objectively about this woman] that was an attempt to limit the scope of the discussion and one student in particular to the text itself.

A final and very brief episode involved a more theoretical consideration of whether the author's point of view was similar to or different from that of the narrator. This episode was in fact a single question that served as a conclusion and an opportunity to make comments about the genre and author as well as to give the essay assignment, for which students were asked to develop one of the "themes" that interested them in a one-page essay in French.

The second feature of the lessons that was examined was the number and length (in CUs) of the turns taken by the respective "parties" to the discussion. This gives a rough indication of the overall relative contributions of the
students and the instructor to the discussion. Table 16 presents the findings of this analysis. The entire lesson consists of 455 CUs, of which the instructor uttered 327 (72% of the lesson) and the students 128 (28%). During the lesson, the number of turns taken by the instructor is 108, and to the students, 116. The average length of the instructor's turns (in CUs) is thus 3.03 and of the students' turns, .91.

Table 16

Patterns of Classroom Discourse--Turn Taking for Event One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher %</th>
<th>Students* %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Communication Units of 455</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Turns by Speaker</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Turn (in CUs)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

In order to more closely examine the patterns and content of classroom literature lessons, individual contributions to the classroom discourse are divided into CUs and coded for linguistic function, knowledge source, and kind of reasoning. The system consists of five basic
categories for coding units of classroom discourse. Each category refers to the apparent function of a given CU: Direct (Category I), Inform (Category II), Question (Category III), Respond (Category IV), and Other (Category V). Several of these categories are further divided into sub-categories for knowledge source and kind of reasoning.

As discussed in the pilot study, an additional category was developed to accommodate the significant language learning dimension of L2 literary lessons that was noted during Phase One. This category is henceforth referred to as Category V, and Other as Category VI.

The CUs of the lesson were coded according to general discourse function. Two raters divided the transcript into CUs and coded them. Exact agreement for the six major categories was 91%. Sub-categories were assigned by discussion and agreement between raters; reliability was not estimated due to the number and complexity of the sub-categories.

The first category of the Marshall analytic system is "Direct". Statements that fall into this category are intended to move auditors toward an action or shift the attention of the audience or the focus of the discussion. The instructor uttered 30 directive statements during the
lesson; these comprised 9.2% of her utterances. There were no student utterances in this category.

The second category, "Inform," includes any statement that is a fact or opinion and whose purpose is to represent what the speaker believes, knows, or thinks about a topic. The instructor produced 80 informative statements (24.5% of her utterances), and the student total is 86 (66.4% of their utterances).

The third category is "Question," meaning any verbal or non-verbal gesture that invites or requires a response from an auditor. The instructor's questions account for 58 of the 59 CUs that fall into this category, which is 17.7% of the teacher's utterances. Only one question (.8%) unrelated to language learning (see Category V) came from a student.

The fourth category, "Respond," describes a verbal or non-verbal gesture that acknowledges, restates, evaluates, or otherwise reacts to the nature, quality, or substance of preceding remarks. Eighty-five CUs in this category came from the instructor (26%) and 12 from the students (9.4%).

The fifth major category concerns utterances specifically related to the usage and meaning of features of the French language (as distinct from utterances concerning classroom logistics or the literary text) and includes vocabulary, pronunciation, syntax, and translation issues.
The instructor uttered 73 CUs in this category; these account for 22.3% of her utterances in the lesson. The students made 25 language-related utterances, 19.5% of their contribution to the lesson.

The sixth category, "Other," includes utterances that do not fit into the other five categories. For the most part, these are inaudible utterances. The instructor made one inaudible utterance (.3%) and students made four (3.1%).

Table 17 shows a summary of the findings for the general discourse function of each of 455 CUs that constitute the lesson. The CUs are presented as number of CUs by speaker.

Table 17

**General Discourse Function--Distribution of Communication Units for Event One**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Students*</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of CUs out of 455</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Direct statements</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Informative statements</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Questions</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Response</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Language learning</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other statements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16
After CUs were coded by general function, they were examined more specifically for type of statement and nature of information. Categories II (Inform), III (Question), IV (Respond), and V (Language Learning) all have multiple levels of subcategories (see Figure 3). The following are the results of further coding of CUs into these specific types.

Informative statements (Category II) were first coded for the nature of information that they sought to convey. Analysis of the lesson showed that 166 CUs fall into this category. Of these, seven concerned classroom logistics (8.8%), and all of these were uttered by the instructor. Seven utterances were quotations or readings from the text; three of these came from the instructor (3.8%), and four from students (4.7%) who were directed by the instructor to read a specific passage. Most of the CUs (152 of 166), however, are considered instructional in nature. Seventy of these came from the instructor; approximately 87.5% of her informative statements were instructional in nature. The students made 82 utterances that were considered instructional statements. Almost exclusively replies to direct questions from the instructor, these constituted 95.3% of their utterances in this category.
Table 18 shows the distribution of CUs that are informative statements (Category II).

Table 18

Focus and Distribution Of Informative Statements
(Category II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher %</th>
<th>Students* %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total of CUs in this Category</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by Type of Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Classroom logistics</td>
<td>7 8.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reads or quotes from text</td>
<td>3 3.8 4  4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional statement</td>
<td>70 87.5</td>
<td>82 95.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Informative statements that were instructional in focus were further analyzed for knowledge source and kind of reasoning.

Knowledge source possibilities include personal/autobiographical statements about the speaker's own experience. The instructor made three such utterances. These comprised 4.3% of the utterances she made in this category. The students made none. The second knowledge source, information drawn from the text, was the most widely represented with 49 CUs (70%) from the instructor and 76 (92.7%) uttered by the students; information about the text-
in-context (e.g., historical period, genre, or biography of the author) was used in only one CU (1.4%) by the instructor. The fourth knowledge source is general knowledge, information drawn from widely available contemporary culture; the instructor used this category for 17 (24.3%) utterances and the students for 6 (7.3%).

The instructional statements in the Informative category were also coded for kind of reasoning. The first kind, summary/descriptive information, concerns literal features of the text and was used in 31 CUs (44.3%) by the instructor and in 21 (25.6%) from students. The second kind of statement, interpretive, derives from inferences about the meaning or significance of the text and was used in 21 instructor CUs (30%) and 55 student CUs (67.1%). Two utterances from the instructor were categorized as evaluative statements (2.9%), which focus on the quality or experience of the text. Generalizations that move toward theoretical speculation about the nature of characters, authors, texts, or themes account for 16 instructor utterances (22.9%) and 6 student utterances (7.3%).

Table 19 shows a description of the knowledge source and kinds of reasoning for instructional statements found in the Informative category (II).
Table 19

Focus and Distribution of Instructional Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher %</th>
<th>Students* %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number in lesson</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Knowledge source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Personal/autobio.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Info. about text</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Text-in-context</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Generalization</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Kinds of reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sum./descriptive</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Interpretive</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Evaluative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Generalization</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

CUs that were classified as questions (Category III) were coded as one of two types: classroom logistics or instructional focus. In this lesson, all 59 CUs were instructional in focus. The instructor made 58 utterances that can be interpreted as instructional questions; only one was posed by a student.

Instructional questions were further coded for knowledge source and kind of reasoning. Of the instructor's 58 CUs in this category, 4 (6.9%) have a personal/autobiographical knowledge source, 51 (87.9%) are based on the text under discussion, and 3 (5.2%) involve the text-in-context. The one question asked by a student that
did not concern language learning solicited information about the text.

Instructional questions were also coded according to kind of reasoning: From the instructor, 17 CUs (29.3%), and from a student, 1 CU, are summary/descriptive in nature. All other CUs come from the instructor, and of these, 32 (55.2%) are interpretive, 6 (10.3%) are generalizations, and 3 (5.2%) are considered "Other".

Table 20 shows the distribution of the source of knowledge and kinds of reasoning for instructional questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus and Distribution of Instructional Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number in lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Knowledge source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Personal/autobio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Info. about text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Text-in-context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Kinds of reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sum./descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CUs that were coded as Respond statements (Category IV) were further coded into seven response statement types. Any verbal or non-verbal gesture that acknowledges, restates, evaluates or otherwise reacts to the nature, quality or substance of a previous remark is considered a response statement. Answers to questions are coded as informative statements. A remark coded as a response to a question is one that asks for clarification or explanation of the question itself or comments on the value of the question.

A total of 97 CUs fall into Category IV. Of these, 11 are coded as acknowledgements. These are non-evaluative confirmations that an utterance was heard and could be a nod of the head or a murmur. The instructor made 10 such utterances, which account for 11.7% of her responses. Only one student made such an utterance (8.3% of student Respond statements). The second type, restatement, is an effort to repeat verbatim a previous remark. There are 22 such utterances (25.8%) by the instructor and 1 by a student (8.3%). Positive evaluation response statements are positive comments or agreement with a previous remark. Nine such utterances (10.5%) were made by the instructor and 6 by students (50%). Four statements (4.7%) by the instructor were negative evaluation statements; one was uttered by a student (8.3%).
Response statements that are requests for explanation, elaboration, or clarification of a previous remark are coded under request for information. The instructor made 12 such requests (14.1% of her Respond statements) and the students made 2 (16.7%). Remarks that move beyond a simple restatement of a speaker's contribution by substantively changing the original speaker's language or by offering an interpretation of what the speaker is saying are coded as elaboration responses. The instructor made 28 such elaborations (32.9%) and the students made 1 (8.3%).

Table 21 describes the types and number of CUs that fall into the categories of response statements.

**Table 21**

**Nature Of Response Statements (Category III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher %</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number of CUs in category</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by type of statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Acknowledgement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Restatement</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Positive evaluation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Negative evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Request for more info.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Elaboration</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16
Utterances that explicitly concern language learning were placed in a separate category, Category V, which was added to Marshall’s system to accommodate the many CUs that concern grammar rules and pronunciation, vocabulary, and translation issues that were a notable feature of the previously observed lessons in this classroom. Language Learning utterances were further coded as belonging to one of three types: informative statements, questions, and responses to previous remarks. These sub-categories are consistent with delineations of other categories in the Marshall system.

Of the 98 CUs of the lesson that were assigned to Language Learning (Category V), 23 (31.5%) that were uttered by the instructor and 14 (56%) by the students were labeled informative statements. These were further separated into two groups: those that concerned the citation of a grammar rule, and those that were answers to vocabulary questions. The instructor made 19 remarks that concerned grammar rules, and 4 that were answers to vocabulary requests. The students made 14 statements that were answers to vocabulary or discrete point grammar questions (the latter type).
The instructor made 16 utterances (21.9%), and students, 4 (16%), that fall into the question category.

The instructor made 33 (45.2%) utterances considered to be responses to previous remarks, and students made 7 (28%) such statements.

Language Learning statements that were considered responses to previous remarks were further coded into five sub-types. The first, acknowledgement, was used 3 times by the instructor and twice by students. The second type, repetition of a previous remark, was used 11 times by the instructor and 5 times by students. The third type, repair, involves incorporating a correction into an acknowledgement. There were eight repair statements uttered by the instructor. Two other possibilities for language-related repair were: Restatement, which rephrases a previous remark. This was used once by the instructor only; and Elaboration, the final type of response statement, which entails adding information about a word or phrase in a previous remark. The focus of such information, however, is not grammatical but rather semantic and includes definitions of terms. The instructor made 11 such remarks.

Table 22 describes the focus of language learning statements.
Table 22

Focus of Language Learning Statements (Category V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total of CUs in this category</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Informative statements</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Grammar rule</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Grammar/Voc. answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Questions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Response to previous remark</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Acknowledgement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Repeat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Repair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Restatement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Elaboration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Summary of Descriptive Data for Essays for Event One

The final data set for Event One consists of a one-page, out-of-class essay that the instructor told the students to write in French. The assignment was to "discuss and develop" any one of the themes of the text that interested them and were discussed in class and to submit the essay at the following class meeting. Thirteen participating students returned essays, but because only 11
also submitted the essay for Event Two, the written data from only these 11 were analyzed.

Each essay was divided into T-units and coded using to the Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) taxonomy of response statements in order to provide a measure of the patterns present in the content of the essays. Two raters coded the essays with an estimated inter-rater reliability of 90%.

Table 23 presents the means, standard deviations, percents, and minimum and maximum results of application of the taxonomy to the essays (n=11). The mean length (i.e. number of T-units) of the essays is 27.1 and the standard deviation is 7.85 and the essays ranged in length from a minimum of 17 T-Units to a maximum of 41. The Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) taxonomy categorizes response statements into five distinct types, with a sixth for response statements that do not fall into these categories.

The first and most frequently used statement type is "Descriptive". This includes statements that literally re-tell the story, low-level inferences, and descriptive references to the story's form, language, setting, or characters. The mean number of descriptive responses is 8.54 and the standard deviation is 5.04. The range is between 0 to 17, with 10 of the 11 participants using this
category. Descriptive statements accounted for 31.5% of the statements made by participants.

The second statement type is "Personal" and includes personal reaction to the way an author has crafted the text and reaction to content. The mean number of personal statements in the essays is 4 (15.1% of participant statements), and the standard deviation is 10; initial responses ranged in number from 0 to 34, with 6 students incorporating personal statements. One participant's essay was composed entirely of 34 personal statements.

"Associative" statements comprise the third type and involve integration of the text with the reader's world knowledge and experience. This statement type can also include autobiographical narrative statements. For this category, the mean is 8.18, the standard deviation is 10.12, and the range is from 0 to 35. Associative statements were the second most frequently used type in the essays and comprised 30.2% of the response statements in the essays.

The fourth type of response statement is "Interpretive". This category applies to inferences about the stylistic devices, content, or meaning of the text as a whole. The mean is 5.45 (20.1%), and the standard deviation is 3.74. The range is 0 to 8. This was the third most
often used statement type and occurred in 10 of the 11 essays.

"Evaluative" statements comprise the fifth type of response statement. Such statements comment on the affective or aesthetic appeal of the text or evaluate the author's method and significance of the work. The mean for this category is .36 (1.3%) and the standard deviation is .67. The range is 0 to 3; evaluative statements were made in only three essays.

Finally, "Other" is a category for response statements that refer to the task, self-evaluation, metastatements, or any other kind of response that does not fit the previous five categories. This category was used three times in metastatements by only one student.

**Table 23**

**Means and Standard Deviations for Essays for Event One (n=11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of T-Units</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Descriptive</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Personal</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Associative</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpretive</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evaluative</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to provide a deeper understanding of what constitutes appropriate writing about literature at this level than is provided by the analysis of the response statements, two experienced instructors of the 201 course (henceforth referred to as raters A and B) independently assessed the quality of the essays. For this task, they rank-ordered the essays and provided comments about the quality of each essay both in terms of French writing and as a literary response.

The rank-orderings showed that the two raters were globally consistent with each other in placing nine of the eleven essays in one of three broad groups: high-, mid- or low-quality. There was wide disagreement concerning the remaining two essays.

The essays written by participants 15 and 11 were both grouped in the high range by both raters. The raters' comments revealed that, although essay 15 showed a remarkable relationship between quality of writing and quality as a literary response, essay 11 was esteemed for the "creativity" of the participant's approach but had "mechanical problems" and was "about average" in terms of quality of written French. Rater B asserted that essay 11, although adequate for the 201 level, might be too
unconventional to meet the expectations of later literature courses.

Both raters agreed that the essays written by participants 5, 13, and 14 fell into the middle range. The remarks concerning essay 5 indicate that it was judged to be in need of proof-reading but showed a variety in the use of vocabulary and showed a particular degree of skill in the selection of examples from the story to support assertions.

Essay 13 was judged to be above average in terms of written French and grammar. The raters disagreed about the quality of the essay as a literary response, rater A asserting that the personal example used in the essay was inadequately supported. The rater B, although acknowledging that the essay was "perhaps too personal", stated that it was a good example of "naive analysis" was well-structured.

Essay 14 was judged "average" and "passable" by rater A in terms of writing quality but to have difficulties, while rater B asserted that these difficulties caused considerable "inconvenience" that were a "turn-off" for the reader. Both raters assessed the quality as a literary response as average because of a lack of "foundation" and development of the central thesis or opinion; one rater stated that, although the thesis was good, the essay was "unconvincing" due to this lack of support.
The essays that both raters placed into the low group included Participant 8's essay. This was judged to be poor in terms of written language because of "little variety" and simplicity of syntax. It was judged below average in terms as a literary discussion due to repetitiveness and unrelatedness to the story.

The two essays on which the two raters' rank-orderings were most widely at variance were written by participants 1 and 6. Essay 1 was ranked in the top third by rater A and in the bottom third by the rater B, who found it "boring" and "not convincing". Essay 6, conversely, was judged to be in the lower third by rater A and in the upper third ("superior to average") by Rater B. Their comments reveal that this divergence of opinion stems from a seemingly higher emphasis on accurate use of French by rater A than by rater B.

Discussion of Event One

Recall Protocols

The text, "Une Famille" [A Family], is a chronologically ordered narrative that follows two main characters through a well-defined sequence of episodes. The weighting of the story propositions by adult native speakers of French provides an indication of whether or not students
followed the structure or plot of the story, which corresponds to Level 4, the propositions judged most important. All 11 participants recalled the basic structure of the plot in the recall protocols; all students recalled more Level 4 propositions (those which contained all propositions pertaining to the basic plot) than any other level. Most students recalled fewer Level 1 propositions than any other level, although one student recalled more Level 1 (7) than Level 2 propositions (4). Four students recalled an equal number of Level 1 and 2 propositions. Five students recalled more Level 2 propositions than the heavier weighted Level 3 propositions, and two students recalled an equal number of Level 2 and Level 3 propositions.

Most of the statements that students made in the recall protocols that correspond to Level 4 propositions in the text were very similar and concern the basic structure of the narrative. What they understood or selected for recall beyond the basic plot varied considerably. Only one participant recalled more Level 3 propositions than Level 2, and more Level 2 than Level 1 propositions. All other participants recalled equal amounts of certain levels, or more lesser-weighted propositions than a higher-weighted level.
With proposition values assigned, the scores out of a perfect 334 ranged from 60 to 124, with a mean of 86.5. As a baseline indication of the students' untutored comprehension of the story, these scores and the generally high rate of recall of the Level 4 propositions are interpreted as indicating that students understood the plot and much of the rest of the story, but selectively recalled only the essentials. The fact that the number of Level 3 and Level 2 propositions is very close—a mean of 5.54 for Level 3 and 5.45 for Level 2—suggests that the distinction in importance between these levels was somewhat difficult for the participants. The mean recall of Level 1 propositions (3.36), those deemed least important by native speakers, was slightly more than half that of Level 2 and 3 propositions, suggesting the possibility that students concurred with native speakers about the relative unimportance of lesser details of the story.

**Initial Responses**

The initial response task followed the recall protocols. They complement the recall protocols in indicating that the students were able to write brief but articulate reactions to the story in addition to simply recalling it. The mean length of the initial responses,
7.45 T-units, contrasts with the relatively much greater length of the recall protocols. The range in length for initial responses, 4 to 13 T-units, is also much narrower than that of the recalls. Students were observed to devote more time to the recalls, perhaps because it was the first task that they were asked to perform or perhaps because they simply had less to say so soon after reading the text. It is similarly likely that they were unwilling to risk making too many assertions about the text prior to the lesson.

Although brief, the initial responses show evidence of a variety of modes of untutored engagement with the text, chief among them Interpretive, Personal, and Associative. This is construed as an indication of an emergent ability and willingness, even after only one reading and with a potentially imperfect understanding of the story, to engage in at least some discussion of the literary texts in their native language. A significantly smaller number of statements were categorized as Evaluative, Other, or Descriptive.

The number of different types of literary response statements in individual responses ranged from 1 to 4. Of a grand total of 82 response statements, the most prominent type was "Interpretive," which was used by 8 of the 11 participants, yielding a mean of 2.63, and a standard
deviation of 3.32. The fact that all but three students made interpretive statements is taken to show a general disposition to engage in interpretation when invited to do so in the relatively unthreatening and "private" forum afforded by the initial response.

Of those who did make interpretive statements, the highest number were statements in which the writer discussed motives or made generalizations about characters or settings. These included such statements as: "She didn't expect him to be so jolly and proud of his family" (Participant 6). An almost equal number of interpretive responses expressed a tentativeness in assertions about meaning, for example, "It seems to me that the author was jealous of Simon." (Participant 5). A smaller number of interpretive responses sought to attribute meaning to the text as a whole, for example, "...it [the story] holds a certain true-to-life lesson that people who you've known for a long time can change during the course of time" (Participant 2). None of the participants made statements interpreting form, style, or author's intent.

The next most common statement type was "Personal," which was used by 7 of the 11 participants, with a total of 19 statements and a mean of 1.72. Only one student made statements that all fell into the Personal category. Of the
Personal statements, the majority (11 statements) were devoted to reaction to the form; such statements express the writer's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the author's methods. An example of such a statement comes from Participant 14: "I like the author's description of the relationship between Simon and Georges before Simon was married." All other statements of this type (8 statements) were reactions to content with often strong moral overtones, for example: "I think it's sad that two such good friends can go 15 years without seeing each other" (Participant 15).

"Associative" statements, those that involve integration of the text with the writer's knowledge, world, or personal experiences, were the third highest response type. Seventeen statements in five responses fell into this category. Ten of these reflected life experience: "I know of many relationships like this one." (Participant 14), and seven were more autobiographical, "I can relate to the idea of two friends not seeing each other for many years because I once had a friend..." (Participant 8).

The next category in frequency is "Evaluative". Such statements were judgements about the aesthetic quality of the text or the author's success. There were 8 Evaluative statements made by six students, with a mean of .72. Although approximately half of the participants made at
least one evaluative statement about the text, only one dealt with the significance of the work. Four made statements evaluating the author's method: "One can almost be blinded by this blatant foreshadowing" (Participant 10). Three responses concerned the aesthetic appeal of the text, for example, "This text wasn't so exciting" (Participant 11).

Three participants made statements concerning the difficulty of the task: "It was the vocabulary, not the syntax, that was difficult" (Participant 15).

Only two students (1 statement each) made Descriptive statements that involved re-telling parts of the story and, in one case, citing the text. As in the pilot study, use of this category was expected to be low because participants had just completed a recall protocol, which is purely re-telling.

Students perceived the initial response task as a literary meaning-making one and offered hints of their dispositions as private readers of literature. Very few, however, took an outsider stance to the text as a literary object or ventured remarks of a literary critical nature. Even among those students who engaged in interpretation and personal engagement, there was a tendency to treat the text as "true", or at least representative of real life. In some
instances, participants did not indicate that they acknowledged a difference between the author and the narrator (the text was narrated largely from the perspective of a main character, with some incursions of an omniscient narrative voice), a source of confusion that persisted throughout the ensuing lesson and which the instructor addressed only at the conclusion of the lesson. Participant 5 writes: "It seems to me that the author was jealous of Simon." Participant 13 writes: "I imagine that the author did not age physically as much as Simon and his wife."

**The Lesson**

The lesson's overall focus and direction, its internal logic, was governed by the instructor's questions and demarcated into instructional episodes by topic shifts. These broadest features of the lesson are also reflected in the nature and lengths of individual speakers' turns and in the coding of the micro-features of the lesson, the CUs. These three levels of analysis of the lesson will be discussed in this section.

The episodic organization of the lesson (see Figure 3) was consistent with the instructor's intentions, which she related following the lesson. It was somewhat less clear the extent to which the lesson reflected other remarks about
her objectives. For example, she stated that her over­
riding objective for this lesson was "examining the
narrative point of view" by "playing with the text". She
conceived of her lessons generally as building from an
initial language focus and summary of the text towards a
more interpretive focus centered on "getting the students to
think of the text as not being neutral" by seeing "how the
narrator manipulates the reader" and that "other points of
view are possible".

A singular feature of this, as of all of the lessons
observed in this classroom, was its strictly language­
related aspects, which constituted a curriculum that was at
times distinct from and at times interwoven with the
literature curriculum. The initial episode of the lesson,
approximately one-fifth of the total number of CUs, was a
follow-up, essentially a recitation, of a vocabulary
matching exercise and a list of "themes" that previously had
been completed by small groups. Additional language-related
questions, repairs, and explanations were frequent and were
interspersed throughout the lesson.

Students periodically solicited the instructor's role
as arbiter of language questions by appealing to her
(through a rising intonation or gesture) for help in
formulating a phrase, pronouncing a word, or completing a
difficult sentence. It is noteworthy that, although these appeals almost exclusively concerned vocabulary, the instructor's language-related interventions concerned solely grammar or pronunciation: These interventions were largely unbidden attempts to aid students to escape from snarled syntax or wording. These occasions contribute to the impression of a dual requirement for accuracy in both language and content that may partly explain the silence of the majority of the students during the lessons. Notably, only twice were these language-related exchanges initiated by students, on both occasions in questions concerning single vocabulary words present in the text.

In addition to the strictly language-related exchanges, most other questions that were asked by the instructor were "display" questions to which either the text or she possessed an answer. This was true as well of all but of a very small number of her questions that seemed to elicit an opinion, as evidenced by her subsequent responses, restatements, or evaluations of student replies. Such exchanges, in effect, further averted the instructor's loss of control over the mode of response and content and direction of the discussion. An unintended probable consequence of the low incidence of questions that genuinely solicited information or reaction and a tendency to answer
her own questions was to seemingly reinforce the hesitation of most students to contribute to the discussion (few actually volunteered contributions to the lesson).

A major emphasis of the lesson was an extensive sequence of questions that solicited quotations or paraphrasals of the text intended, according to the instructor, to teach them to narrate in French but functioning as a means of establishing a concensual understanding of the story's language, plot, and descriptive details. This segment, which comprised nearly one-half of the total CUs, contrasts starkly with the relatively high degree of comprehension of the basic plot and chronology of the story evident in the recall protocols.

The nominally more interpretive episodes of the lesson, which occupied about one third of the total CUs, were centered first on an endeavor to deepen the students' understanding of the story through speculation about characters and how the story might have been different if told from another point of view (among her stated objectives for the lesson). The instructor then invited students for the first time to contribute a personal statement to which neither she nor the text held the reply by asking them to state what they would have felt if they were in a situation analogous to the narrator's. This led to the only period
during which the dual authority of the instructor and the text was loosened and the "naive" subjective responses of the students to briefly endanger her governance of the discourse. At this point, citing the approach of the end of the lesson, she introduced what appeared to be her own interpretive perspective: "Uh, il est presque l'heure. Et je veux parler de l'image de la femme" [Uh, it is almost time, and I want to talk about the image of the woman.]

At the conclusion of the lesson, the instructor broached a topic that for the first time openly invited the students to view the text from a critical perspective as an aesthetic object: "Est-ce que Georges [the narrator] représente le point de vu de l'auteur?" [Does George represent the author's point of view?]. Because it occurred at the end of the lesson, however, and was followed immediately by identification of the author and genre and announcement of the essay assignment, the students' ability to analyze the narratological workings of the text remained unexplored during the lesson.

The roughly equal number of turns for the instructor (108) and the students (116) was characterized by a dialogic, question and answer format between two parties: the instructor and the students who actively participated. (Although sixteen students were present during the lesson,
only approximately half of them contributed to the lesson.)
The mean length of the instructor's turns (3.03 CUs) was more than three times that of the students' turns (.91 CUs). Student turns were virtually all direct answers to questions that focused either on language issues or on reconstructing the content of the story. These answers tended to be brief, often one or two words, both because few of the questions to which they responded solicited extended answers and because their contributions were cut short by repairs or restatements uttered by the instructor. The instructor's turns, on the other hand, tended to be of greater length because they incorporated either restatements or elaborations of students' responses to questions or added linguistic or cultural information before propelling the discussion forward with a new question.

Of the 455 CUs uttered during the lesson, the instructor uttered more than twice as many (327) as the students, who uttered 128. Student CUs were often a single word of agreement or a one-word answer to a question.

The 30 CUs that were categorized as directives represented slight topic shifts within episodes, transitions to a new episode, or calls for attention to specific passages of the text. The typical pattern of the ensuing series of exchanges that followed the directives within
episodes was remarkably consistent. The overwhelming majority of the students' 82 informative utterances were direct answers to instructional questions addressed to individual students who had non-verbally indicated that they were prepared to respond; on only three occasions did students volunteer remarks or respond to another student's contribution. The focus of the instructor's questions, and hence of the students' answers, was nearly always either text- or language-related, even during sequences that ostensibly elicited their personal reactions. Some additional student utterances followed a repair with a repetition of their own repaired utterance or an acknowledgement.

In terms of the instructor's responses to student replies, with almost no exceptions, students' contributions were either simply acknowledged or evaluated by the instructor. When the student's statement was merely acknowledged or was positively evaluated, it was nearly always repeated verbatim by the instructor, often to then be elaborated upon and followed-up with a request for more information, another question addressed to a different student, or a topic shift. If it was negatively evaluated, the student's utterance was repaired, elaborated upon, or more information was requested. On many occasions, the
request for more information took the place of a negative evaluation in an evident move by the instructor to avoid overt correction.

In terms of the source of knowledge drawn upon by either instructor or students, the text was overwhelmingly predominant, and at no time did students draw upon personal or autobiographical knowledge sources; the instructor made three instructional statements and asked four questions that drew on personal/autobiographical knowledge that either went unanswered or she answered herself. The 70 informative instructional CUs uttered by the instructor were largely not in direct response to student remarks and were within a given topic. These statements usually offered additional explanatory comments or generalizations stemming from the text or modified the topic slightly in preparation for a new question. The text was similarly the source of knowledge for the great majority (51) of the instructor's 58 instructional questions.

In summary, this lesson was characterized by the instructor's control of the direction and content of the discussion through a question-and-answer format and by the dominance of objective features of the text. A rigorously accurate demonstration of understanding which served as a prerequisite to personal or interpretive discussion was
effectively never arrived at during the lesson. The silence of the majority of the students appears to have been interpreted by the instructor as a lack of basic understanding and consequently an inability to formulate extended or insightful comments that could go significantly beyond the narrative surface of the story. Although it appears to have been an acceptable “participatory” strategy in this context, the silence of the majority and the brief and constrained participation of a more loquacious minority did not seem to contradict the instructor’s assessment. It is only in light of the recall protocols and initial responses to which the instructor did not have access that it becomes possible to interpret silence and limited participation as mute testimony to the fact that, from the students’ point of view, the lesson was either uninspiring or simply overwhelming.

**The Essays**

This section will first discuss the findings of the analysis of the response statements in the essays before turning to a discussion of the results of the rank-orderings and quality assessments carried out by two experienced, bilingual raters.
The essays may globally be described as containing large amounts of retelling and illustrating understanding through a linkage of the narrative with personal experience. They were written in frequently ungrammatical but generally easily comprehensible French and used language, argumentative strategies, and a range of response statements of which there was no hint during the lesson. The majority of students who said nothing in public demonstrated in their essays that their silence was not for lack of understanding or anything to say, but rather due to differences between the public forum of the lesson and the private, reflective mode of discussion afforded by the essay task.

The prevalence of "Descriptive" statements, the most often used category, can be characterized as attempts to support a theme or opinion through specific references to the text. This was the least used category in the initial responses that were written before the lesson, probably due to the fact that students had just written a recall protocol, which is largely re-telling, minutes before writing the initial responses.

Only slightly fewer statements were "Associative". Although the mean was 8.18, the standard deviation was great, 10.12. (One participant’s entire essay was composed of 35 associative statements while two essays contained
Nine of the 11 participants made at least two associative statements in their essays, almost all of which related to life experience, for example, "L'amitié nous fournit le bonheur et la sécurité pour vivre dans une grande société" [Friendship provides us the happiness and security to survive in a large society] (Participant 1). Eight other associative statements were autobiographical, for example: "Par mon propre expérience, je pense que quand ces gens seront d'un certain âge, ils deviendront seul" [From my own experience, I think that when people reach a certain age, they must go it alone] (Participant 6). "Associative" statements were the second most frequently used response statement type, comprising 30% of the total; these were followed by "Interpretive" statements, which comprised 20%. In the initial responses, students had made more interpretive statements than any other type (35.4%), followed by "Personal" reaction statements, and "Associative" statements were third in frequency. It is possible that associative responses rely on an understanding of the text as a whole, and that the students were therefore more comfortable making such statements after they had had time to reflect on and benefit from the lesson.
Of the "Interpretive" statements, a small fraction (6%) dealt with issues of stylistic devices, symbols, or universality of theme. Most interpretative statements were related to content and characters and were couched in halting and tentative language, commonly beginning with, "Il semble que..." [It seems that] or "Peut-être..." [Maybe]. Eleven of the 60 statements in a total of five essays expressed interpretations from a more authoritative stance: "Georges ne le comprend pas parce que Simon a aimé la vie dans Paris avant son mariage." [George does not understand it because Simon liked his life in Paris before he got married.] (Participant 5)

The relative dearth of interpretive statements that sought to explain the work as a mirror of the world generally or illustration of a universal theme was consistent with the lesson, during which these critical commonplaces were also virtually absent. An example of such a statement is: "Cet extraît nous montre qu'une famille donne le bonheur à quelqu'un." [This excerpt shows us that a family gives someone happiness.] (Participant 6).

Evaluative statements were exceedingly rare in the essays, as they were in the initial responses and the lesson. Only three participants risked offering such authoritative assessments. The few such statements of this
kind resembled Participant 7's assessment of the author's intentions: "Je pense que l'auteur voulait donner son opinion de sujet du mariage." [I think the author wanted to give his opinion on the subject of marriage.] It is likely that students either lack the confidence in their own ability to express judgments through openly evaluative remarks or that they have in fact learned that such remarks are not typically sanctioned by academic conventions of "doing" literature.

All responses that fell into the category, "Other", were questions used as rhetorical devices, for example, "Pourquoi?" [Why?] or "Combien a-t-il changé?" [How much had he changed?] (Participant 13).

The fact that the most frequently used categories were, in order of frequency, Descriptive, Associative, and Interpretive, suggests that most of the students looked upon the essay task as an occasion for personalized interpretation. This approach is consistent with some of the writing that they did in weekly journal entries, but stands in marked contrast with the very low incidence of personal comments, all by the instructor, during the lesson. Nor can personal essays be said to represent the canonical explication de texte mode that the instructor stated that she most highly valued. The essays were consistent with the
content of the lesson, however, in the widespread use of references to the text to support interpretive assertions about character motivations and probable states of mind.

The analysis of the content of the essays using the taxonomy of response statements was generally corroborated by the rank-ordering of and remarks about the essays by two experienced instructors of this level. With few exceptions, there was considerable consistency in the rank-orderings when the rankings are viewed as falling into three orders of quality--high, middle, and low. The essays that were given the higher rankings showed evidence of sophisticated grammatical control, variety of vocabulary, and hence a degree of eloquence that set them apart from the less highly rated essays. The raters appeared to have relatively modest expectations of the degree of mastery over written French that they considered adequate for this level and task.

Although the raters' comments confirm that the more esteemed essays often lacked transitions and firm support for their assertions, they all showed evidence of some form and degree of analytic thinking and attempted to respond to issues raised by the text that the raters considered important. The raters also expressed approval for the choice of topic or focus of these essays. The mid-range essays also exhibited a degree of grammatical control, but a
lack of variety of vocabulary was referred several times by the raters in describing them. Overall, it appears that most of these essays failed to support or develop their theses or substantiate individual assertions by citing convincing evidence, which could be either largely personal or largely textual. Several of these essays earned remarks that drew attention to a lack of depth and unwarranted generalization or "naive" analysis.

Low-range essays stood out from the other groupings in containing syntactic and other language-related weaknesses that "inconvenienced" and "turned off" the readers by obstructing meaning. Rhetorically, these papers were described as using the text as the distant backdrop for a personal anecdote that ultimately lost any but the most fragile or superficial connection to the story and discussion. This also resulted in several comments that cited a total lack of substantiation for the assumptions and assertions in the essay; one rater questioned whether a participant had even read the text at all.

Comparison of the rankings with the composition of the essays in terms of response statements confirmed the insights that were revealed by examination of the raters' comments. In essence, a range of ways of substantiating a statement or assertion and of maintaining a connection to
the text appears to have been acceptable to the raters. Nor did overall length of the essays appear to have influenced rankings. Rather, the success of a particular essay was assessed as a function of a variable relationship between solidity of argument and connection to the text, accuracy and variety in the use of French, and originality of approach.

Beyond the basic necessity for documenting assertions, the extent to which the lesson built upon the students' understandings of the text as a work of literature or of possible ways to frame a written discussion about the text is unclear. The recall protocols and initial responses demonstrated that all of the students had a relatively good grasp of the basic plot and an ability to make assertions about the significance of the story prior to the lesson and in their native language. It appears that the combination of the thorough review of the story content during the lesson and, presumably, a second reading of the text afforded students the confidence that they needed to be able to compose a coherent essay on a point of interest to them. Despite the persistence of a rather tentative critical voice in the essays, the opportunity to reflect upon and write about the text brought out a range of insights that one
would never have guessed from the labored and heavily scaffolded talk of the lesson.

If the essays are viewed as the product of a ripening process the purpose of which is to arrive at an analytic or objective critical perspective and voice, then they were not on the whole a success. Despite attempts by several students to examine a theme from an impersonal, analytic perspective, their attempts appeared to falter due to a struggle with language problems, and the majority of the essays were openly personal in tone. If, however, the essays are viewed as a personal language-writing exercise in which students weave the content of what they have read to into their lives, they were relatively successful. The very fact that the students construed the essay task as they did mid-way through the course suggests that the instructor allowed or even encouraged students to view their writing assignments as personal language practice.

Description of Data for Event Two

The second literary event, Event Two, took place during the eighth week of the Spring quarter of 1993. A procedure identical to that used in Event One was used for this event. The students read and wrote a two-part initial response (a recall protocol and a initial response) to a one and a half
page, unedited and unglossed short story by Colette, entitled, "L'Autre femme" [The Other Woman]. The recall protocols were scored according to the Johnson (1981) system of proposition weighting, using the following values for the 174 propositions in the text based upon native speaker propositional weightings: 44 were Level 4, 43 were Level 3, 43 were Level 2, and 44 were Level 1. With proposition values assigned, a perfect recall score is 435. The division of the texts into propositions and the assignment of weights was performed by two native speakers. Inter-rater reliability was 89.1%. Disagreements were settled by a third, bilingual, rater.

Summary of Descriptive Data for Recall Protocols for Event Two

Table 24 presents the means, standard deviations, percents, and lowest (minimum) and highest (maximum) scores for Event Two participants on the Recall Protocol (n=11). The mean recall score is 53.36 of a possible 435, and the standard deviation is 24.86. The minimum score is 12 and the maximum score is 89. Of the 174 propositions that comprise the text, the mean number of these that were included in student recalls is 18.8, and the standard
deviation is 9.73. The range between the minimum and maximum number of propositions recalled is 4 to 33.

Level 4 propositions are those that are judged most important to the story by literate adult native speakers. Of the 44 Level 4 propositions, 6.09 (or 32.1% of the total propositions recalled) is the mean number recalled, and the standard deviation is 2.84. The range is 1 to 10.

For the 43 Level 3 propositions, the mean number recalled is 6.72 (35.8%), and the standard deviation is 3.77, with a range of 2 to 12.

For the 43 Level 2 propositions, the mean number recalled is 2.81 (14.2%), and the standard deviation is 2.18, with a range of 0 to 6.

There are 44 Level 1 propositions, and the mean recall score is 3.18 (17.9%) with a standard deviation of 2.63 and a range of 0 to 7.
Table 24

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percents of Comprehension Scores for Recall Protocols for Event Two (n=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recall Scores (of 435)</td>
<td>53.36</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Props Recalled (of 174)</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Props Recalled by Type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Level 4 (of 33)</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Level 3 (of 33)</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Level 2 (of 35)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Level 1 (of 33)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial response data were divided into T-units by two raters, who then applied the Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) taxonomy of response statements to assign each unit to a response statement category. Inter-rater reliability was estimated at 91%; disagreements were negotiated.

Summary of Descriptive Data for Initial Responses for Event Two

Table 25 presents the means, standard deviations, percents, and range of response statements of the 11 participants (n=11) in Event Two. The mean overall length in T-units of the initial responses is 5.45, and the standard deviation is 1.86. The minimum length is 4 and the maximum is 7. The Newell et. al (1989) taxonomy of response
statements categorizes statements into five distinct types, with a sixth category for those that fall outside conventional literary responses.

The first category of response statements, "Descriptive", includes statements that literally retell the plot, make low-level inferences, or make descriptive references to the story's form, language, setting, or characters. Only one participant used this category, using one statement; this was one of the least used category and comprised 1.7% of the total number of initial response T-Units or statements.

The second statement type, "Personal", was used by six participants. These responses include personal reactions to the way the author has crafted the text and reactions to content. The mean for personal statements is 1.36 (or 25% of the statements made by participants), and the standard deviation is 1.50. The responses ranged in frequency from 0 to 4. This was the third most often used statement type.

The third type of response statement, "Associative", occurred in only two responses. These statements involve integration of the text with the reader's world knowledge and experience, and can include autobiographical narrative statements. For this category, the mean is .45 (8.3%), and
the standard deviation is 1.03. The range is from 0 to 3. This was the second least-used statement type.

The fourth type of statement, "Interpretive", occurred in five initial responses and refers to inferences about the stylistic devices, content, or meaning of the text as a whole. This is the most widely used category, with a mean of 1.45 (26.7%) and a standard deviation of 2.50. The range is 0 to 8.

"Evaluative" statements comprise the fifth type of responses. Such statements comment on the affective or aesthetic appeal of the text or evaluate the author's method and significance of the work. A single response contained one evaluative statement, comprising 1.7%.

The final category, "Other," describes statements that might refer to the task, self-evaluation, or metastatements such as, "I don't know". The frequency of use of this category yields a mean of 2 (36.7%) and a standard deviation of 2.53. The range is 0-7. This was the most frequently used type of statement in the initial responses and occurred in 6 of the 11 initial responses.
Table 25

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percents for Initial Responses for Event Two (n=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of T-units</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Personal</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Associative</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpretive</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evaluative</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the recall and initial response tasks, students formed small groups to locate synonyms in the text of French expressions that the instructor had listed on the board. A thirty-two minute instructor-fronted lesson began after eleven minutes of small-group work.

Summary of Descriptive Data for Literature Lesson for Event Two

The lesson was video-recorded and transcribed. The amended Marshall (1989) system (see Appendix) for analyzing the patterns of discourse in literature lessons was used by two raters to divide the lesson into communication units (CUs) and assign individual CUs to the various categories of the system.
As in the report of the analysis of Event One, this report follows Marshall in describing three concentric levels of organization of classroom discourse--classroom episode, speaker turn, and communication unit (CU). This section will detail the structure and organization of the lesson in terms of episodes and speaker turns before presenting the data for the coding of the CUs according to the amended Marshall system. (See Figure 3)

The first classroom episode of Lesson Two began with a vocabulary-matching small-group activity in which students located non-standard synonyms in the text for each the of standard French expressions that the instructor had listed on the board; the small group work was not audible and was not analyzed. After eleven minutes of group work, the instructor led a recitation of the findings of the matching exercise in which she directed students' attention to the specific line in the text and read the word or words aloud. This episode spanned approximately one fifth of the CUs (Lines 1-60 of the transcript) of the lesson. Students volunteered replies by reading what they thought was the appropriate expression from the board. The instructor digressed briefly from the rapid-fire, language and vocabulary-related nature of this episode on two occasions
for follow-up questions about the story characters and on one occasion for a personal anecdote.

The second instructional episode, an abbreviated attempt to interactively summarize or re-narrate the text, was considerably briefer than the same episode observed during other lessons. In fact, the students' replies to the instructor's questions appear to have strayed from the strictly text-based content of her questions, apparently inducing her to cut short her customary attempt to monitor their comprehension of the story. This retelling episode spanned approximately one-tenth of the total CUs in the lesson (Lines 61-103).

The third, more interpretive episode was comprised of four sub-episodes that correspond to the instructor's moves to direct the students' attention. The first of these (Lines 103-157) was marked by a complete turn away from the text to a consideration of student opinions about a major "theme" of the text (marriage). Students were prompted by the instructor's questions to collectively define what constitutes a traditional as opposed to a modern marriage. Although the students' contributions were dominated by two students in particular, several others who were not observed to contribute significantly to other lessons offered opinions on this topic. This sub-episode and the three that
followed it were notable in several respects. In addition to a near-total absence of references to the text and several vocabulary-related exchanges initiated either by the instructor or students, there were several unsolicited student remarks and two exchanges that evoked laughter from the class as a whole. A further singular feature of this segment of the lesson was an intertextual reference to a text by a different author that was read previously in the class. It is also noteworthy that student turns and individual CUs were longer during the interpretive sub-episodes than during the more rapid-fire exchanges of the other portions of the lesson.

The onset of the second interpretive sub-episode (Lines 158-218) was signalled by a return to the text in which the thematic insights from the preceding discussion were applied in a move by the instructor to engage in interpretation of the characters' states of mind and the the thematic question of how marriage figured in the story. One personal digression by the instructor and a second intertextual reference to an earlier reading occurred during this segment. On the whole, this segment was characterized by oscillation between references to the dialogue and descriptive details of the text and the elicitation and
expression of interpretive inferences and judgments about the details.

A third, very brief sub-episode (Lines 219-231) was introduced by a question inviting students to guess the author’s probable gender and to justify their answer by citing the text. After two students offered responses, the instructor answered the question, identifying the author, the date of publication, and the anthology in which the story had been published before offering an analysis of the students’ guesses. This third sub-episode appeared to constitute a digression from the primary interpretive direction of the second, to which the discussion returned in the fourth sub-episode (Lines 232-278).

The penultimate episode (Lines 279-336) was characterized largely by a return to re-narration, but was divided into an extended series of exchanges that focused on “close reading” of two successive passages in the text. In both instances, the instructor called attention to and invited detailed reconstruction of the specific passages before very briefly opening the floor to speculation by the students about the characters’ feelings. The instructor then intervened with further citations of the text in an attempt to direct the students’ attention more closely to the text.
At the conclusion of the lesson, the instructor gave the essay assignment: "Pour l'essai pour vendredi, je laisse le sujet ouvert. Vous choisissez quelque chose qui vous intéresse dans le texte--un thème, des images, par exemple--et vous développez, vous écrivez une page, d'accord." [For the essay for Friday, I am leaving the subject open. You choose something that interests you--a theme, some images, for example--and you develop, you write a page, OK.] This was followed by a final comment, an apparent afterthought, in which the instructor mentioned a formal feature of the text:

"Notez bien aussi...que cette histoire termine sans vraiment terminer, donc, il y a trois points qui indiquent que l'histoire continue, elle va continuer. Vous pouvez imaginer ce qui se passe après." [Note well, too...that this story ends without really ending, so, there are three periods that indicate that the story continues, it is going to continue. You can imagine what happens next.]

Turn-taking patterns during Event Two are presented in Table 26. The turn is described by Marshall (1989) as consisting of "one or more CUs spoken by a single participant who holds the floor" (p. 4). The entire lesson consisted of 392 CUs, of which the instructor uttered 258; her utterances constitute 65.8% of those of the entire
lesson. The students contributed 134, which account for 34.2% of the utterances in the lesson. The number of turns attributed to the instructor is 106, and to the students, 116. The mean length of the instructor's turns (in CUs) is thus 2.43 and of the students' turns, 1.16. The instructor's turns were thus both nearly twice as numerous and twice as long in terms of CUs as the students' turns.
Table 26

Patterns of Classroom Discourse--Turn Taking for Event One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Communication Units</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Turns by Speaker</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Length of Turns (in CUs)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Each of the five basic categories for coding units of classroom discourse refers to the function of a given CU: Direct (Category I), Inform (Category II), Question (Category III), Respond (Category IV), and Other (Category V). Several categories are further divided into sub-categories for knowledge source and kind of reasoning. As discussed previously, an additional category was developed to accommodate the language learning dimension that was prevalent in this classroom. This category is henceforth referred to as Category V in this study, and Other as Category VI.

The CUs of the lesson were coded according to general discourse function by two bilingual raters. Inter-rater reliability for the six major categories was estimated at
Sub-categories were assigned by discussion and negotiation between raters. Results of the coding of the six basic categories will be followed by a report of the assignment of CUs to the sub-categories of the Inform, Question, Respond, and Language Learning categories.

The first category of the Marshall system, "Direct", refers to statements that are intended to move the auditors toward an action or shift the attention of the audience or the focus of the discussion. The instructor uttered 17, which accounted for 6.6% of her utterances directive statements during the lesson.

The second category, "Inform," includes any statement that is a fact or opinion and whose purpose is to represent what the speaker believes, knows, or thinks about a topic. The instructor produced 84 informative statements (32.6% of her CUs), and the student total is 92, which is 68.7% of their CUs.

The third category, "Question", describes an utterance that invites or requires a response from an auditor. The instructor uttered all 43 of the CUs in this category, corresponding to 16.7% of her CUs.

The fourth category, "Respond", refers to an utterance or gesture that acknowledges, restates, evaluates, or otherwise reacts to the nature, quality, or substance of
preceding remarks. Sixty-one CUs (23.6%) in this category were uttered by the instructor and 16 by students (11.9%).

The fifth category, "Language Learning", describes CUs that explicitly concern the usage or meaning of features of the French language and includes vocabulary, pronunciation, syntax, and translation issues. The instructor uttered 53 CUs (20.5%) in this category, and the students, 23 (17.2%).

The sixth category, "Other", includes utterances that do not fit into the other five categories. These are uncodable, incomplete, or abandoned utterances. All three of these (2.2%) were uttered by students.

Table 27 shows a summary of the findings for the general discourse function of each of 392 CUs that constitute the lesson. The CUs are presented as number of units by "speaker"; percentages refer to the proportion of instructor or student CUs assigned to a given function.
Table 27

General Discourse Function--Distribution of Communication Units for Event Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Students*</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of CUs out of 392</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Direct statements</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Informative statements</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Questions</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Response</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Language learning</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other statements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

After CUs were coded according to general discourse function, they were examined more specifically for type of statement and nature of information. Categories II (Inform), III (Question), IV (Respond), and V (Language Learning) all have multiple levels of sub-categories (see Figure 3). The following are the results of coding of CUs into these specific types.

Informative statements (Category II) were first coded according to the nature of information that they conveyed. Of the 176 CUs in this category, 7 concerned classroom logistics and were uttered by the instructor; these account for 8.3% of her informative statements. Five utterances
were quotations or readings from the text; four of these came from the instructor, 8.8% of her CUs, and one from a student who was directed by the instructor to read a specific passage. Most of the CUs (164 of 176), however, are considered instructional in nature. Seventy-three of these instructional statements (86.9%) were uttered by the instructor and 92 by the students (99% of their informative statements).

Table 28 shows the distribution of CUs that are informative statements (Category II).

Table 28
Distribution Of Informative Statements (Category II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher %</th>
<th>Students* %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total of CUs in this Category</td>
<td>84 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by Type of Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Classroom logistics</td>
<td>7 8.3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reads or quotes from text</td>
<td>4 4.8 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional</td>
<td>73 86.9 91 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

Informative statements that were instructional in focus were coded for knowledge source and kind of reasoning. Knowledge source possibilities include personal/auto-
biographical statements about the speaker's own experience. The instructor made 7 such utterances, 9.3% of her instructional statements. The second knowledge source, information drawn from the text, was the most widely represented with 50 CUs (68.5%) from the instructor and 74 (81.3%) from students; information about the text-in-context (e.g., historical period, genre, or biography of the author) was used in 8 CUs (11%) by the instructor. The fourth knowledge source, general knowledge or information drawn from widely available contemporary culture, was cited by the instructor in 3 (4.1%) CUs and by the students in 17 (18.7%). Information that refers to previous class discussions or readings was the source of knowledge for two instructor utterances (2.7%). Three instructor CUs (4.1%) that were statements alluding to hypothetical situations did not fit the above categories.

Informative statements that were instructional in intent were also coded for kind of reasoning. The first kind, summary/descriptive information, concerns literal features of the text and was used in 31 CUs by the instructor (or 42.5% of her instructional statements) and in 26 by students (28.6% of their instructional statements). The second kind of statement, interpretive, describes inferences about the meaning or significance of the text and
was used in 28 instructor CUs (38.4%) and 45 student CUs (49.5%). Generalizations that move toward speculation about the characters, author, text, or themes account for 5 instructor CUs (6.8%) and 2 student CUs (2.2%). Statements that do not match any specific kind of reasoning are labeled, "Other". Nine such CUs came from the instructor (12.3%), and 18 were made by students (19.8%). These involved cultural information that pertained to specific elements in the text, the author or genre, or general experiences.

Table 29 shows the knowledge source and kinds of reasoning for instructional statements in the Informative category (II).
Table 29

Focus of Instructional Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number in lesson</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Knowledge source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Personal/autobio.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Info. about text</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Text-in-context</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Generalization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Previous class discussion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Kinds of reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sum./descriptive</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Interpretive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Generalization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

The CUs that were classified as instructional questions (Category III) were all uttered by the instructor; there were a total of 43 instructional questions.

As with informative instructional statements, instructional questions were further coded for knowledge source and kind of reasoning. In terms of knowledge source, of the instructor's 43 CUs in this category, only 1 (2.3%) has a personal/autobiographical knowledge source, 33 are based on the text under discussion, accounting for 76.7% of
her questions, and 2 (4.7%) involve the text-in-context. Five (11.6%) were generalizations.

Results for kinds of reasoning of instructional questions follows: 17 CUs (39.5%) are summary/descriptive in nature, 15 (34.9%) are interpretive, 3 (7%) are generalizations, and 6 (14%) are considered "other". Again, these pertain to cultural "asides" not directly related to the text that do not readily fit any of the categories for kinds of reasoning.

Table 30 shows a description of the source of knowledge and kinds of reasoning for instructional questions:

Table 30
Focus and Distribution of Instructional Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number in lesson</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Knowledge source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Personal/autobio.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Information about text</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Text-in-context</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Generalization</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Kinds of reasoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Summary/descriptive</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Interpretive</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Text-in-context</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Generalization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication units that were Respond statements (Category IV) were further assigned to seven response statement types. Any utterance or gesture that acknowledges, restates, evaluates or otherwise reacts to the nature, quality or substance of a previous remark is considered a response statement. Explicit answers to direct questions, however, are coded as informative statements. A remark coded as a response to a question would ask for clarification or explanation of the question itself or would comment on the value of the question.

Of a total of 77 CUs were coded as responses, 61 came from the teacher and 16 from students. Eight of the utterances are acknowledgements or confirmations that an utterance was heard and could be a non-evaluative nod of the head or a murmured assent; only audible acknowledgements were coded as CUs. The instructor made 5 (8.2% of her utterances in the Respond category), and students made three (18.8% of their Respond statements). The second type, restatement, is an effort to repeat verbatim a previous remark. There are 10 such utterances (16.4%) by the instructor. Positive evaluation response statements are positive comments or agreement with a previous remark. Eight such utterances were made by the instructor (13.1%) and 7 by students (43.8%). Four statements by the
instructor (6.6%) were negative evaluation statements. Two negative evaluation statements (12.5%) were made by students.

Respond statements that are requests for explanation, elaboration, or clarification of a previous remark are coded under request for more information. The instructor made 18 such requests (29.5% of her Respond statements) and the students made 2 (12.5%). Remarks that move beyond a simple restatement of a speaker's contribution by substantively changing the original speaker's language or by offering an interpretation of what the speaker is saying are coded as elaborations. The instructor made 16 such elaborations (26.2%) and the students made 2 (12.5% of their utterances).

Table 31 shows the distribution of CUs assigned to Category III into the sub-categories for the nature of response.
Table 31

**Nature and Distribution Of Respond Statements (Category III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>% Students*</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number of CUs in category</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by type of statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Acknowledgement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Restatement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Positive evaluation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Negative evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Request for more info.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Elaboration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=16

CUs that explicitly concern language learning were placed in a separate category, Category V. Each of these statements was further assigned to one of three sub-categories: informative statements, questions, or responses to previous remarks.

Of the 76 CUs that were overtly related to language learning, 53 were uttered by the instructor and 23 by the students. Ten informative language learning statements (18.9% of her language-related CUs) were uttered by the instructor. Eleven, all of which were answers to direct language-related questions from the instructor, were uttered.
by students, constituting 47.8% of their language-related CUs.

Informative language-related statements were further separated into two groups: those that concern the citation of a grammar or pronunciation rule or example, and those that were answers to vocabulary or grammar questions. The instructor made six remarks that concerned grammar rules, and four that were answers to requests for vocabulary from students. The students made 11 statements that were answers to vocabulary or to discrete point grammar questions (the latter type).

The instructor uttered 12 CUs (22.6%), and the students, 6 (26.1%), that fall into the language-related question category; the students' questions were questions or appeals for help with vocabulary, while the instructor's questions concerned both grammar and vocabulary.

The instructor made 31 utterances (58.5%) coded as responses to previous remarks, and students made 6 such statements (26.1%). Language-related statements that were responses to previous remarks were further coded into five sub-types. The first, acknowledgement, was used three times by the instructor and once by a student. The second type, repetition of a previous remark, was used six times by the instructor and twice by students. The third type, repair,
involves acknowledging an utterance with a correction. Twelve repair statements were uttered by the instructor, and one by a student. Restatement, which rephrases a previous remark, was used once by the instructor and once by a student. Elaboration, the final type of response statement, involves adding information about a word or phrase in a previous remark. The focus of such information, however, is not grammatical but rather semantic and includes definitions of terms; this category is on occasion difficult to distinguish from evaluative statements and repair. The instructor made 8 such remarks, as did one student.
Table 32 describes the focus of language learning statements.

Table 32

**Focus of Language Learning Statements (Category V)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total of CUs in this category</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of CUs by type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Informative statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Grammar rule</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Grammar/Voc. answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Questions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Response to previous remark</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n=16

**Summary of Descriptive Data for Essays for Event Two**

Following the lesson, participants wrote as homework a one-page essay on "L'Autre femme" [The Other Woman] in which they were asked to discuss or "develop" a "theme" or "some images" derived from the text that interested them. The essays were divided into T-units, each of which was coded
using the Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) taxonomy of response statements that was used to code the initial responses. Two raters divided the essays into T-Units and coded them, negotiating any disagreements that arose; inter-rater reliability was estimated at 95%.

Table 33 presents the means, standard deviations, percents, and minimum and maximum tabulations of response statements for the 11 participants (n=11). The mean length (i.e., number of T-units) of the essays is 24.5 and the standard deviation is 6.87. Essays varied in length from 9 to 35 T-units.

The mean number of "Descriptive" statements in the essays was 4.81 (19.6% of the statements offered) and a standard deviation of 4.04. The range is 0 to 12. The second most frequently used statement type, descriptive statements are present in all but three essays.

The second type, "Personal", has a mean of 2.54 (10.4%) and a standard deviation of 3.39. The range is 0 to 8. This is the fourth category in frequency of use and occurred in seven of the 11 essays.

The mean for the third type, "Associative", is 4.45 (18.2%), and the standard deviation is 7.94. This is the third most used category. The range is 0 to 25, with one
student using this category for the entire essay and five other essays containing from 1 to 11 such statements.

The next type of response statement is "Interpretive". This category yields a mean of 12.09 and a standard deviation of 6.99 and a range from 0 to 14. This is by far the most common statement type in the essays, comprising nearly half (49.3%) of the total and used in all but one essay.

"Evaluative" statements were rarely used, being found in only three essays. The mean for evaluative statements is .36 (1.5%) and a standard deviation of .67 and the range is 0 to 3.

The final category, "Other", was the least used category and was present in only two essays, with a mean of .27 (only 1.1%) and a standard deviations of .64. Two rhetorical questions about the author's life in a single essay were coded in this category.
Table 33
Means, Standard Deviations, and Percents for Essays for Event Two (n=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of T-Units</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Descriptive</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Personal</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Associative</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interpretive</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Evaluative</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the Event One essay, two experienced instructors of the 201 course independently assessed the quality of the essays by rank-ordering them and commenting on the quality of each essay both as French writing and as a literary response.

The rank-orderings again showed global consistency between the raters in that their rank-orderings, which placed most of the essays (eight of a total of eleven essays) in one of three broad groups: high-, mid- or low-quality. There was very wide disagreement concerning one essay; the divergence of opinion about the remaining two was significant but less wide. Examples of rankings and rater comments on essays from each level are discussed below.
The essays written by participants 15 and 10 were grouped in the high range by both raters (Essay 15 held the highest or second highest ranking for both raters in both events). The raters' comments concerning essay 15 in terms of quality of writing differed, rater A finding that there were "mechanical problems" but rater B judging it "excellent". With regard to quality as a literary response, essay 15 was appreciated by rater A for "good ideas" but reproached for "barely developing" them, while rater B appreciated the fact that the essay "did not assume things" and showed "prudence" in the use of qualifiers and in careful analysis.

Essay 10 was termed "solid" by rater A and "very readable" by rater B in terms of writing quality. Rater B further stated that the "reader isn't distracted by errors". The quality of the essay as a literary response was esteemed by both raters; rater A nevertheless suggested that there was "too much paraphrasing", while rater B maintained that the essay was "very good" and well-synthesized in its conclusions.

Both raters placed the essays written by participants 11, 13, and 2 in the mid-range. The remarks concerning essay 11 indicate that it contained considerable syntactic errors and lacked variety in the use of vocabulary. Rater A
reproached the quality of essay 11 as a literary response for containing undeveloped "value judgments" and asserted that the essay's conclusion should have been its introduction. Rater B, however, valued the essay for taking an "original" critical approach.

Essay 13, was found by rater A to have some syntactic problems in the use of verb tenses but to employ varied vocabulary, while rater B judged the writing quality to be in the lower range of acceptability. The raters differed in their assessments of the quality of the essay as a response, rater A stating that it contained "thought-provoking questions" but did not develop them adequately. Rater B doubted that the participant had understood the text completely.

Essay 2, also in the mid-range, was deemed to have a list of specific syntactic problems by rater A and to be "very average" by rater B. As a literary response, essay 2 was judged to make unexplained generalizations and assertions by rater A and, by rater B, to lack both introduction and conclusion and indeed to appear to be "a paragraph taken from a larger analysis".

Two essays that fell into the low range were written by participants 14 and 8. The raters' comments suggest that essay 14 was uniformly poor both as a writing and as a
literary response. Comments about the quality as a response include the reproach that "personal experience was not tied to the text" (Rater A) and "superficial" and "clumsy" (Rater B).

Regarding the problems of Essay 8 that caused it to be judged of poor quality, both raters agreed that, although there was a "glimmer of good French", the quality as a literary response was dismal because the discussion was not linked to the text and there was a lack of transition.

The essay on which the two raters' rank-orderings most diverged was again written by participant 1. Essay 1 was ranked the best essay by rater B, while rater A judged it to be in the bottom third at ninth place. Rater B found the essay to be uneven in terms of writing quality, having some very precise sentences and others that were "clumsy" to the point of being a "turn-off". Rater A, on the other hand, found a "poor use of syntax" overall, anglicisms, and expressed the thought that parts of the essay "seemed like translation from English to French". In terms of the quality of essay 1 as a response, the raters' comments also reveal broad differences. Rater A was "confused" by the repetitiveness and seemingly erroneous plot summary, also concluding that the single citation of the text did not suffice to support the essay's generalizations. Rater B, by
contrast, stated that the essay was "full of excellent insights" and showed both coherence and good development of ideas.

Discussion of Event Two

Recall Protocols

The text, "L'Autre femme" [The Other Woman], is a short story composed largely of a dialogue between two characters interspersed with "stage directions" and several brief omniscient narrative incursions indicating a change of action or setting. All of the "action" takes place during a single main episode, a mid-day meal and conversation at a restaurant shared by a recently married couple, who discover upon their arrival that the husband's ex-wife is seated alone in the most desirable location. In essence, the story implies rather than states that the couple were married quite recently and that seeing the ex-wife and learning more about the reasons for the divorce cause her to re-evaluate her husband and perhaps the prospects for her marriage.

The computation of scores using weighted story propositions provides an indication of the extent to which the students followed the course of the conversation and narrative passages within this single episode and were able to pick out significant or meaningful parts of the dialogue.
or other details. The relatively low overall weighted recall protocol scores (which ranged from 12 to 89 of a possible 435) and the distribution of recall of the four levels of story propositions suggest that the story, in particular the aspects judged most important by native speakers, was difficult for the students to understand and recall. The scores and distributions further suggest that one source of difficulty was the fact that many of the Level 4 propositions, those that obliquely suggested the changing state of mind of the new wife, were embedded within dialogue or narrative passages and concerned rather subtle gestural or descriptive elements and shifts in direction of the characters' gaze.

An additional source of difficulty concerning the major elements of the story may have been that the long passages of unmarked back-and-forth dialogue presented difficulties in attributing remarks to a particular character. A final potential point of difficulty in comprehending some of the lower level text propositions stems from cultural/historical references; these difficulties are revealed in some of the mis-readings in the recall protocols as well as in initial responses and in the class discussion. These include references to specific items of food and clothing and
restaurant practices, but also features of the lifestyle of the French middle-class in the early 1900’s.

All of the 11 participants nevertheless successfully recalled many of the most basic elements of the story that were assigned to Level 4 and Level 3. These include the principle aspects of the action and setting, the relationship between the two main characters, the presence and description of the ex-wife, and the general tone and content of the conversation that is at the center of the story. (The mean of Level 3 and 4 propositions recalled is 6.72 and 8.09 respectively). Mean recall of Levels 1 and 2 (3.18 and 2.81 respectively) followed these quite distantly but were also very close to each other in frequency. It is noteworthy that virtually all participants remembered some lower level elements such as the food items, physical description, and hair and clothing colors of the women.

In effect, the recall data suggest not only that the story was difficult, probably due to its dialogic and subtle nature, but that the students recalled story propositions in two broad categories--major and minor story elements. This indirect assessment of the relative importance of story elements (as indicated by selection for recall) is somewhat at odds with that of the native speakers who assigned weights to the propositions. The recall of the most heavily
weighted and hence most important statements (Level 4) depended on detecting possible symbols or the significance of a gesture or seemingly insignificant remark. For example, many students recalled that the husband decided upon and ordered his wife’s dinner as well as his own, Level 2 propositions. None of them, however, recalled the husband’s less obvious warning to his wife not to gain any more weight on the vacation or she would no longer be attractive, a Level 4 proposition.

In summary, the majority of the propositions that were recalled tended to be overt actions and concrete details, not the nuances or subtleties of phrase that carried strong implications about the couple’s attitudes and relationship and were thus deemed most crucial to the story by native speakers. It appears that, due to obstacles to comprehension that stemmed from the language used in the passage and, especially, from a combination of factors inherent to the narrative structure and cultural and historical content of the story, a single reading was not adequate for the students to gain a sufficiently firm grasp of the story to recall it either extensively or accurately. Some of the response statements in the initial responses, as well as their brevity, confirm that the subtleties and
implications of the text were difficult for the students to comprehend.

**Initial Responses**

The students wrote the initial responses immediately after recalling the story. Their mean length, 5.45, contrasts with that of the considerably longer recall protocols. Although nearly all participants recalled the basic plot and some supporting details, as the low overall weighted recall scores indicate, the brevity of the initial responses suggests that students did not understand the text well enough to offer reactions with any confidence.

An indication of this reluctance to interpret an ill-understood text is that the most frequently used category of response statements in the initial responses is "Other", with a mean of 2 statements per response and a standard deviation of 2.53. This category was used by 6 of the 11 participants for at least one statement. Of these, three are from the same student and are off task: "I's in a bad mood so's I's written all silly like." (Participant 8). A few were metastatements, such as, "There is something in the story that I didn't pick up on. I am unclear about the ending." (Participant 7). The greatest number, however, cite language as a source of difficulty: "There was a lot
of vocabulary that I didn't understand." (Participant 14). One student's response is entirely devoted to seven statements about vocabulary, grammar, and syntactic difficulties.

The tentative tone of the interpretive statements that students offered (this was the second most frequently used category) lends added support for the difficulty of the text. A substantial proportion of interpretive statements were tentative, hedged statements about the meaning of the text and the relationships of the characters. For example, "I think that his ex-wife was too independent." (Participant 1), or, "It seems to me that Alice is getting jealous" (Participant 6). Other interpretive statements took a more assertive stance, such as, "She is a little jealous and insecure" (Participant 11).

"Personal" statements, those that react to form or content, very closely follow interpretive statements in frequency. Many express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the story's form or content, for example, "There is not enough information to describe people accurately" (Participant 5), or "It was such a nice short story" (Participant 8). Others took a judgmental stance that treated the characters as if they were real, for example, "She needs to realize that if he wanted to be with the first
woman, he wouldn't be with the new woman now" (Participant 10).

Very few of the other three categories of statements appear in the initial responses. "Associative" statements were made by only two students, for a total of 5 T-Units, and "Descriptive" and "Evaluative" statements account for only 1 T-unit each. The low frequency of associative statements is not surprising considering the relatively large number of "Other" responses that refer to difficulties in understanding the vocabulary and the text. Most participants in Event One, by contrast, used associative statements to illustrate an understanding of broad issues inspired by the text, such as a friend changing, getting married, or the banality of family life. The students clearly experienced difficulty relating the Event Two text to their own experiences because they were unsure about the meaning of the text.

The Lesson

The episodic structure and interactive patterns of the lesson confirm that "L'Autre femme" [The Other Woman] was more complex and difficult to understand than the Event One text. Paradoxically, however, the lesson also suggests that the complexity and difficulty of the story did not prevent
students from identifying with or analyzing the motivations of the story's characters.

The lesson immediately followed the initial response tasks and began with a small-group task which was recorded but not analyzed. The degree of animation that characterized the groups was never again evident during the lesson, nor on any subsequent occasion was a student again observed to address another either directly or indirectly. During the group task, the instructor circulated about the room and interacted with each group; group work was entirely in French with only a few audible, semi-clandestine English-language remarks.

As discussed in the description of the findings, the episodic organization, interactive dynamics and specific patterns of CUs within the turns of the analyzed portion of the lesson were wholly guided by the instructor's questions, directives, and instructional statements. In terms of sheer quantity, the instructor uttered nearly twice the number of CUs (although in fewer turns) as did the students and these were twice as long. At a more subtle level, however, the flow of the lesson at both the episode level and the CU level also seemed to respond both to the apparent difficulty of the text and to the students' input.
As was the case during every lesson observed in this classroom, the language learning "curriculum" that was overt during the initial small-group task and the follow-up review of the results of group work resurfaced periodically throughout the lesson. Language issues broke through the literature lesson frequently and in a variety of ways, either through student appeals or questions concerning vocabulary or through instructor questions or informative statements concerning details of grammar or vocabulary either present in the text or in student remarks.

Another major category of language-related CUs is responses. Many of the instructor's 29 language learning responses were reactions, interruptions really, to language errors contained in student statements about the text. The majority of these occasions elicited a repair from the instructor, but other possibilities not always clearly distinguishable from overt correction (repair) are repetition, restatement, requests for more information, and elaboration. The apparent difficulty in making this distinction is the instructor's use of indirect correction strategies, evidence of a measure of reluctance to consistently offer overt correction, a common strategy in language classrooms for encouraging, or at least not discouraging, participation. The students' 11 language
learning responses were exclusively either acknowledgements or repetitions of instructor repairs, following which students either continued their statement concerning the ongoing discussion about the text or were not offered the opportunity to do so because the instructor continued their train of thought for them.

The episodic organization of the lesson reveals that, after the initial language-related follow-up to the small-group work, there was a brief attempt by the instructor to elicit a summary of the story. This strictly text-based, re-telling segment functioned to establish a partial consensus about the plot and setting of the story. The influence of the students on the movement of the lesson became apparent subsequent to this episode when the instructor opened the floor to non-display input from the students and when student replies and unsolicited comments (which were few) offered interpretive opinions about the characters.

This second, interpretive episode of the lesson consisted of four sub-episodes, each of which corresponded to a slight topic shift by the instructor. Throughout this segment, the students who participated took longer turns and even those who did not actively participate appeared more deeply engaged in the discussion. The students'
contributions during these segments showed a marked willingness to engage in speculation about the characters' emotional states. This suggests an emergent, deeper understanding of the text, perhaps due to the lesson itself, and is consistent with the mode of response with which they subsequently appeared to be most comfortable in the essays. The more animated and less instructor-governed character of the latter parts of the lesson was most pronounced during the most openly non-display question and answer sequence, which departed entirely for a short time from the text and concerned a comparison of traditional and modern marriages.

This topic shift from plot reconstruction to a social theme closely followed an incident that illustrates the erosion of the instructor's early attempts to segregate the literal text from other modes of approach to the text. This occurred when a student made an assertion concerning the probable thoughts of a main character only to be reprimanded by being accused of interpretation: "Alors, vous interprétez! Vous interprétez!" [You are interpreting! You are interpreting!]. Very shortly after this somewhat revealing admonition and the ensuing exchange (during which the student appeared to be embarrassed by his interpretive transgression), the instructor abandoned the attempt to have the students re-narrate the story by suggesting a free
discussion of a thematic topic: "Parlons un peu du mariage parce que la question du mariage est centrale" [Let's talk a little about marriage because the question of marriage is central].

Clearly marking the boundary between the retelling episode and the open topic, this shift also reveals that the instructor, although resisting interference with the orderly progression of her lesson plan, was willing to depart from it but only under circumstances in which she retained control of the direction of the conversation. The open discussion included a series of extended exchanges between the instructor and two students in particular and lasted a relatively short time before returning to text- and character-based interpretation.

The generally predictable pattern of the CUs of most of the lesson was as follows: teacher instructional question, followed by student instructional statement in reply, followed directly by either a follow-up question or first by an acknowledgement, restatement, repair, or elaboration and then a follow-up question. This pattern, identical to the smaller number of sporadic language-related exchanges, is roughly confirmed by the CU counts in the various categories of respond statements as well as informative instructional statements and instructional questions (all of which were
uttered by the instructor), which account between them for 218 of the total of 392 CUs and most of which concerned the text.

The general pattern was interspersed, however, in addition to language-related and personal asides, with several more rapid-fire exchanges, students volunteering unsolicited input, and occasional and relatively off-task humor that was instigated by students but taken up in responses by the instructor. There was even gestural evidence and sub-vocal muttering on the video-tape during this discussion indicating that one and possibly two students disagreed with the instructor's interpretations of marriage and of the characters' states of mind. The testiness of their replies to her questions, the fact that they were among the most vocal of the students, and the fact that they did not wait to be called upon but volunteered their remarks all attest to a degree of frustration with the discussion and a series of low-level disagreements.

After the instructor initiated a move back to interpretive, text-related exchanges, the remainder of the lesson was characterized by a complex dialectic between largely text-based question-and-answer sequences and others that invited inferences and opinions about the text. The students who contributed seemed readily to offer the latter,
but even with persistent nudging and direction by the instructor to resist more firmly connecting their assertions to specific passages in the text. At the very conclusion of the lesson the instructor offered two interpretive insights or clues that remained undiscussed, one of which called students’ attention to the incomplete nature of the narrative and invited them to “complete” it. A final remark tantalizingly suggested that there was a single detail in the text that explained the shift in attitude of the new wife over the course of the meal as she observed the serene ex-wife smoking by the bay window across the room.

Throughout the lesson, the students’ speech, and even the instructor’s, was marked by much hesitation, long pauses, appeals for vocabulary, self-repair, and even abandonment of utterances. The frequently fragmented speech of the participants, combined with the non-linear episodic flow of the lesson, confirms both the difficulty of the text and the impression that the discussion was not perceived to be going smoothly by any member of the class. It is possible that the laborious participation of the students caused the instructor to become aware of the students’ difficulties in comprehending the subtleties of the story as well as in discussing it and that this awareness caused her to deviate from the habitual pattern of her lessons.
The supposition that the problematic character of the text was responsible for the uneven episodic and interactive character of the lesson was partially confirmed by the instructor's comments about her lesson. She stated that she perceived that it had not been as successful as it might have been and that "there was a problem with the lesson plan" because she had "hoped that the group task would focus them on the detail of the text" to a greater extent. She ascribed the fact that the lesson had been "a little stifling" and "like pulling teeth" to the fact that it was near the end of the Spring quarter, concluding that the failure of the students to focus on detail caused the "argument" that she was "trying to get them to build" to falter and remain unbuilt.

In addition to the features of the lesson that were observed, it is worth noting the features that were not observed or rarely occurred. For example, the absence of student questions about the text is baffling given the obvious difficulties that they attested to in reading it. Even the six language-related questions asked by the students referred largely to vocabulary that they themselves needed to make a point rather than that used in the text.
A further notable near-total absence from the lesson is personal autobiographical statements and questions by the students, who readily produced such statements in the initial responses and in the essays, although not in great quantity. It is perhaps the case that the instructor (who uttered seven personal statements and one personal question, which she answered herself) felt able to divulge personal information but not to solicit it out of respect for the students' privacy. It is equally possible, however, that she did not want to excessively encourage students to view personal engagement as a sanctioned approach to literary discussions. An example of a personal aside by the instructor follows: "...Je ne sais pas ce que vous faites avec vos amis avec vos petits amis mais s'il y a un homme qui commande pour moi, c'est la dernière fois que je sors avec lui, d'accord. Ça, c'est pas très moderne..." [I don't know what you do with your friends with your boyfriends but if there's a man who orders for me, that's the last time I go out with him, OK. That's not very modern.]

A final comment about what the lesson did not contain concerns French culture. There were no student questions about the cultural, historical, or literary background or content of the text. Only two references to the historical period of the text were made, both by the instructor. One
of these referred to its date of publication, the celebrity of the author, and the title of the anthology in which the story was published. The other concerned the style of hat worn by the women characters and included a sketch on the board. It was evident from the recalls, the initial responses, and the essays as well as from some of the comments during the lesson made by the students that certain features of the time period, the practices relating to food and restaurants, and other general cultural and historical background information might have provided helpful insights into the setting and deepened the students' understanding of the story.

**The Essays**

The analysis of the distribution of response statements in the essays suggests an effort by all but a single student to engage in varied and uniquely personal versions of more-or-less documented interpretation. The rank-ordering of the essays and assessments of their quality as French writing and as literary responses illustrate that the degree and successful integration of documentation was a chief variable in how they were esteemed by two experienced instructors of this level.
After the clarification of some initial comprehension difficulties during the lesson (and perhaps notwithstanding persistent difficulties in understanding the story), the students had shown themselves readily disposed to read the story into the texts of their own opinions and lives, a trend with which the majority of the essays are broadly consistent. As only one indicator of this tendency, the essays demonstrate a strong general preference for the kinds of "Interpretive" statements that characterized a substantial proportion of their contributions to the lesson. Such statements were used by an overwhelming majority of the participants (10 of 11 essays and a range of 3 to 23) and comprised half of the total of 270 T-Units in the essays. Seventy-five of the 133 statements in this category were expressed in an assertive or at least non-tentative voice: "L'ex-femme est indépendente" [The ex-wife is independent] (Participant 10). Forty-seven of the interpretive statements, however, were expressed with some tentativeness, for example: "Peut-être que cette femme a l'air mystérieuse," [Maybe this woman has a mysterious air] or "Il semble qu'elles sont des types différentes" [It seems that the two women are of different types] (Participant 15). Only six statements offered by four students sought to
interpret the text or characters as a whole: "Alice représente la femme traditionelle" [Alice represents the traditional woman] (Participant 13). An even smaller number of interpretive statements (five statements from a total of three participants) sought to examine the work as a mirror of the world. Interpretive statements were the second most frequently used type in the initial responses, with a mean of 1.45 and a standard deviation of 2.50 (26% of the total 60 T-units).

"Descriptive" statements, those that involve literal retelling of the plot or very low level inferences, were the second most strongly represented response statement type in the essays. Eight of the 11 students made at least 2 of these statements with 12 being the most offered by a single student. Such statements were used systematically and quite successfully to support interpretive statements, for example: "Son mari commande le repas d'Alice; elle ne le choisit pas" [Her husband orders dinner for Alice; she doesn't choose it] (Participant 10) served to support the statement, "Alice n'est pas indépendente" [Alice is not independent].

"Associative" statements were very close in overall frequency of use to descriptive statements (18.2% and 19.6% of the total number of essay T-Units respectively). Forty-
five of the 49 T-Units that fell into this category were statements in which the reader made references to personal experience and knowledge of the world to illustrate understanding or support assertions. One student’s entire essay consisted of 25 associative statements, although this essay concentrated on the consequences of divorce for families today and constituted a deviation from the assignment in that it did not refer to the text. The mean use of associative statements is 4.45, with a standard deviation of 7.94. Examples include: "L'année, 1918, a marqué le fin de la première guerre mondiale" [The year 1918 marked the end of the first world war] (Participant 6), or "Plusieurs d'auteurs adressent ce sujet dans leurs écritures" [Several authors address this subject in their works] (Participant 10). Four statements were autobiographical, for example, "Je sais que j'ai cette problème" [I know that I have this problem] (Participant 14).

In the initial response task, associative statements ranked only slightly behind personal reaction statements. In the essays, however, there are more associative statements, a difference that is noteworthy in suggesting the students’ increased willingness or ability after the lesson and a re-reading of the story to use the text and
their own knowledge and experience to further (or to further demonstrate) their understanding.

Twenty-eight statements were devoted to "Personal" reactions to the text, 22 of which focus on content; only a 6 focus on form. Seven of the participants used this category. Reactions to content, for example, were statements such as: "Sait-elle qu'elle n'est qu'un tremplin dans sa vie? Si elle ne sait pas maintenant, je suis certain qu'elle le soupçonnerait à bientôt" [Does she know that she is but a springboard in his life? If she doesn't know it now, I am certain that she will suspect it soon] (Participant 13).

Only three participants made evaluative statements. Such statements resemble Participant 6's evaluation of the author's methods, "C'est intéressant comment l'auteur contraste la vieille femme et la nouvelle femme" [It is interesting how the author contrasts the old-fashioned woman and the modern woman] (Participant 10).

"Other" responses were used by only two participants for a total of 3 T-units and were questions used as rhetorical devices that could not be coded under the major categories but may nevertheless be considered to be modeled upon a didactic argumentative stance that is a not uncommon feature of critical texts.
The prominence of interpretive, descriptive, and associative statements indicates that participants conceived the writing task as a way of offering the meaning that they made of it rather than a call for their interpretation based on the teacher's guidance during the lesson. The general trend to link personal and interpretive statements to the text, however, can be said to be globally consistent with the lesson. Although stating their interpretation as facts dominated interpretive statements, the tentativeness surrounding 47 of the 133 of these statements could suggest a variety of what Barnes (1976) terms "exploratory talk" in oral discourse; some of the essays were characterized by a palpable resemblance to the uncertain tenor of language-learner speech and are therefore potentially consistent with "thinking out loud". The relatively high incidence of "Descriptive" statements--those that focus on retelling the story--also indicates that students are disposed to offer text-based support or illustration of their interpretations or reactions.

The smaller number of "Personal" statements relative to their prominence in the initial responses and the commensurate rise in the number of associative responses could suggest that students were sensitive to the emphasis in formal writing on support for a statement and the
necessity to use the personal as illuminative of the text rather than the other way around. It is likely that the relative frequency of personal statements, even if the students are aware of the devalorization of the personal in formal writing, is because their own experience and world knowledge function as a "life support" or "safety net" for what is unquestionably a difficult and laborious writing task.

The extremely low incidence in four of the essays (only 18 or 6.7% of 270 total essay T-Units) of mention of stylistic devices, symbols, word choice, and global or philosophical significance of the work is noteworthy. If the lesson is to be viewed as the model for the essays, however, this absence of traditional ways of talking about literature in the essays is predictable: There was no mention of these attributes of literature or indicators of possible critical approaches to the text during the lessons.

The reasonably high consistency in the rank-orderings and remarks about quality offered by the raters furnishes a further dimension to an understanding of the essays. In particular, comparison of the essays about which agreement was highest to the distribution of response statements suggests that the essays with the highest number of interpretive statements were ranked in the high-range by
the raters. Response statement distribution in the mid-range essays varied widely, but they tended to include a preponderance of personal and interpretive statements. The raters cited inadequacy in French and in organization and a lack of support for assertions as contributing to the mediocre overall quality of these essays. The two low-range essays on which there was high agreement between the raters were almost entirely composed of associative statements, with few links to the text via descriptive or interpretive statements. The sharp difference in the rank-order assigned by the raters to essay 1 indicates that they responded differently to the large number of inadequacies in terms of quality of French. Both raters made positive remarks about the essay's quality as a literary response, but rater A was clearly more disturbed by the inaccuracy of the French than rater B. Except for this single exception, there was a marked tendency in both raters to overlook inadequacies that did not impede comprehension.

Description and Discussion of Student Questionnaires

During the tenth week of the quarter, students filled out a 30-item questionnaire (see Appendix) about their general academic background, previous experiences in
English-language and French literature classes, and attitudes about literature study. All 16 class members filled out the questionnaires outside of class, but only those of the 11 who participated in all components of both literary events will be reported and discussed in this section.

**General Academic Background**

Of the 11 students who participated in the study, six were Freshmen, two were Sophomores, and three were Juniors. They reported an overall GPA of 3.38, with a standard deviation of .55.

**English-language Literature Background**

Three Freshmen students listed English 110 as their only college literature class. (English 110 is the first core curriculum course and is a basic composition course. It is not a literature course although some literary texts are represented in the mixed genres used in the course.) Four students listed English 111 as their only college literature course. (This course is a composition course but uses literary texts for its focus.) Four students indicated that they have had at least two 200-level or above literature courses. In two cases these were taken as
Comparative Studies courses, and one as a Women’s Studies course.

**General French Academic Background**

Most students indicated that their academic background in French came from high school courses. All but one of the 11 students reported at least four years of high school French, with three having taken courses beyond the fourth-year level in “Advanced Placement.” All students took French 104 (the final course in the lower level sequence) at OSU. Four of these had taken French 103 at OSU as well. Only one student had begun French study at OSU at the 102 level. Prior to the Introduction to Literature 201 course they were currently enrolled in, only one student had taken courses beyond the 104 level (401, 402) at OSU, and one student had taken an upper-level course at another university. Students reported high grades (a mean score of 3.73, standard deviation .51) for their previous French courses in high school and at college.

Students also assessed their language abilities on a scale of 1 to 10 in speaking, understanding, reading and writing in French, and to indicate their level of vocabulary knowledge. On the average, students ranked their listening comprehension as the highest, with a mean score of 7.18 and
a standard deviation of 1.47. They rated reading comprehension second, with a mean score of 6.55 and a standard deviation of 1.03. Writing ability in French was only slightly lower with a mean of 6.18 and a standard deviation of 1.25. Speaking ability was lower, with a mean score of 5.82 and a standard deviation of 1.99, the largest variance. Vocabulary knowledge was the lowest, with a rating still slightly above mid-range, 5.64, and a standard deviation of 1.50. Such scores indicate that students perceived themselves to be slightly above mid-range in overall French ability, with an overall mean self-assessment of 6.27 on a 10-point scale across all skills.

**Attitudes and Expectations**

**English-language literature.**

When asked about their previous experiences with English-language literature courses, three students reported positive attitudes; they found literature interesting or enjoyable. Three students reported negative attitudes; two of these found studying literature boring, and a third confessed to "detesting" it. The five remaining participants were ambivalent, with four stating that their
attitudes depended on the particular work, and one described literature study as “useful but frustrating.”

Participants also listed their expectations of English-language literature courses. Four said they expected large amounts of reading and writing; one expected the texts to be interesting, and one mentioned analytical writing tasks. Five students mentioned class discussions and guidance from the instructor as part of a literature class. One student expected such classes “to encourage and accept a wide variety of interpretations.”

When asked what they believed to be the purpose of studying or reading English-language literature, students gave several responses. Among those given, most stated learning about culture, problems of humanity, and life as the purpose. Others included to learn to express ideas and develop intellectual skills. Only two responses referred to aesthetics; one said, “to learn about literature,” and the other said, “for pleasure.”

Students were also asked to comment on the purpose of writing in such study. Five of the 9 students who chose to comment indicated that writing was a vehicle for self-expression and practicing precision in presenting ideas. One student said it was “to demonstrate understanding,” and one said writing was “to sharpen analytical skills.”
Students were also asked to give their personal definition of literature. Seven of the nine students who chose to respond specified that literature was a written document; two of these said it was a written form of knowledge, two said it conveyed an idea or opinion, one said "anything meant to be read," and one said, "anything that interests me and is fun to read." The other two responses specified that literature was "any work of fiction" and "a fictional account of something."

**French-language literature.**

When asked about their previous experiences in French literature study, all students interpreted the question to mean what they had studied. None listed attitudes. Some listed amounts of literature study they had had ("very little," "3 years in high school"). Some listed course numbers, genres, or specific works they had studied.

The question asking for expectations of French literature courses was largely interpreted as desires, not traditional components based on experiences. Seven students stated that they expected French literature courses to improve their reading, writing, and speaking ability in the language. Two expected a variety of works. One mentioned improving vocabulary. One student said he expected the
instructor to assist in understanding why the work was written.

Attitudes toward studying French literature were mostly positive, with seven participants stating that they found it interesting, fun and helpful and/or satisfying. On the other hand, four found it boring, difficult and frustrating.

When asked what they thought the purpose of reading or studying French literature is, six answers included “to understand the culture.” Six responses included “to increase fluency or learn about the language.” Two of these responses specified improving reading skills. Three students indicated that they found the purpose to be the same as the purpose for studying English-language literature: one said, “to learn about literature,” and two others said learning about or broadening understanding of human nature.

Seven of the 11 respondents indicated that the purpose of writing in a French literature course was to improve language skills. Three included, “to explain culture”. Two responses included “to communicate ideas.” Two others included demonstrating understanding of own or author’s ideas.
Personal Goals in French

Finally, participants were asked about their personal goals in studying French. Eight of the responses were "fluency in the language". Another six, while they did not use the word "fluency," gave a close equivalent, "improving language ability." Two responses included "expanding my mind." One response was "to better understand the culture." The most instrumental goal came from one participant: "to go to France."

Summary and Discussion of Questionnaires

The questionnaire results are illuminative in several respects. First of all, because the responses were solicited to during the final week of the quarter during which the study was conducted, the questionnaires constitute a summation of the students' attitudes and self-assessments at the end of their first formal post-secondary experience in studying French-language literature.

According to their self-reported grades in previous French classes, the participants, all but a few of whom had volunteered to continue their study of French beyond the required sequence, were good students, with an overall average of "B". A striking fact is that all of the participants had had at least four years of French in high school and at least some exposure to French literature.
None of these students were products solely of the required college level language sequence. All but three students reported prior experience studying English literature at the college level, suggesting that they had some exposure to conventions of literary analysis and possessed a degree of general "literary competence" that was rarely revealed during the public or private segments of either event. Student self-assessment of language abilities in French indicated a comfortable evaluation of their own abilities, and the mean across skills was above the mid-range. The students assessed their listening and reading abilities consistently higher than their writing and speaking abilities, suggesting that they consider the so-called "receptive" skills as their relative strengths.

Students generally offered mixed reviews and attitudes about studying English-language literature. Half were quite categorical, either liking or disliking it. The other half linked their attitudes to particularly appreciated works. On the other hand, more than half reported positive attitudes towards French-language literature.

An explanation for differences in attitudes towards English and French literature both within and between respondents may be inferred from reports about the purposes of studying the two. Students stressed the intellectual and
aesthetic virtues of studying English-language literature but tended to consider the study of French-language literature principally as a means of improving language skills or learning about French culture. It is significant that students' attitudes at the end of the course towards French literature remained positive, and suggests that they perceived that the contents of the course had helped them to achieve their goals.

Students' personal goals in studying French and orientations towards future study also revealed a distinct focus on the improvement of language ability; none reported humanist goals such as aesthetic or personal enrichment. Students' expectations concerning courses in French- and English-language literature were similar. They expected a degree of challenge and difficulty in both. The greatest similarity, however, was the expectation of class discussions and teacher guidance. The purpose of writing about literature in the two languages was seen as similar, generally as a vehicle for demonstrating understanding or knowledge. This expectation that writing is a form of demonstration rather than a vehicle for exploration is consistent with the paper-and-pencil, test-like nature of most writing about literature that has been reported in large-scale surveys of literature instruction.
On the whole, the information provided by the questionnaires suggests that the students approach the subject of French literature primarily as an opportunity for language and culture learning. This "learning set" appears to be consistent with the prevalence of a language learning dimension during the two literature lessons. Although some students volunteered negative comments about the course in which they were enrolled, these do not predominate, and there is an overall sense of satisfaction that their language and culture learning goals were met by the class.

**Synthesis of Events One and Two**

Comparison of the data from the two events reveals similarities and differences of which interpretation can only be tentative: The written and spoken records of the two events ultimately offer only a summary trace of the complexities of the private and public dimensions of the "work" of reading and responding to the two texts. The relatively short period of time between the events (two weeks) makes it unlikely, but not impossible, that the differences stem from changes in dynamics within the class or in the abilities of the students. The differences in the recall data, initial responses, lessons, and essays suggest
that at least some of the differences between the two events stem from differences between the texts.

The first text, "Une Famille", may be considered to have been less difficult for the students to comprehend due to the fact that it was conventionally narrated and followed a clearly defined, linear chronology across episode boundaries. The fact that the chronology of the story was generally followed in the recall protocols and during the lesson suggests that this structure provided a framework that facilitated both comprehension and discussion. Although it, too, included a chronological element, the most important elements of the second text ("L'Autre femme"), by contrast, were contained in deceptively small descriptive details and in subtleties of gaze, gesture, and dialogue. Indeed, it appears that the second text placed a significantly greater burden of inference on the readers than did the first: It was a model of an "incomplete" text in Iserian terms for which the reader was required to provide the social implications as well, quite literally, as the ending (the text ended in a diaeresis). Nor did this complexity and incompleteness appear to provide an obvious framework within which the instructor could guide the discussion. (See Figure 4)
Evidence for differences between the two texts as private reading and meaning-making experiences is present in the prevalence of statements about language and other difficulties in the second set of initial responses. The responses to the first text, on the other hand, contained roughly the same distribution of interpretive and associative statement types that the essays contained, suggesting a somewhat greater willingness to engage in interpretation after one reading. The near total absence of evaluative statements in either set of initial responses suggests that students felt unprepared to stand as authorities on the value or overall significance of the works, but it also foreshadows a dearth of such statements in both the lessons and the essays and a general lack of consideration of the texts as works of literature that might authorize or invite a reader's judgment. It is also conceivable that prior experiences with the study of literature as well as this class had taught students to avoid evaluating the works under study. (See Figure 5)

The public dimensions of the two events, the lessons, also were similar in some respects and different in others, although it is of course unclear whether the contrasts are definitively traceable to features of the texts. The turn-taking patterns of the two lessons are starkly different:
In the first, the instructor took twice the number of turns as the students and they were twice as long. In the second lesson, the instructor took slightly fewer turns relative to those taken by students, but her turns were more than three times as long. (See Figure 6) This truly striking difference reflects both the greater number of mostly brief student contributions to the second lesson and the greater number and length of the instructors’ elaborations of her own or the students’ contributions. This may be interpreted as a function of the greater “difficulty” and incompleteness of the second text.

Both lessons followed a clear overall pattern that began with a language-related episode before moving into an attempt to publicly and interactively re-narrate or summarize the texts. During the first lesson, the instructor evidently assumed to a greater extent than during the second lesson that the students had not understood the text. A significant proportion of the first lesson was devoted to a reconstruction of precisely those elements of the story that were present in all of the recall protocols. As a consequence, although it was intended as a reading lesson by the instructor, the retelling portion of the first lesson can at best have functioned as a language lesson for
students since they had understood the literal text to a high degree.

Even as a language lesson, it is uncertain whether the heavy linguistic and ideational scaffolding of the utterances of the minority of students who participated constitutes an optimal language learning environment. The proportion of the second lesson that was devoted to interpretation was much greater, however, and this period reveals the greatest differences with the first lesson. During the less rigorously text-based episodes of the second lesson, more students volunteered contributions, including several who were observed to be silent during all other lessons. Students showed themselves either more able or more willing to accept invitations to engage in personal analysis of the characters and plot than during the first lesson. At times, students even offered unsolicited opinions about characters. The noticeably greater degree of animation that characterized the second lesson is curiously in conflict with the instructor’s assertion that the second lesson was “like pulling teeth” whereas she deemed the first lesson to have been an overall success. It is conceivable that the contrast between the instructor’s perception of the lessons and the observed differences between them are indicative of either her heightened
expectations of them near the end of the term or a tension between her desire to "stick to the text" and the students' belief that this was, after all, a language lesson. Their prior experiences with language lessons appear to have moulded or at least not to have contradicted an implicit assumption that the lessons in this classroom were somehow less serious than "real" discussions of literature. This is consistent with the questionnaire responses, in which many of the students reported viewing French literature primarily as a vehicle for language learning.

The instructor periodically regained control of the discourse during the second lesson by referring back to the text, but to a greater extent than ever occurred during the first lesson, the students' input influenced the direction and the flow. In neither event did the instructor ever relinquish overall control, however. Her presence dominated every exchange, such that the majority of the exchanges during both lessons resembles a tennis match in which she changed partners after each exchange sequence. Only she appeared to possess or assert the right to offer wholly personal asides to illustrate themes or other aspects of the text, or in fact to deviate from the topic under discussion. The students could never fully "own" a perfectly right answer during either lesson in terms either of content or
language form, but there was some evidence of attempts on
the part of at least three students to impose ownership
during the second lesson. These attempts to express wholly
personal judgments met with either explicit or indirect
guidance of their attention back to the text.

In neither lesson did the vocal minority or the silent
majority of the students ever contradict the implicit
assumption of the instructor that they needed the multi­
level scaffolding or safety net of the text, her language
expertise, and her question and feedback sequences in order
to comprehend or discuss the texts or indeed to participate
at all. Nor did the students’ participation ever disconfirm
the instructors’ evident belief in the need to shelter them
by means of a fixed and steady progression from language to
text re-telling to interpretation or from any but low level
inferences. Only tantalizing suggestions of more elaborate
or distant analytic approaches to the stories were offered
by the instructor at the end of the two lessons; the very
few apparent attempts at such contributions by students were
difficult to decipher due to language difficulties or
corrections by the instructor.

Ultimately, the essays from both events that were
judged most successful are consistent with the predominant
interpretive dimensions of the two lessons in focusing to a
large extent on what may be termed documented psychological character analysis. In fact, the primary stance that the lessons and the essays demonstrate towards the characters treats them as if they were actual people by stating what they ought to do next or surmising what their lives "will" be like in the "future". Essays deemed less successful tended to be more focused on personal responses to the stories and to lack adequate linkage to the texts or justification of assertions and generalizations. This suggests that the language-learning stance extends not only to reading but to writing about French literature.

The essays show evidence of a variety of approaches in terms of stating a thesis and defending it with examples and were largely judged to be coherent, if frequently ungrammatical. Few of the rater's comments suggested that language inaccuracies posed obstacles to understanding. Like the lessons (except for one or two hints), however, very few of the essays adopt a formal/analytic or mature spectator stance towards the texts in which the text is treated as an aesthetic object. A very small minority of the essays contains statements that do move towards envisioning the text as an instantiation of broader literary or social themes; these tended to be ranked higher by the raters if the analysis was supported by references to the
stories. None of the essays, however, framed their discussions as discussions or evaluations of the literary form or functioning of the texts. (See Figure 7)

In conclusion, these two literary events exemplify the difficulties for the instructor and the students of reading and discussing literature at this level in French and in what might be considered academically acceptable ways. The adaptations to these difficulties by the instructor and students during the lessons constitute a collaborative achievement. The tacitly agreed upon "rules" for participating in the discussions include waiting to be called upon and avoiding the dual risk of language and interpretive error by keeping one's counsel or responding with the simplest and shortest reply possible. The "rules" for responding to the stories in writing are more difficult to discern, but also include an avoidance of risk by relying on simple language and on the kind of personalized editorializing that is more common in communicatively-oriented language classrooms than in the English-language literature discussions and writing that all of the students reported having experienced in the past. The evident contrasts between the two events suggest that they placed somewhat different demands on the members of the class, but were fundamentally similar in treating the texts as much as
stimuli for less-than-optimal language practice as for formal literary discussion.
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CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The present study set out to describe what it means to "do" literature in an introductory French literature classroom by asking how two classroom literary events shaped students' literary understanding and responses. Examining the structure and content of the literature lessons and students' written responses to literary texts before and after them, the analysis and discussion have sought to reveal how the participants construed and enacted the tension inherent in the two-fold nature of the course--language learning and literary study--through public and private discursive modes.

The design of the study followed the evolution of each event via the responses of 11 students from their initial, private encounter with a literary text through the public forum of the lesson, culminating in an essay. The procedures for each event were as follows: Students first read an unedited French-language short story and then wrote a two-part, native-language protocol consisting of recall
and initial response tasks. The instructor then led a literature lesson in her customary way, and each lesson was video-recorded and transcribed. The final stage consisted of an out-of-class, French-language essay of approximately one page. Students subsequently completed a questionnaire concerning their experiences, abilities, and attitudes about literature and about the study of French.

The preceding chapter presented and discussed the findings from the two literary events and the questionnaires before contrasting the two events. The present chapter will first discuss the findings in light of the overall research questions that motivated the study, demonstrating when possible links between the findings and prevailing arguments for a reconsideration how junior scholars are inducted into the world of FL literature and the role of literature in the post-secondary FL curriculum. The chapter will then propose directions that future research in the area of FL literary response might profitably take.

Although the final section will outline some of its methodological and conceptual limitations, it should be noted at the outset that the narrow focus of the study on two literary events in a single classroom seriously restricts direct generalization in any traditional sense. Rather, the relevance of the study to broader debates within
the profession turns on the degree to which the findings are consistent with those debates and with other empirical classroom studies.

Research Questions

1. What did it mean to the learners and their instructor to "do" literature in this intermediate level, introductory French literature classroom?

The close-up view of two individual literary events afforded by the study shows that doing literature in this classroom was a complex, laborious, and even schizophrenic process. It meant that much of the instructor's and students' considerable labor was expended in a struggle to find workable ways to express in French their ideas about the two stories. It ensnared the students and the instructor in a daunting "double bind" that simultaneously demanded accuracy in language and a text-based variety of accuracy, if not always acuity or depth, in literary and intellectual insights. This entailed, from the students' perspective, heavy reliance upon a linguistic and ideational "safety net" for both the content and the form of their contributions. From the instructor's perspective, the struggle to engage students in the texts and in the discussion entailed the use of a range of sociolinguistic
strategies and tactics in the construction and perpetual maintenance of the safety net. For all the participants, finally, doing literature in French meant relying to a large extent on objective features of the text rather than on individual or collectively negotiated interpretive processes. Finally, it entailed an unspoken and perhaps "unspeakable" accord that it was neither wholly literature nor wholly language that was being done, but rather collaboration in the continuous and uneasy creation of hybrid public and private discourses.

This collective, local, and entirely tacit solution to the problems inherent in the necessity of speaking and writing about authentic French-language literary texts in French is derivative of the collaborative performance that characterizes the immersion environment of lower level language classes. As van Lier (1982) has noted, the communicative language classroom is characterized by a particularly dramatic version of the highly ritualized and constrained exchanges that have long been observed to predominate in L1 classroom discourse (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). As Bernhardt (1991) has noted, students in L2 classes, particularly elective classes such as that examined in the study, learn to cooperate with the instructor by displaying whatever knowledge and ostensibly
literate behaviors are required to "get the lesson done". This joint achievement comes to be accepted by the participants as acquiring--or merely displaying--knowledge, "doing" reading or, in the case of the study participants, doing literature. In this sense, the performance of the students and the instructor belies a belief that practicing speaking--or listening on the part of the majority who speak rarely or not at all--under heavily scaffolded instructional guidance would lead to being able to read and write about literature in French as well as to increased overall proficiency, a belief that has been seriously questioned by several researchers (Brooks, 1992; Riley, 1977).

It is difficult to assess with confidence the concessions that this hybrid communicative environment entails in terms of eventually cultivating critical habits of mind or of introducing the specialized language and analytic habits of the explication de texte mode of response that intermediate level students inevitably will confront in subsequent literature classes. One notable sacrifice, however, is suggested by the paucity of statements during the lessons and in the essays that considered the texts from a detached critical stance as formal aesthetic objects by considering how or why they work or using conventional terms and rhetorical modes of analysis. In effect, it is
difficult to imagine how or even whether the lessons themselves would have been different had the texts been expository as opposed to literary texts.

2. What forces shaped, defined, or constrained the evolution (from private reading through the public forum of a lesson) of the students' written literary responses?

The researcher contends that the students' contributions to the lessons and essays were shaped largely by the necessity of getting through the tasks with the minimum of error and risk rather than an effort to communicate what they thought or felt or to forge new knowledge. The halting language of the lessons and its written analog in the essays offer testament to the fact that the struggle to express themselves in French was a significant factor in shaping and constraining the students' responses and the instructor's role in eliciting and informing them.

The study cannot fully account for other forces that influenced the final written outcomes of the two literary events since the data do not reveal what individual students were thinking either during the lesson or while composing the essays. Nor, more importantly, can the influence of previous experiences with the study of literature and
general "literary competence" on the students' untutored understandings, participation in the lessons, and composition of the essays be known. The influence of L1 literacy and literary knowledge, skills, and experiences on the essays is suggested, however, by the fact that the students all reported having studied English language literature at the college level. In addition, at least some of the students, those whose essays were most favorably ranked, used conventional strategies of argumentation and documentation that were not modeled or overtly encouraged in any of the lessons observed in this classroom.

The public discussions, in being closely managed by the instructor in a steady progression from vocabulary building to re-narration and eventually to limited and heavily circumscribed interpretation, reveal that the instructor subscribed to the commonly held belief that students' understandings need to be built in courses, rather like a brick structure. This process of building vocabulary and literal understanding was apparently seen by her as an absolute prerequisite to any sort of autonomous or personal engagement or to the kinds of interpretation that might eventually lead to formal, analytic writing about the texts in French. The moderate to high range of recall of the essentials of the stories and the fluency of the immediate
reactions offered in the initial responses, however, suggest that this lock-step guidance through and beyond a threshold level of literal understanding was not uniformly appropriate to the task of enriching the students' varied but emergent understandings and personal and interpretive engagement prior to the lessons. There is adequate evidence in the data to assert that the students were capable of engaging in abstract critical thinking and discussion that never found a voice during the two events.

The participation of the students in the lessons never contradicted the instructor's evident assumption that their understandings were inadequate for interpretation. The lessons offered little opportunity for them to do so, nor did they at any time after the brief initial small-group episodes allow for the students' understandings to be shared or negotiated in ways documented and argued for in the context of L1 literature lessons by Golden (1988) and Hynds (1990b). It is likely that the disparity in language abilities between instructors and students inherent in L2 literary discussions discourages the kinds of social interaction and "exploratory talk" (Barnes, Britton, & Torbe, 1989) that might encourage truly thoughtful discussion or eventually foster the development of
autonomous literate engagement with literary texts or discussions.

The essential similarities between the discursive and interactive patterns of the lessons analyzed in this study and Marshall's (1989) findings in L1 literature lessons, however, suggest that there are similar tendencies in the L1 and L2 settings for the dual authority of the text and the teacher to constrain patterns of student response. This study is like Marshall’s and others’ (Purves, 1981; Rogers, 1988) in finding that, frequently despite teachers’ declared intentions to the contrary, a normative, New Critical or fundamentalist stance towards literary texts tends to prevail and to constitute a “tacit curriculum” (Marshall, 1989) in which the students’ role is to fill in the blanks in an interpretive agenda implied by the teacher’s questions.

The lessons examined in this study offer evidence that the culture of the L2 literature classroom induces what Barnes, Britton, and Torbe (1989) term the frequently "ritual-like nature" of classroom literature discussions in which "in presenting the right answers, the students are using language to satisfy the teacher" (p. 73). The advantages of the kind of talk that results in such a discursive environment are that "it is abbreviated, it
serves the purpose of educational control, and it brings the pupils' statements in line with the teacher's frame of reference" (p. 73); in the L2 classroom, the programmed nature of the discussion serves the added face-saving purpose of sheltering students from producing muddled or error-ridden language and the inevitable embarrassment of correction or repair.

The analysis of the essays, particularly the rank-orderings, echo Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989) in finding that students who opted for a personal mode of response tended to use a slightly wider range of response statements and to be judged of as high or sometimes higher quality as students who chose more formal approaches. The determining factor appeared to be the degree to which the essays were linked to the text rather than the mode of response or quality of the French. Several of the essays that were ranked the highest were those that were judged most successful in documenting their analyses and generalizations but did not necessarily use the most sophisticated or accurate French.

It is evident that the relatively open and private forum provided by the two essay assignments was construed by the students as an opportunity to express and explore reactions to the texts that they either could not or did not
express during the public forum of the lessons. An additional factor that appeared to influence the students' approach to the essay task was the belief, expressed by the students in the questionnaires and implicit in the instructor's teaching practices, that the primary purpose of writing about literature in French was to improve French language abilities. This attitude produced what is tantamount to a tacit, written equivalent of "procedural display" (Bloome, 1985) in which the content and rhetorical demands of the task are secondary or even irrelevant to simply getting the task done. Indirect support for this observation comes from the fact that at no time during the lessons observed in this classroom or in conversations with the instructor did she address the modes of analysis and rhetorical strategies specific to writing about literature, perhaps assuming that the lessons would indirectly prepare the students.

A number of the essays, by largely and unabashedly resembling personalized compositions more than analyses of literature, may illustrate a disposition on the part of the students to engage in personal literary discussion. It is equally possible, however, that the tendency to use a personal mode of response confirms the fact that the language learning curriculum competed with or even
superseded the literature curriculum in the final product of the events as well as during the lessons. The prevalence of this approach, which characterizes all but a small minority of the essays, suggests that the students in this classroom, and by extension their instructor, viewed the essay task as an extension of previous communicative language learning and writing experiences rather than a forum for potentially serious literary discussion. Problems with language exemplified by ungrammatical French, short sentences, and a generally tentative, spoken tone offer additional evidence of pronounced constraints on the ability of the students to express their ideas in written French but may also constitute signs of the exploratory, experimental approach also noted in the personal mode by Newell, Suszynski, and Weingart (1989).

3. What does the variation among learners reveal about the problems that they confronted in encountering and responding to authentic French-language literary texts?

Student performance on the different tasks of the two events varied widely within and across students and events: Individual students who recalled the story relatively well in one event did not necessarily do so in the other, and the distribution of response statements and rank-orderings of
their essays across events were similarly highly variable for most participants. The lack of any identifiable pattern indirectly suggests that differences in their reading and writing abilities in French were not the sole factors in determining students' understanding and responses.

It is probable that the intra-individual differences are in part explained by the differences between the two texts. The aspects of the stories that the students selected for recall as well as differences in the recall scores between events indicate that they had greater difficulty understanding the most important elements of the second story than the first story. It is similarly possible that some students simply had less to say about one text than the other. In either case, the likelihood that differences between the texts were a significant factor reaffirms that comparability across events is limited and even hazardous and that the reader-text-context interaction is complex and variable.

The lessons themselves offer few direct clues to what the students understood or thought about the stories. The environment of the lessons did not invite the students to hazard evaluative or analytic comments whether they were able to do so or not, and in many instances this tacitly agreed upon avoidance of risk or inability to engage in
literary analysis extended to many of the essays as well. The silence of the majority throughout both lessons and even the active participation of several students cannot explain differences in their written responses due to the heavily formatted and scaffolded character of the instructor's discourse for the students to fill.

Similarly, there appears to be no set pattern in the relationship between the content of the essays and the assessment of their quality beyond the appreciation by the raters of attempts to document assertions. This is yet another indication that abilities in French were only one of a constellation of factors determining students' engagement with the texts and performance of the tasks.

In summary, the results of the study suggest that the students were able to privately read and respond in English to literary texts in ways that were not and perhaps could not have been reflected in the lessons, and that the lessons may not have contributed substantively to their understandings as they ultimately found expression in the essays. The rank-orderings and quality assessments of the essays reveal above all that the students whose essays were most successful exhibited an ability to structure and document a personal or analytic argument, an ability or
disposition that they very likely brought with them to the study of French.

The lessons, apart from illustrating the difficulties of the "double bind" for all concerned, showed evidence of a transfer from communicative language classes of language learning and teaching strategies such as the instructor's teacher-talk, which minimized the risk of student error and was laced with repetitions, redundancies, and restatements and rarely used anaphoric pronoun reference. As Brooks (1992) found, the instructor's attempts to maximize participation while minimizing inaccuracy paradoxically hindered negotiation of meaning and provided few opportunities for exploration or enrichment either of ideas or socially mediated language development. For the students, this entailed a set of strategies for playing along with an immersion game by either remaining silent or offering short, risk-free utterances that never revealed more than a direct question solicited.

The transfer of a language learner, display-oriented mind-set extended to the essays, in which students were able to discuss the texts in passable language-learner French, but rarely went beyond a naïve version of psychological character analysis. The essays and lessons finally suggest that the dominant and consensually arrived uses of the texts
are three-fold: as resources for vocabulary-building; as stimuli for the practice of summarizing and renarrating skills in French; and, to a lesser extent, as stimuli for interpretation of the plot and characters as though they were actual facts. In effect, neither the instructor nor the learners exhibited any indication that doing literature in this classroom was anything other than an exercise in language learning that for at least half the time resembled a drill of the objective features of the texts. This resulted in the adoption, in private and in public, of a hybrid version of what Rosenblatt (1978) refers to as an "efferent" (as opposed to an "aesthetic") reading stance that is associated most closely with the reading of informational and expository texts.

Implications for FL Curricular Planning and Instruction

The questions about curriculum and instruction that motivated this study stem from the contention that the division and even disjunction within the profession between basic language instruction and advanced language and literature instruction is inscribed in the daily work of classrooms at all levels but is especially visible at the intermediate level introduction to literature. The study is
further grounded in the notion that the "functional" and essentially spoken conceptualization of communicative competence that underlies the basic language sequence may not optimally prepare language students for more advanced, literacy- and literature-based studies and may contribute to discouragement and attrition at the intermediate level (Benseler, 1991).

The study has illustrated, through a close-up view of specific literary events, how the abrupt transition from the basic language sequence to the intermediate level literature class can produce a classroom culture that ultimately may not optimally contribute either to language learning or to the development of FL literary competence. The researcher concludes that the study does indeed corroborate a growing body of empirical research in L2 literacy and broader-based trends in conceptions of literacy in calling for substantially re-examining approaches to teaching literature in the FL setting.

In terms of curricular planning, the results of the study also reaffirm the suggestion by a number of FL researchers, administrators, and literature specialists (e.g., Davis, 1992; James, 1989; Jurasek, 1988; Swaffar, 1992) that the literacy and even the intellectual component of the required basic language sequence at the post-
secondary level could benefit from a critical re-examination. Specifically, the struggle to demonstrate even a basic understanding that hindered the public and private responses to the texts from moving into personal, aesthetic, or analytic modes could potentially be alleviated if literacy-based activities, considered as ends in themselves rather than as subservient to the development of basic spoken proficiency, formed a more integral part of basic language courses than is often the case. Second language reading and writing research have demonstrated that students at even relatively low ability levels are able to engage meaningfully and profitably in literacy activities, but the prevailing communicative paradigm continues to promote the development of "functional" oral proficiency as its primary objective.

Underlying the communicative language teaching paradigm is an implicit belief that a mythic threshold level of "general" (e.g., oral) proficiency is necessary for theoretically more "advanced" skills such as reading and writing (except, of course, for pencil-and-paper tests of "recorded speech"). This view effectively denies or represses the intellectual and critical skills that FL students bring to the classroom in the name of functional oral proficiency: Post-secondary learners are literate
adults who, in many of their other academic experiences, are capable of—if not uniformly accustomed to—using reading and writing as private, exploratory meaning-making and learning processes. This study appears to confirm Swaffar's (1991) assertion that instruction that discourages risk and encourages display may unwittingly foster the persistence of immature reading strategies among more advanced second language learners (McLaughlin, 1987) and thereby actually impede the transfer of the literacy-based skills that could in turn support language learning.

The inclusion of literacy-based activities as a more substantive element of basic language courses, in addition to inviting or requiring students to use the broadest possible range of intellectual tools that we know that they possess to learn language, offers the possibility of substantially narrowing the gap between the environment of basic language classes and that of the upper reaches of the undergraduate curriculum (James, 1989; Swaffar, 1991, 1993). Authentic texts of all genres and media (including film, advertisements, and graffiti as well as literary texts) offer sources of appropriate language in context, cross-cultural insights and, perhaps most importantly, stimuli for critical thinking, discussion, and writing that pedagogical reading materials graded according to criteria of ostensible
difficulty and "readability" simply cannot rival. As Nunan (1985) has usefully argued and successfully practiced, the responsibility of the curriculum is to adapt the tasks to the texts rather than the reverse.

In addition to joining arguments for inclusion of authentic texts and extended, process-oriented reading and writing practice at all curricular levels (e.g., Davis, et al., 1992), the researcher proposes that the transition between basic language study and more advanced study would best be facilitated by a critical examination of the overall FL undergraduate curriculum. The gap between language and literature/culture faculty is exactly mirrored in the literacy gap between lower and upper division courses, a gap that was deeply inscribed in the day-to-day functioning of this single classroom. This crucial gap demands debate concerning the fundamental objectives of language study and the instructional materials and procedures designed in extremis to bridge it. The relative silence concerning the intermediate level, universally acknowledged by students and faculty as problematic at best, does not speak well for communication and healthy self-examination in or among the various branches of the profession.
If a study of such modest proportions offers implications for daily teaching practice, they necessarily depend upon specific characteristics of the FL as well as contextual and institutional factors. The researcher's conclusion is that, despite an obviously well-intended effort to the contrary, the tacit contract to participate in a low-risk language lesson that characterized this classroom in effect impeded exploration and enrichment of the students' French-language literacy skills and literary understandings. In confirming Swaffar's (1993) assertion that reading and writing habits characteristic of immature first language learners are unwittingly perpetuated at this level, the study demands a search for alternative instructional practices. At a minimum, instruction should base lessons on what students have understood of a text rather than assuming that they have not and should provide for a range of exploratory speaking and writing activities that do not implicitly demand linguistic accuracy at the expense of critical thought.

If the intermediate level is to continue to function essentially to address the development of literacy knowledge and skills and literary competence that are less emphasized basic language classes, it is imperative that ways be found to integrate teaching approaches that bridge the two
paradigms by enabling students to use their first language literacy skills rather than suppressing them. An initial first step might be to consider an approach that cultivates the potential pleasures of reading and talking about literature rather than focusing so relentlessly on achieving flawless literal understanding: The common finding that students can comprehend the basic plot and structure of unedited texts and can respond to them even if their understanding is flawed or incomplete indicates that more instructional time and energy could be devoted to intellectually challenging and critical discourse if lessons used what the students have understood as a point of departure.

The fact that students are more articulate private readers, thinkers, and writers than public speakers indicates a greater use of writing as exploration and as unevaluated process as an antecedent to and even major component of lessons: Rather than test-like writing for a sole reader/examiner, such writing would be destined for an audience of peers and would serve as the stimulus for discussion and for further writing. In this manner, students'--and the instructor's--own preferences for particular reading attitudes and response modes could be made explicit and debated.
This could ultimately lead to a functional, consensually developed awareness of the appropriateness of different rhetorical, interpretive, and critical practices valorized in different contexts, ranging from the most formal academic writing task to discussions among friends. This could be combined with group work, in which the authority of the instructor and dependence upon a linguistic and ideational safety net are sharply reduced, for the semi-private negotiation of literal meaning as well as interpretation.

It is clear that certain implications flow from an open acknowledgement of the fact that the language learning curriculum tends at times, probably inevitably, to supersede the literary and intellectual curriculum at the intermediate level. In addition to the almost alien concept of promoting pleasure in reading and talking, another possibility is that the instructor’s and students’ roles could be redefined in order to ensure the optimal amount of the meaningful interaction that is widely recognized as crucial to language learning. The ideal language learning environment under such conditions would be one in which no reading or judgment is invalidated, and every insight could be incorporated into the progressive construction of a collaborative interpretation that need never sacrifice either rigor of
argumentation nor textual reference. It is not inconceivable that the negotiation of literal comprehension, an evident necessity in the FL literary experience, could be treated as a special variety of interpretation that has both personal, cultural, and linguistic dimensions. Similarly, the pursuit of linguistic accuracy in speech and writing could come to be viewed as an element of the quest for clarity and precision in interpretive insight rather than as an inhibiting prerequisite to expression.

In summary, it seems that a response-oriented literary pedagogy for the introductory literature classroom is potentially consistent with a communicative approach to language teaching. Such a hybrid pedagogy would promote pleasure as a goal of reading, would encourage the expression of the entire range of responses to aesthetic experience, and would hold that all responses are valid if they adhere to the conventions established or agreed upon by the community. It would insist that no member of the "interpretive community" can hide behind tactics of display or silence while maximizing the socially negotiated processes of interpretation and response that are, not coincidentally, the primary locus of learning and knowledge construction as well. It would invite learners to themselves become conscious of the socially mediated
"pragmatics" of the modes and tropes of aesthetic response that determine their appropriateness to different settings and genres—spoken or written, formal or informal, public or private, for pleasure or for academic purposes. It would, finally, promote a kind of "hybrid rigor" that would seek to promote both the challenges and the pleasures of reading, talking about, and interpreting literary and cultural texts and other aesthetic experiences.

Directions for Further Research

Given the unchallenged preeminence of literary studies in FL scholarship and the dearth of research that has examined how FL literary scholars are formed, this study is necessarily only a minuscule step within a potentially broad field of enquiry. It is grounded in research and theoretical models borrowed largely from L1 that have adopted a reader response perspective as both an analytic and pedagogical framework.

Suggestions for research include further refining both the conceptual and methodological adaptation of this L1 perspective to L2 and FL literature contexts: It is clear that the parameters of the L2 literature lesson are different from L1, but far from clear precisely how these differences affect literary response or understanding.
Studies that compare the character of L1 and L2 literature lessons could inform the definition of these differences and begin to answer the troubling dialectic between comprehension and interpretation. Case studies of students in which their L1 literary competence and literacy skills are assessed and serve as a backdrop to their L2 literary responses would be useful in this regard.

Among potentially fertile methodological possibilities are introspective think-aloud and read-aloud case studies that would reveal what students are thinking when reading and responding to literary texts. The question of efferent versus aesthetic stance that is implicit in this study could be investigated more adequately using such methods.

Additional areas that invite investigation are the roles of writing as exploration and small-group work versus teacher-fronted or large-group discussions in shaping students' literary understandings and responses. Despite the practical difficulties in studying small-group work, this is an avenue of research with a relatively rich body of antecedents.

The fact that this study focused exclusively on one instructor is a limitation—and a strength. It is in any event clear that a great deal needs to be known about FL literature lessons in a variety of languages and
institutional and instructional contexts before valid generalizations can be drawn. This suggests a need for survey research as well as ethnographic, participant-observational studies that describe classrooms and lessons that are intact and do not impose the kinds of quasi-experimental constraints imposed by this study.

A final area of investigation that is warranted due to how little is known about intermediate level FL instruction is the existing attitudes and practices within FL departments concerning the transition from lower to upper level classes and the prevailing expectations of instructors responsible for teaching upper level literature classes.

Limitations

The study is limited by the fact that it was conducted with a single group of learners and their instructor during two literary events and therefore cannot make credible claims about other groups or even developmental or other diachronic changes in the character of the classroom during the course of the study. The study is also constrained in interpretive breadth by focusing so intently on the micro-functioning of these two events. Furthermore, despite an attempt to interfere minimally with the daily affairs of the classroom, it is also limited by the fact that it did
inevitably upon the routine pattern of literary events in this setting.

An additional limitation upon interpretation of the results is the underlying and not directly supported assertion that the students’ L1 literacy and literary competence may have influenced their responses. Further, rather than focusing on variation among individual learners’ responses, the study draws inferences from broad trends in the distributions of pooled data that diluted variation rather than making it an object of study.
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J'allais revoir mon ami Simon Radevin
que je n'avais point aperçu depuis quinze ans.
Autrefois, c'était mon meilleur ami,
1'ami de ma pensée,
celui avec qui on passe les longues soirées tranquilles
gaies, celui à qui on dit les choses intimes du cœur,
pour qui on trouve, en causant doucement,
les idées rares,
fines,
ingénieuses,
délicates,
nées de la sympathie même qui excite l'esprit et le met à
l'aïse.
Pendant bien des années,
ne nous nous étions guère quittés.
Nous avions vécu, voyagé, songé, rêvé ensemble,
aimé les mêmes choses d'un même amour,
adméré les mêmes livres,
compris les mêmes oeuvres,
frémi des mêmes sensations,
et si souvent ri des mêmes êtres que nous nous
comprénions
rien qu'en échangeant un coup d'œil.
Puis, il s'était marié.
Il avait épousé tout à coup une fillette de province
venue
à Paris pour chercher un fiancé.
Comment cette petite blondasse, maigre,
aux mains niaises,
aux yeux clairs et vides,
à la voix fraîche et bête,
avait-elle cueilli ce garçon intelligent et fin?
Peut-on comprendre ces choses-là?
Il avait sans doute espéré le bonheur, lui,
le bonheur simple, doux, et long
entre les bras d'une femme blonde,
tendre, et fidèle;
et il avait entrevu tout cela,
dans le regard transparent de cette gamine aux cheveux pâles.
Il n'avait pas songé que l'homme actif, vivant, et vibrant,
se fatigue de tout dès qu'il a saisit la stupide réalité,
à moins qu'il ne s'abrutisse au point de ne plus rien comprendre.
Comment allais-je le retrouver?
Toujours vif, spirituel, rieur et enthousiaste,
ou bien endormi par la vie provinciale?
Un homme peut changer en quinze ans!
Le train s'arrêta dans une petite gare.
Comme je descendais de wagon,
un gros, très gros homme aux joues rouges,
a ventre rebondi,
s'élança vers moi, les bras ouverts, en criant :
"Georges."
Je l'embrassai,
mais je ne l'avais pas reconnu.
Puis je murmurai stupéfait :
"Cristi, tu n'as pas maigri."
Il répondit en riant :
"Que veux-tu?
La bonne vie!
La bonne table!
les bonnes nuits!
Manger et dormir,
voilà mon existence!"
Je le contemplai,
chercheant dans cette large figure les traits aimés.
L'œil seul n'avait point changé;
mais je ne trouvais plus le regard et je me disais :
"S'il est vrai que le regard est le reflet de la pensée,
la pensée de cette tête-là n'est plus celle d'aujourd'hui,
L’œil brillait pourtant,
plein de joie et d’amitié;
mais il n’avait plus cette clarté intelligente qui
exprime,
autant que la parole, la valeur d’un esprit.
Tout à coup, Simon me dit :
“Tiens, voici mes deux aînés.”
Une fillette de quatorze ans,
presque femme,
et un garçon de treize ans,
vêtu en collégien,
s’avancèrent d’un air timide et gauche.
Je murmurai : “C’est à toi?”
Il répondit en riant : “Mais, oui.
— Combien en as-tu donc?
— Cinq!
Encore trois restés à la maison!”
Il avait répondu cela d’un air fier,
content, presque triomphant;
et moi je sentais saisi de pitié profonde,
mêlée d’un vague mépris,
pour ce reproducteur orgueilleux et naïf
qui passait ses nuits à faire des enfants entre deux
sommers,
dans sa maison de province,
comme un lapin dans une cage.
On eut vite traversé la cité,
et la voiture entra dans un jardin qui avait des
prétentions de parc,
puis s’arrêta devant une maison à tourelles qui cherchait
té passer pour château.
“Voilà mon trou”,
disait Simon, pour obtenir un compliment.
Je répondis :
“C’est délicieux.”
Sur le perron, une dame apparut,
paree pour la visite,
coiffée pour la visite,
avec des phrases prêtes pour la visite.
Ce n’était plus la fillette blonde et fade que j’avais
vue à l’église quinze ans plus tôt,
ume grosse dame à falbalas et à frisons,
ume de ces dames sans âge,
sans caractère,
sans éloquence,
sans esprit,
sans rien de ce qui constitue une femme.
C'était une mère,
enfin,
une grosse mère banale,
la pondeuse,
la poulinière humaine,
la machine de chair qui procréée sans autre préoccupation
Elle me souhaita la bienvenue et j'entrai dans le
vestibule
où trois mioches alignés par rang de taille semblaient
Je dis :
“ Ah! ah!
voici les autres?”
Simon, radieux, les nomma :
“Jean, Sophie, et Gontran.”
Deux couverts?
Par ici, monsieur et madame,
il y a encore une table contre la baie,
si madame et monsieur veulent profiter de la vue.
Alice suivit le maître d'hôtel.
---Oh!
oui, viens, Marc,
on aura l'air de déjeuner sur la mer dans un bateau.
Son mari la retint d'un bras passé sous le sien.
---Nous serons mieux là.
---là? Au milieu de tout ce monde?
J'aime bien mieux...
---Je t'en prie, Alice.
Il resserra son étreinte d'une manière tellement significative qu'elle se retourna.
---Qu'est-ce que tu as?
Il fit "ch...tt" tout bas,
en la regardant fixement,
et l'entraîna vers la table du milieu.
---Qu'est-ce qu'il y a, Marc?
---Je vais te dire, chérie.
Laisse-moi commander le déjeuner.
Veux-tu des crevettes?
ou des œufs en gelée?
---Ce que tu voudras, tu sais bien.
Ils se sourirent,
gaspillant les précieux moments d'un maître d'hôtel surmené,
atteint d’une sorte de danse nerveuse,
qui transpirait près d’eux.
---Les crevettes, commanda Marc.
Et puis les oeufs bacon.
Et du poulet froid avec une salade de romaine.
From
Spécialité de la maison?
Va pour la spécialité.
Deux très bons cafés.
Qu’on fasse déjeuner mon chauffeur,
ou nous repartons à deux heures.
Du cidre?
Je me méfie
Du champagne sec.
Il soupira comme s’il avait déménagé une armoire,
contempla la mer décolorée de midi,
le ciel presque blanc,
puis sa femme qu’il trouva jolie sous un petit chapeau de
Mercure à grand voile pendant.
---Tu as bonne mine, chérie,
et tout ce bleu de mer te fait les yeux verts,
figure-toi!
et puis tu engraisse, en voyage...
C’est agréable, à un point,
mais à un point!...
Elle tendit orgueilleusement sa gorge ronde,
en se penchant au dessus de la table:
---Pourquoi m’as-tu empêchée de prendre cette place
contre la baie?
Marc Séguy ne songea pas à mentir.
---Parce que tu allais t’asseoir à côté de quelqu’un que
je connais.
---Et que je ne connais pas?
---Mon ex-femme.
Elle ne trouva pas un mot à dire et ouvrit plus grands
ses yeux bleus.
---Quoi donc, chérie?
Ça arrivera encore.
C’est sans importance.
Alice, retrouvant la parole,
lança dans leur ordre logique les questions inévitables:
---Elle t’a vu?
Elle a vu que tu l’avais vue?
Montre-la moi?
Ne te retourne pas tout de suite,
je t’en prie,
elle doit nous surveiller...
Une dame brune,
tête nue,
ellle doit habiter cet hôtel...
Toute seule, derrière ces enfants en rouge...
Oui. Je vois.
Abritée derrière des chapeaux de plage à grandes ailes,
Alice put regarder celle qui était encore,
quinze mois auparavant,
femme de son mari.
"Incompatibilité", lui racontait Marc.
"Oh! mais, là...
incompatibilité totale!
Nous avons divorcé en gens bien élevés,
presque en amis,
tranquille, rapidement.
Et je me suis mis à t’aimer,
et tu as bien voulu être heureuse avec moi.
Quelle chance qu’il n’y ait, dans notre bonheur,
i ni coupables, ni victimes!"
La femme en blanc,
casuée de cheveux plats et lustrés où la lumière de la mer miroitait en plaques d’azur,
fumait une cigarette en fermant à demi les yeux.
Alice se retourna vers son mari,
prit des crevettes et du beurre,
mangea posément.
Au bout d’un moment de silence:
Pourquoi ne m’avais-tu jamais dit qu’elle avait aussi les yeux bleus?
Mais je n’y ai pas pensé!
Il baisa la main qu’elle étendait vers la corbeille à pain
et elle rougit de plaisir.
Brune et grasse,
on l’eût trouvée un peu bestiale,
mais le bleu changeant de ses yeux, et ses cheveux d’or ondé,
la déguisaient en blonde frêle et sentimentale.
Elle vouait à son mari une gratitude éclatante.
Immodeste sans le savoir,
Elle portait sur toute sa personne les marques trop visibles d'une extrême félicité.
Ils mangèrent et burent de bon appétit,
et chacun d'eux crut que l'autre oubliait la femme en blanc.
Pourtant,
Alice riait parfois trop haut,
et Marc soignait sa silhouette,
élargissant les épaules et redressant la nuque.
Ils attendirent le café assez longtemps,
en silence.
Une rivière incandescente,
reflet étiré du soleil haut et invisible,
deplaçait lentement sur la mer,
brillait d'un feu insoutenable.
---Elle est toujours là, tu sais,
chuchota brusquement Alice.
---Elle te gêne?
Tu veux prendre le café ailleurs?
---Mais pas du tout!
C'est plutôt elle qui devrait être gênée!
D'ailleurs, elle n'a pas l'air de s'amuser follement
si tu la voyais...
---Pas besoin.
Je lui connais cet air-là.
---Ah! oui,
c'était son genre?
Il souffla de la fumée par les narines et fronça les sourcils:
---Un genre...
Non.
A te parler franchement,
elle n'était pas heureuse avec moi.
---Ça, par exemple!...
---Tu es d'une indulgence délicieuse, chérie,
une indulgence folle...
Tu es un amour, toi...
Tu m'aimes...
Je suis si fier, quand je te vois ces yeux...
oui, ces yeux-là...
Elle...
Je n'ai sans doute pas su la rendre heureuse.
Voilà, je n'ai pas su.
---Elle est difficile!
Alice s’éventait avec irritation,
et jetait de brèves regards sur la femme en blanc qui fumait,
la tête appuyée au dossier de rotin,
et fermait les yeux avec un air de lassitude satisfaite.
Marc haussa les épaules modestement:
---C’est le mot, avoua-t-il.
Que veux-tu?
Il faut plaire ceux qui ne sont jamais contents.
Nous, nous sommes si contents...
N’est-ce pas, chérie?
Elle ne répondit pas.
Elle donnait une attention furtive au visage de son mari,
coloré,
régulier,
à ses cheveux drus,
faufilés ça et là de soie blanche,
à ses mains courtes et soignées.
Dubitativa pour la première fois,
s’interrogea:
"Qu’est-ce qu’elle voulait donc de mieux, elle?"
Et jusqu’au départ,
pendant que Marc payait l’addition,
s’enquérat du chauffeur,
de la route,
elle ne cessa plus de regarder avec une curiosité
envieuse la dame en blanc,
cette mécontente,
cette difficile,
cette supérieure...
APPENDIX C

RECALL AND INITIAL RESPONSE PROMPTS

Name__________________________

Using paragraph form, please write down all that you remember about the text you just read.

Again using paragraph form, describe your response to the text.
Notes:
Sixteen students participated. The event consisted of individual reading of an unedited, 725 word short story by Guy de Maupassant, individual recall and personal response, and a lesson that began with small-group work using a teacher-prepared worksheet before moving to a teacher-fronted question-and-answer format.

11:31 The instructor gave directions for the tasks in English prior to distributing the texts and prompts. Average reading time was 10 minutes and was fairly uniform; time for completion of recall/personal response tasks ranged from 7 to 13 minutes.

12:04 The lesson began when the instructor collected the recall/responses and distributed worksheets for the group task. Worksheets consisted of two parts: An initial task that asked students to find non-standard synonyms in the text for a list of standard French expressions; the second task asked that they compile a list of "themes" that appeared to be raised by the text; the instructor offered examples: la mort, la mortalité, le printemps [death, mortality, springtime].

Five small groups formed in a well-practiced shuffling of chairs, varying in number of students from 2 to 4, and immediately began to work in an increasingly animated and voluble manner. Some clandestine use of English in the groups was noted, but most worked solely in French as the instructor circulated among them, offering hints, prompting, clarifying, approving, and observing. Group work was video-recorded but not transcribed.

12:14 Lesson begins

1 T: Bon alors (2 sec) Nous allons arrêter votre travail en groupes et nous allons trouver ces réponses ensembles.

2 Dans le premier paragraphe, quelle expression veut dire la même chose que "je n'avais pas vu"?

3 Je m'excuse; je n'aurais pas dû mettre le 'l' là.

4 'Je n'avais pas vu' est une autre façon de dire quoi?

5 S: "Je n'avais point aperçu."


7 ne point ça veut dire la même chose que ne pas et puis apercevoir veut dire voir.

8 Deuxième paragraphe--'au passé' veut dire quoi?

9 S: [Barry] "Autrefois".

10 T: C'est ça. C'est ça.

11 Et d'habitude, quand vous décrivez vos activités d'autrefois, vous utilisez l'imparfait, n'est-ce pas.

12 [offers example] Autrefois, j'aimais aller au cinéma.

13 Maintenant je suis trop occupée.

14 Quand vous parlez d'une autre période.

15 Uhm (Uhm) Troisième paragraphe--une autre façon de dire 'plusieurs années', c'est quoi? Smita?

16 S: [Smita] Uhm "Bien des années."

17 T: Bien des années. C'est ça.

18 Bien de c'est une autre façon de dire plusieurs ou beaucoup de.

19 'Presque jamais'?

20 S: [Chris P] Ne guère.

21 T: Ne guère. C'est ça.

22 Et dans ce contexte uh "nous ne nous étions guère quittés" ne guère veut dire presque jamais.

23 Parfois ne guère veut dire presque pas du tout, d'accord.


25 ( ) Uh ( ) 'un regard furtif'.

26 S: [Bill] "Un coup d'oeil".

27 T: Un coup d'oeil. C'est ça.

28 Quand vous regardez quelqu'un très vite, c'est un coup d'oeil.

29 Uh 'une jeune fille'?

30 S: "Une fillette."

31 T: Une fillette. Une fillette.

32 Avec le 'y' au lieu du 'l' ( ? )pour la prononciation.

33 'Qui a les cheveux très blonds'? Peter?

34 S: [Peter] "Blondasse."

35 T: Blondasse. ( ).

36 Et puis, quand vous parlez d'une jeune fille et vous l'appellez une fillette blondasse, vous avez l'impression
que c’est une façon très sympathique de décrire //une jeune fille?

37 S: //Non.

Parceque//

38 T: //Non.

39 Alors si vous voulez dire une jeune fille, d’habitude vous dites une jeune fille uh d’accord.

40 ‘Une fillette’ minimise un peu.

41 Ss: //Ss laugh//

42 T: Ça veut dire que je n’trouve pas cette personne très importante.

43 Blondasse, ça veut dire les cheveux presque blancs, d’accord. Pas de beaux cheveux blonds.

44 Uh une autre façon de dire ‘il avait voulu’? Quel est l’autre verbe qui veut dire vouloir dans ce paragraphe?

45 S: [Kendra] Il a espéré.

46 T: Espérer.

47 Quel mot est plus fort? Vouloir ou espérer? Quel quel mot indique plus de force, je//

48 Ss: //Ss laugh//

49 T: Vouloir? Vous pensez? Dans quel sens?

50 Quand je veux aller en France cet été ou j’espère aller en France cet été, lequel indique que je suis plus sure?

51 [Barry] S: Uhm j’espère que je pense que quand on dit je veux c’est un rêve mais ce n’est pas une possibilité mais j’espère peut être//

52 T: //Vous avez interprété différemment que moi.

53 Parce que un espoir n’est-ce pas c’est quelque chose un peu plus loin, un peu moins possible, d’accord.

54 Mais ce sont des synonymes. Donc on peut les interpréter exactement ( ? ). ( ) Donc, quel est une autre façon de ‘dire ‘cet enfant’? 

55 S: [Bill] “Cette gamine”.

56 T: Cette gamine.

57 Et la forme masculine c’est [writes]. Donc, vous avez un gamin, une gamine.

58 Vous connaissez d’autres mots qui veulent dire la même chose que gamin ou gamine?

59 S: [?] Gosse.

60 T: Une gosse ou un gosse. [writes]

61 Ce sont des enfants, d’accord; ( ) de jeunes enfants.

62 Qu’est-ce que vous trouvez comme thèmes dans ce texte?

63 Quels sont les thèmes centraux les plus importants? //

64 S: //Le mariage.
356

65 T: Le mariage. D'accord.
66 S: [Chris J] Et le temps qui passe.
67 T: Oui, d'accord. [writes] Le temps qui passe.
68 Ça veut dire pas le temps qu'il fait, pas en termes de la météo. Le mariage.
69 Quoi d'autre?
70 S: Uhm le bonheur.
71 T: Le bonheur, oui. Qu'est-ce que c'est que le bonheur.
72 C'est une question dans de ce texte.
73 S: [Ushma] La beauté.
74 T: La beauté. Pourquoi pas?
75 S: [Chris J] Le change de l'amitié.
76 T: [repa] Les changements. Le changement (?).
77 Mettons les changements et l'amitié ( ) d'accord.
78 [defines] L'amitié, quand on est amis, on a de la'amitié.
79 S: [Barry] La mort.
80 T: La mort? Pourquoi vous dites cela?
81 S: Parce que uh parce que Simon et uh sa femme quand um ou quand ils se marient, il s'épousaient ils a étaient en amour.
82 T: Ah. L'amour// J'ai compris la mort.
83 S: [Barry] // L'amour. Oui.//
84 Ss: // laughter//
85 S: [Barry] L'amour.[repeats]
86 T: Que pour Georges veut dire la mort ( )
87 Quoi d'autre?
88 S: [Ushma] La femme.
89 T: Oui, oui. La femme. La femme.
90 Spécifiquement son role. Qu'est-ce que c'est qu'une femme.(?) Qu'est-ce qu'elle doit faire.(?)[rhetorical restatements, not really questions]
91 S: [Chris P] Et les hommes aussi.
93 On peut les mettre [writes] dans ( ) ça avec l'amour, dans ce cas.
94 Alors maintenant, racontez-moi l'histoire.
95 Comment s'appellent le deux personnages principaux et qu'est-ce qui se passe dans ce texte?
96 Il y a un homme qui s'appelle comment?
97 S: [Smita]Simon.
98 T: D'accord. Il y a Simon et il y a ( )
99 S: Georges.
100 T: Georges. ( )
101 Et qu'est-ce qui se passe? Racontez-nous la première partie de l'histoire.
102 Oui, Karen?
103 S: [Karen] Ce sont des amis.
104 T: Oui, ce sont des amis, non seulement des amis mais des...
105 S: [Karen] des meilleurs amis.[completes T statement]
106 T: Oui de très bons amis.
107 Et qu’est-ce qui se passe après nous avons cela?
108 S: [Smita] Uhm ils faisaient des toutes les choses ensemble.
109 T: Oui.
110 Quand est-ce qu’il faisaient tout ensemble?
112 Quand est-ce qu’ils faisaient cela? Récemment?
113 S: [Smita] Non.
114 S: [?]Quand ils étaient jeunes[/?]
115 S: [Peter] Il y a quinze ans.
116 T: Il y a quinze ans quand ( ) quand ils étaient jeunes; Ils étaient des jeunes adultes, d’acCORD.
118 Et puis qu’est-ce qui arrive? Eddie?
119 S: [Eddie] Uhm il racontait ce mémoire (?) et il parle beaucoup il décrit la manière de son amitié.
120 T: C’est qui qui décrit l’amitié//
121 S: [Eddie] //C’est Georges.
122 T: C’est Georges qui parle dans ce texte--Georges, c’est le narrateur.
123 Et qu’est-ce que Georges fait? Chris?
124 S: [Chris P] Georges a dit qu’il a une femme uh est venue de Provence uh () pour chercher un fiancé.
125 Et c’est j’ai pas le mot j’ai pas le nom de de l’amie de Georges//qui est le narrateur
126 T: //Simon//.
127 S: Simon? OK.
128 uh ()et et Simon et la femme blondasse se marient//
129 T: //Ils se sont mariés il il y a quinze ans// d’accord.
130 S: //ils se mar//
131 T: //Et puis maintenant, aujourd’hui, au présent dans ce texte, qu’est-ce que Georges fait? Et que’est-ce que c’est qu’il voit? Et qu’est-ce qu’ils font?
132 S:[Karen] Il visite Simon//
133 T: // Oui, il lui rend visite.
[gram. repair]
134 S: [Karen] Oui, uhm () uhm
135 T: Et qu’est-ce qu’il trouve quand il voit son ami qu’il n’a pas vu depuis longtemps? Chris?
136 S: [Chris J]Simon est grosse et//
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137 T: //Oui, il est gros. Il a grossi.
138 S: [Chris J] Il a des des enfants.
139 T: Combien?
140 S: [Chris J] Uh quatre?
141 Ss: Cinq! [Loud repair by other Ss, laughter]
142 S: [Chris J] Oh.
143 T: Vous êtes le seul à ne pas le savoir. ( )
144 Alors, bon, ça c’est l’histoire.
145 Georges arrive. Il a vu son ami qu’il n’a pas vu depuis quinze ans. Son ami Simon a beaucoup changé.
146 Est-ce que Georges est content de voir que Simon () est très gros, qu’il a cinq enfants? Qu’est-ce qu’il pense de la situation? Smita?
147 S: [Smita] Je pense que Georges a été étonné que Simon est très fier de sa famille uhm et il expect [/?=vocab appeal]
148 T: il attendait
149 S: attendait que Georges attendait que Simon sera triste
150 T: qu’il soit triste
151 S: qu’il soit triste (  ?  )
152 T: D’accord, bien.
153 S: [Chris P] Il le décrit comme un lapin dans une cageée.[volunteers comment!]
154 T: dans une cage. [repairs pronunciation]
155 S: [Chris P] dans une cage.
156 T: qui font des petits lapins ( )
157 Bon. Quelques questions à vous poser.
158 Qu’est-ce que Georges pensait de la fiancée de Simon? Quand ils étaient jeunes il y a quinze ans, quelle était son opinion de cette femme? Barry?
159 S: [Barry] Il n’aime pas cette femme.
160 Il pense que( )qu’elle est une chose qui sépare les deux amis.
161 T: D’accord. D’accord.
162 Donc, elle provoque de la sa jalousie parce qu’elle arrivait à voler son ami/.
163 S: [Barry] //et je pense qu’elle est content qu’elle ( ? ) sa jalousie.
164 T: [laughs] D’accord.
165 Autre chose? Félicité? Quelle est son opinion de la jeune fille qui s’est fiancée avec son ami//
166 S: [Félicité] //Il pense qu’elle n’a pas qu’elle n’est pas très intelligente//
167 T: //Pas très intelligente, oui, oui.
168 Autre chose?
169 S: [Holly] Je pense qu’il dit qu’il pense qu’elle est bête.
170 T: Oui, oui. Il pense qu’elle n’est pas intelligente.
171 S: Elle ne cherche qu’un mari.
172 T: Oui. Il pense que c’est une fille venue à Paris explicitement pour se marier:
173 Elle n’est pas intelligente, pas assez belle belle pour se marier avec son mari, qu’elle n’est pas assez sophistiquée (?) .
174 Parce qu’il s’agit aussi ( ) Un des thèmes, c’est Paris et la province ([writes]) d’accord. C’est un des thèmes cachés.
177 N’oubliez pas qu’il y a une province qui s’appelle la Provence [writes].
178 Il y a des différences entre la Provence et la province. 179 La Provence est une province française qui se trouve dans le sud près de la Méditerranée, d’accord—La ville d’Avignon, la ville d’Aix-en-Provence, sont en Provence. 180 La province, quand on parle de la province, en France, c’est tout ce qui n’est pas la région parisienne. 181 La France se divise en Paris et la province, tout ce qui n’est pas Paris.
182 Et les Parisiens comme Georges sont peut-être un peu snobs parfois au sujet de la province de la vie en province. 183 Uh ( ) avant de revoir son ami, quand Georges fait le voyage, il se demande ce qu’il va trouver bon chez son ami Simon. 184 Regardons le paragraphe six, le sixième paragraphe. Il pose la question “Comment allais-je le retrouver?” 185 Lisez ce paragraphe, Julie.
186 S: [Julie—reads sixth paragraph—count as one CU???] 187 T: C’est ça.
188 Alors, Georges se pose une question: Comment vais-je le retrouver? Quand il fait son voyage, il pense ‘qu’est-ce que je vais trouver quand je retrouve Simon?’ 189 Mais parfois quand on pose une question c’est pas parce qu’on cherche une réponse mais parce qu’on croit savoir déjà la réponse.
190 Avez-vous l’impression que Georges pense déjà savoir la réponse à cette question? Qu’est-ce qu’il attend 191 et n’oubliez pas que le verbe attendre [writes], dans ce sens dans la question ‘qu’est-ce qu’il attend ( ) chez son ami Simon’, ça veut dire to expect, n’est-ce pas.
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192 Qu’est-ce qu’il pense être la réponse à cette question, même avant de voir Simon? Holly?

193 S: [Holly] Il pense que Simon ( ) sera ( ) ennuy
nenuyeuse [vocab appeal]

194 T: ennuyeux, oui. [repair/vocab]

195 S: [Holly] Il pense que Simon va être//

196 T: //oui, il pense que

Simon

va être ennuyeux ou ennuyé--boring or bored--
ennuyeux//ennuyé.

197 S: [Holly] /ennuyé, ennuyé/

198 T: Ennuyé, d’accord. Donc il pense que Simon ne va pas
être heureux, d’accord.

199 Autre chose qu’il pense? Ushma?

200 S: [Ushma] Il sait que Simon est heureux mais il ne veut
pas le direr qu’il est heureux.

201 T: Oui mais vous pensez à ce qui vient après dans
l’histoire.

202 Maintenant, Georges est dans le train et il n’a pas
encore vu son ami et il se pose la question ‘Qu’est-ce que
je vais trouver?’. d’accord. Et Holly a suggéré qu’il pense
son ami sera ennuyé de sa vie.

203 S: [Karen] Je pense qu’il je pense qu’il pense que Simon
a changé probablement pour le mauvais.

204 T: Oui, changé en pire [T gram/voc repair]

205 S: [Karen] parce qu’il dit qu’il est toujours vif et
enthousiaste et des choses comme ça et uhm probablement il
n’est pas assez de tout les choses il n’est pas assez vif
qu’avant.

206 T: Aussi vif qu’avant. [gram repair].

207 Donc, vous pensez que Georges pense déjà qu’il ne va pas
être très impressionné de Simon.

208 Moi, je suis d’accord que Georges se prépare à être
décu, à être dégoûté par la vie de son ami Simon, d’accord.

209 Mais quand il voit Simon ce gros homme qu’il ne
reconnait pas ( ) pour uh la première fois qu’il le voit,
que pense Simon de sa vie? Que pense Georges de la vie de
Simon? Que pense Simon de sa propre vie?

210 S: Simon/

211 S: [Félicité] //Simon (?) est fier de sa vie.

212 T: Il est fier de sa vie? De quoi dans sa vie
spécifiquement?

213 S: [Félicité] Ses enfants, sa maison, sa femme ( ? )

214 T: Sa femme, bien.


216 Il se prépare aux changements de Simon dans la
personnalité mais il ne se prépare pas pour des changements
de Simon physiques ( ? )
217 T: Oui, des changements physiques.
218 Vous allez dire ça un jour quand on revoit des très vieux amis comme cela, des amis qu’on n’a pas vu depuis très longtemps on se demande, 'Mon Dieu, est-ce que j’ai vieilli comme ça! Moi, je ne parais pas vieux vieille comme ça j’espère.'
219 Mais c’est vrai que cela arrive.
220 Il est étonné par les changements physiques il ( ) est-ce qu’il pense que Simon a une bonne vie?
221 S: [Peter] Non.
222 T: Pourquoi pas?
223 S: [Peter] Il pense que Simon et sa famille a une vie vide--il mange, il fait des enfants // [Ss laugh] //, il ne fait rien important, il ne fait rien intellectuel, il ne pense jamais, il fait seulement des choses très simples.
224 T: Oui. Donc, l’opinion de Georges c’est plutôt que Simon et sa femme survivent mais ne vivent pas parce qu’ils n’ont pas de vie intellectuelle//
225 S:[Barry] //Je pense je pense aussi que Georges ne peut pas comprendre pourquoi Simon est très content de sa vie car Georges n’a pas uh d’enfants.
226 Il ne peut pas comprendre la joie//
228 Quand Georges revoit Simon et il ne le reconnaît pas ( ) puis il le regarde de près et il remarque qu’il y a une chose qui n’a pas changé, une chose qu’il reconnaît, et c’est quoi cette chose?
229 S:[Bill] Ses yeux.
230 T. Ses yeux. Il le reconnaît par ses yeux.
231 Mais le regard est différent.
232 Les yeux de Simon n’ont pas changé, mais son regard, ce qu’on peut lire dans ses yeux, a changé.
233 Quelle émotion a remplacé quelque chose d’autre? Qu’est-ce que Georges voit aux yeux de Simon qu’il n’a pas vu avant? ( 3 sec )
234 Nous pouvons regarder le paragraphe. C’est le neuvième paragraphe. Uh presqu’en bas de la page--"L’œil brillait pourtant"--
235 lisez cela, s’il vous plaît, ( ) Félicité.
236 S: [Félicité][Reads paragraph nine]
237 T: C’est ça. Alors ce qui n’est pas là, c’est l’intelligence, d’accord. Il ne voit plus d’intelligence ( ) au regard de Simon.
238 Et qu’est-ce qu’il voit au lieu ( ) de l’intelligence? Qu’est-ce qui a remplacé l’intelligence? ( 10 sec )
S: [Barry] Uh
S: [Holly] Joie et amitié.
T: C'est ça, la joie, d'accord.
Donc on voit que Simon est un homme qui est très content.
Mais que pense Georges de cela?
Est-ce qu'il dit qu'il pense est-ce qu'il dit 'Je suis très content de voir que mon ami soit content'?
S: [Barry] Non. Je pense que peut-être il est un peu jaloux.
T: Peut-être, oui.
Les autres? Vous êtes d'accord avec cela? Est-ce qu'il s'agit de la jalousie? Smita?
Oh, excusez-moi, Ushma?
S: [Ushma] Peut-être, mais on peut interpréter ( ? ) un peu triste et n'est pas très comme lui ( ? ) uhm dans une autre fois et il fait tout ensemble et il pense qu'il ne va pas vieillir.
Mais il n'est pas vrai. Il n'est pas vrai.
T: Ils ne se ressemblent plus, c'est vrai.
Donc, préparez à une question qui dont dont la réponse n'est pas dans le texte.
Est-ce que Georges est une personne heureuse?
S: [Barry] //Je pense//
T: //Est-ce que la vie de Georges est une vie heureuse?
S: [Barry] Je pense qu'il est avant de partir Paris il était heureuse mais maintenant il voit une vie qu'il ne peut pas avoir.
Il voit il n'est il sait qu'il ne peut pas avoir la joie uh d'un père et je pense que maintenant il est un peu jaloux.
T: Donc vous pensez qu'il devient triste//
S: [Barry] //Oui//
T: //quand il était assez content de sa vie à Paris, normale//
S: [Barry] //sans voir son ami//
T: Mais quand il a vu le bonheur de son ami, il a dit maintenant je suis triste parce que je ne suis pas heureux () mon ami.
Les autres, vous êtes d'accord, avec cela?
S: [Chris J] Non. Il n'est pas jaloux, il est juste diss what's disappointed?
T: Déçu.
S: [Chris J] Déçu de son ami ( ) uh parce qu'il est il est uh un grosse ( ) il est banal et ennuyeux, n'est-ce pas, il est déçu de son ami.
Son ami Georges, il a été parisien et maintenant il est trop simple après d'après Georges. Georges est heureux parce que les difficultés de la vie dans la vie ( ) uh il est content. Et Georges il est trop simple. [confuses characters]

D'accord, donc vous pensez que Georges pense comme le Parisien stéréotypique: La vie à Paris est bonne et je ne peux pas comprendre ces autres gens qui veulent habiter en pro en province. Et c'est vrai, qu'à Paris, il y a des préjugés contre les gens qui habitent en province parce qu'ils sont moins sophistiqués.

C'est comme les New Yorkais qui pensent que les Américains qui habitent au Middle-West ne peuvent pas être heureux, n'est-ce pas, parce que nous n'avons presque pas d'opéra; on ne peut pas uh aller voir le ballet tous les weekends, n'est-ce pas; nous n'avons pas le Musée Métropolitain ici, à Columbus. Comment être heureux ici dans cette ville, à cette ville?  Maintenant imaginez l'histoire de l'autre point de vue. Nous avons vu les pensées de Georges qui va en ( ) qui fait le voyage dans le train, qui voit son ami pour la première fois. Maintenant, mettons-nous à la place de Simon. Parce que pour Simon aussi ça faisait quinze ans qu'il n'avait pas vu son ami. Et il devait se demander aussi 'Est-ce que mon ami Georges aura changé? Comment va-t-il être?' Alors Simon voit son ancien ami, il passe un peu de temps avec lui. Imaginez maintenant que Georges est parti, il est retourné à Paris, et que Simon parle à sa femme. Qu'est-ce qu'il dit? Quelle est sa perception de la vie de Georges et de la personnalité de Georges?

Il n'est pas heureux uh Qu'est-ce qu'il va dire à sa femme? Il va dire 'Oh, pauvre Georges n'est pas heureux'? Oui. Pourquoi pas? Quelles raisons va-t-il donner pour cela? Il n'est pas heureux parce qu'il ( ) Je pense que Georges n'a pas une famille. Georges n'est pas. // Oui. Puisque Simon est très heureux d'être un un bon mari et un bon papa.

Autre chose?
287 S: [Chris P] Je crois qu'il uh qu'il dirait 'Georges n'a pas changé toujours il n'est comme un Parisien parce qu'il est trop heureux.
288 Il n'a pas il ne jugerait pas Georges.
289 T: D'accord. Donc vous trouvez que Georges est critique de Simon mais que Simon n'est pas critique //de Georges.
290 S: //Oui, oui//
291 T: Peut-être pas.
292 Regardons un peu la description de la maison et du jardin de la deuxième page. [all flip pages]. C'est le troisième paragraphe là
293 [reads from text] "...et la voiture entra" alors maintenant la voiture arrive chez Simon. Barry?
293 S: [Barry] J'ai une question. Quand il dit "Voilà mon trou", qu'est-ce que c'est?
294 T: Un trou ça veut dire a hole, d'accord, mais c'est une expression argotique pour le domicile, la maison, l'appartement.
295 ( 2 ) Alors donc ils arrivent et c'est Georges qui nous dit il dit "la voiture entra dans un jardin qui avait des prétentions de parc, puis s'arrêta devant une maison à tourelles qui cherchait à passer pour un château."
296 Est-ce que Georges est impressionné par le jardin et la maison de Simon?
297 Ss: Non.
298 T: Il est impressionné?
299 Barry pense que non. Pourquoi est-ce que vous dites que non? Ushma?
300 S: [Ushma] Parce qu'il a dit uh ( ? ) que la maison n'est pas comme un château exactement mais qu'il est presqu'un château.
301 T: C'est une maison qui veut être un château mais qui n'est pas un château.
302 S: [Chris P] Il croit que Simon voudrait avoir un château comme les gens riches à Paris donc il juge//.
303 T: //Mais à Paris il n'y a pas de châteaux//Il y a des maisons//et des appartements.
304 S: [Chris P.]/ouï// //oui,OK//
306 T: Mais ce sont les gens riches qui ont les châteaux par-ce que le château c'est comme un palais.
307 Mais maintenant, on a toujours pensé au point de vu de Georges, qui est un point de vu spécifique, d'accord, mais ce n'est pas le seul point de vu possible.
308 Imaginez que vous voyez un jardin qui ressemble à un parc français.
Vous avez vu des photos ou vous avez visité des parcs en France?
Comment sont les parcs en France?
S: Très belles.
S: Très propres.
S: Des fleurs.
T: Très propres, très beaux, des fleurs, de gros arbres.
S: [Peter] Des petits rues.
T: Oui. On dit des pistes.
S: [Peter] Des pistes, oui.
T: C'est connu parce qu'il ne faut jamais marcher sur la pelouse, en France.
Pelouse, c'est lawn.
S: Il n'y a pas de chiens, aussi.
T: Oui. On dit des pistes.
S: Et les chiens sont interdits.
T: Oui, oui. Dans les parcs en principe, mais c'est ( ) accepté. D'accord?
Donc, les parcs en France sont très beaux, très soignés.
Là, soigné--cared for.
Et un château est une maison très chère ( ) la maison d'une personne très riche.
Alors, imaginez que vous allez, dans quinze ans, chez un ami ou chez une amie que vous n'avez pas vu depuis longtemps. Et cet ami a une grande maison et un jardin qui ressemble à un parc.
Qu'est-ce que vous diriez pour décrire la propriété de votre ami--Est-ce que vous diriez 'Oh, cette pauvre personne!'
Ss: Non!
T: Qu'est-ce que vous diriez?
S: C'est ( ? ) C'est une belle vie.
T: D'accord. Donc vous pensez qu'on peut dire que Simon a une très belle maison, une belle et grande maison et un beau jardin.
S: [Barry] C'est un bonne chose d'avoir une belle maison avec cinq enfants.
T: Oui, d'accord.
Donc, il a une assez bonne vie, Simon.
Uh Il est presque l'heure. Et je veux parler de l'image de la femme.
Georges la détestait quand ils étaient jeune parce qu'elle est venue voler son ami. Maintenant, elle n'est plus jeune,
et comment est-ce qu'il la décrit? Félicité?
S: [Félicité] "Sans caractère, sans élégance, sans (?)"
Oui, sans rien.

Que veut dire "falbalas"?

Falbalas, ça veut dire quand vous quand vous avez une robe avec beaucoup de dentelles—lace, frilly things, d'accord.

Donc elle a mis sa plus belle robe pour la visite, d'accord. Et ( ) elle s'est bien coiffée spécialement pour la visite. Elle est prête à accueillir l'ami de son mari. Mais Georges n'est pas impressionné. Il la trouve grosse, pas assez élégante, n'est-ce pas, et il dit au milieu de ce paragraphe "sans rien de ce qui constitue une femme", d'accord. Donc, pour Georges, ce n'est même pas une femme, d'accord.

Qu'est-ce que c'est qu'une femme d'après Georges?

Elle va être élégante.

Avec caractère et esprit, le contraire de ce qu'elle a.

D'accord. Est-ce qu'une vraie femme a des enfants?

Non. [Gestures, shaking of heads indicating no]

Non, c'est pas amusant les femmes qui ont des enfants.

Donc, son idée de ce que c'est qu'une femme apparemment est différente de l'idée de son ami Simon.

Mais pensons essayons de penser un peu plus objectivement à cette femme, qui arrive sur le perron "parée pour la visite"—OK, beaux vêtements, "coiffée pour la visite, avec des phrases prêtes pour la visite". Est-ce qu'on peu faire une image un peu plus positive de cette femme?

Non.

Vous êtes dégoûté par cette femme.

Vous savez ce que c'est qu'une machine?/

De chair/

//la chair, c'est ça [points?]. Flesh. ( )

Mais cette femme, elle est prête pour la visite, n'est-ce pas. Elle reçoit l'ami de son mari ( )

et ( ) qu'est-ce que vous pensez de cette femme?

Elle est vide.

Elle n'est pas ( ? )

D'accord, elle essaie de se faire sophistiquée.

Mais est-ce que c'est une raison sympathique? Ushma? Pourquoi?
S: [Chris P.] Elle essaie de uhm faire Georges confortable et uhm faire Georges accepte par à chez lui.
T: Oui, oui. Elle veut le faire le bienvenu. C'est ça. Donc, évidemment, c'est une femme qui est très fidèle à son mari. Elle ne connaît vraiment pas Georges, n'est-ce pas, mais Georges est important à son mari, n'est-ce pas. Donc, elle fait de son mieux.
Peut-être qu'elle n'est pas sophistiquée, mais c'est une bonne femme—elle est gentille, c'est une bonne mère. Donc on peut dire beaucoup de choses positives de cette femme, mais Georges choisit de ne pas les dire.
Je vais vous demander uh on va en repasser un petit peu la prochaine fois: Est-ce que Georges représente le point de vue de l'auteur? D'accord. J'ai oublié de mentionner, l'auteur est de Maupassant [writes], et ce que vous avez c'est une partie de la nouvelle—nouvelle, short story. Ce n'est pas toute la nouvelle, c'est la première partie. D'accord.
Est-ce que le point de vue de Georges est point de vue de Maupassant ou est-ce que nous sommes censés uh prendre Georges pour l'antagoniste?
Ss: Non!
T: Et le devoir, pour John, le sujet est très ouvert cette fois. Vous choisissez un thème, qui vous intéresse, vous regardez le texte, vous développez ce thème. Une page, tapée à la machine, d'accord.
12:52 [Lesson ends. Last T utterances amid general sounds of preparation for departure.]
Notes:
Fifteen students participated in the lesson, which followed individual reading of an unedited and unabridged, one-and-one-half page (950 words) short story by Colette and a two-part initial response: a recall protocol and a personal reaction/response. The lesson then began with small-group work that centered on matching non-standard expressions in the text to a list of synonyms on the board before moving to a teacher-fronted discussion. Group work was video-recorded but not transcribed.

11:32 The instructor reminded students to read attentively and to respond in English. Reading time ranged from eight minutes to twenty minutes, while writing time for the initial responses ranged from seven minutes to fifteen minutes.

12:08 The small group segment of the lesson began as groups of three formed and began to find synonyms; very little use of English was audible among the groups, and the groups worked steadily and in increasingly animated tones as the instructor circulated among them offering suggestions and asking questions.

12:19 The instructor called an end to the group segment (=11 minutes)

12:56 The teacher-fronted segment of her lesson that comprises the transcript (=37 minutes).
Lesson begins

1 T: Bon, je vais arrêter votre travail maintenant parce qu'certains groupes ont déjà terminé.
2 Si vous n'avez pas trouvé tous les mots, vous pouvez écouter ce que disent les autres.
3 Uh la ligne neuf, Marc dit à sa femme "je t'en prie, Alice".
4 Quelle est une autre chose qu'il aurait pu dire?
5 S: S'il vous plaît.
6 T: Oui, mais pas vous parce qu'il parle à sa femme.
7 S: S'il te plaît.
8 T: S'il te plaît. C'est ça. S'il te plaît.
9 Qu'est-ce qu'il veut qu'elle fasse?
10 Pourquoi est-ce qu'il dit s'il te plaît, "je t'en prie"?
11 S: [Chris P] Parce qu'il ne veut pas qu'elle fasse.
12 T: Oui, il ne veut pas qu'elle pose des questions maintenant.
13 S: [Chris P] Oh, oui.
14 T: Ou apparemment, par ce qu'il fait "Chtt, chttt".
15 Ça ce dit "tais-toi" en français.
16 Uh la ligne dix-sept, elle pose la question "Qu'est-ce que tu as?"
17 Quelle est une autre façon, une autre question qu'on peut poser? Chris[/?]
18 S: [Chris P] Qu'est-ce qui ne va pas?
19 T: Qu'est-ce qui ne va pas, oui, ou bien ( )
20 S: Quel est le problème?
21 T: Quel est le problème, c'est ça.
22 C'est comme ça qu'on commence à se disputer avec son petit ami ou avec son mari ou sa femme.
23 On dit 'Qu'est-ce que tu as?' et puis on a des problèmes après.
24 Uh ( ) à la ligne dis-neuf, "surmené", le maître d'hôtel est surmené.
25 C'est une bonne chose ou une mauvaise chose pour un maître d'hôtel?
26 Ss: Une mauvaise chose.
27 T: Une mauvaise chose.
28 Quel est le problème?
29 S: Il a trop à faire.
30 T: Exactement. Exactement. Il est très pressé, il est débordé de travail, il y a beaucoup de monde dans le restaurant, et Marc et Alice commandent trop lentement, n'est-ce pas.
31 Vous avez travaillé dans des restaurants? Certains d'entre vous?
32 Moi, je suis ancienne serveuse, il y a dans le temps.
33 Et vous comprenez, quand vous êtes très occupé et les gens ils pensent et ( ) c'est ça le problème.
34 ( ) Uh, à la ligne ( ) vingt-cinq: "Marc comtempl la mer"—un synonyme de cela?
35 S: Regardait avec intérêt[/?]
36 T: Oui, il regarda la mer,
37 au passé simple.
38 Il regarda, contempler, un synonyme de regarder.
39 Uh à la ligne vingt-neuf, il dit à sa femme, "tu engraisses" d'accord.
40 Ce n'est pas un compliment, aujourd'hui, mais à l'époque, peut-être, ça dépend de la femme.
41 Bon, "tu engraisses"[/?]
42 S: [Chris ?] Je ne suis pas sûr, mais devenir gros [/?]
43 T: Oui, 'tu grossis un peu, ma chérie', n'est-ce pas.
44 Moi, je déteste quand les amis me disent tu grossis,
45 mais apparemment à l'époque ce n'est pas un insulte.
46 Uh ( ) ensuite, la ligne quarante, Alice "lança les questions".
47 Quel est le verbe dont on se sert oralement avec les questions?
48 S: Poser.
49 T: Oui, elle posa les questions.
50 Lancer est un synonyme de jeter.
51 Donc, on a l'impression qu'elle posait les questions de quelle manière?
52 S: [Bill] Rapidement.
53 T: Rapidement, oui. Avec énergie.
54 Uh à la ligne quarante-sept, Alice est "abritée" derrière les chapeaux.
55 S: [Barry] Se trouvait.
56 T: Umm pas trouver, un peu plus précis//
57 S: [?] Cachée.
58 T: Cachée, c'est ça.
59 Elle épiait l'autre femme par-ce que ils étaient près de la plage, et les gens dans le restaurant, les femmes surtout, portaient des chapeaux.
60 Alors Alice se cachait un peu derrière les chapeaux pour regarder l'autre femme, n'est-ce pas.
61 Qu'est-ce qui se passe dans cette nouvelle?
62 ( ) Racontez-moi ce que vous avez lu
63 il y a un couple
64 S: [Barry] uhm et uhm elle désire s'uhm s'asseoir à une certaine place mais son uhm ( ) son homme
65 T: Ils sont mariés?
66 Oui, ils sont mariés. Son mari.
67 S: [Barry] Maintenant, car il y a son ex-femme.
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68 T: Oui, il a vu son ex-femme et il ne voulait pas s'asseoir à côté de son ex-femme, avec sa deuxième femme.
69 C'est assez normal, je crois.
70 Est-ce que vous avez l'impression que Marc et Alice, ce couple, sont mariés depuis longtemps?
71 Ss: Non/
72 T: //Qu'est-ce qui vous donne cette impression? Félicité [/?]
73 S: [Félicité-reads] Uh (?) "quinze mois auparavant" Alice (?)//
74 T: //C'est ça//
75 S: [Félicité] //(/ ? /) Marc a divorcé ( ) est divorcé
76 T: Il a divorcé. Il y a quinze mois, il était toujours marié à cette autre femme.
77 Ça veut dire que Marc et Alice sont plus ou moins des nouveaux-mariés.
78 Uh ( ) pensez-vous qu'Alice ( ) soit heureuse ( ) avec son mari?
79 S: [Barry] Non, pas maintenant. Je pense qu'elle est très jalouse de l'autre femme uhmm elle ( ) c'est comme elle ( ) les deux.
80 T: Les deux.
81 Bon, je vais dire.
82 Au commencement de l'histoire, que pense Alice de son mari?
83 S: [Chris P] Il est ( ? )
84 T: Et qu'est-ce qu'elle pense de Marc?
85 S: [Chris P] Elle pense que ( ) Marc est le mieux ( ) le meilleur pardon [self-repair with apology] ( ) le meilleur des hommes ( ) parce qu'il lui demande ( ) ce qu'elle voudrait uh manger ( ) et ce qu'elle voudrait ( ? ) et ce qui ce qu'il ordre//
86 T: //ce qu'il choisit, c'est ça,// oui, d'accord.
87 S: [Chris P] //ce qu'il choisit//
88 T: Donc, et c'est normal.
89 Ils viennent de se marier Marc et Alice assez récemment.
90 Elle est amoureuse de son mari.
91 Qu'est-ce qu'il pense d'elle? ( ) Quelle est l'opinion de Marc?
92 S: [Peter] Elle l'aime
93 T: Elle l'aime, oui.
94 S: [Peter] et il l'aime aussi un peu ( ) mais//
95 T: //un peu?//
96 S: [Peter] pas beaucoup mais il pense de son ex-femme quand elle
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98 Mais dans l’histoire vous avez l’impression qu’il aime beaucoup sa femme. Ça lui ( ? ) pas.
99 S: [Chris P] Il est fier de sa femme ( ) parce que c’est dans l’histoire qu’il a dit qu’il est très fier quand elle sourit// et
100 T: //Oui, il est fier d’elle// [incl. pron. correction of fier]
101 S: [Chris P] et pour être avec elle
103 T: Parlons un peu du mariage parce que la question du mariage est centrale/
104 S: [Barry] Je pense que le deuxième mariage est er( ) the courtship I guess était très vite je pense que uhm//
105 T: //Ils se sont mariés assez vite//
106 S: [Barry, cont]//par-ce que Alice uhm ne sait ne sait pas beaucoup de l’autre femme
108 Je veux parler du mariage traditionnel et du mariage moderne, d’accord. ( )
109 Qu’est-ce qui caractérise un mariage traditionnel?
110 S: [Barry] Uhm c’est quand les parents ont fait le mariage. Ils ont décidé unh qui le fils ou la fille se marient ( )
111 T: Comme dans “Une Partie de campagne”? [reference to previous class reading]
112 S: [Barry] Oui.
113 T: Où c’était la fille ( ) elle a décidé parce que ses parents ( ) voulaient qu’elle se marie avec cet homme, d’accord.
114 Autres éléments d’un mariage traditionnel? Ushma[/?]
115 S: [Ushma] C’est le mariage qui est ( ? )
116 T: Oui, de complaisance (writes)
118 T: D’accord, d’accord.
119 Quels sont d’autres éléments possibles d’un mariage traditionnel?
120 S: [Bill] Ils sont très rares, peut-être.
121 T: D’accord. ( ? )? [clearly not understanding]
122 S: [Bill] Ils sont très rares. Rarement.
123 T: Aujourd’hui? Aujourd’hui?
124 S: [Bill] Non, les divorces.
125 T: [getting it] Ah! Dans les mariages traditionnels les divorces les divorces sont très rares?/
126 S: [Peter] Mais traditionnels dans quel sens? traditionnels//dans le
Ahh, mais c’est à vous de déterminer; c’est à vous de définir ce mot.

Il n’y a pas beaucoup de différence.

Entre quoi?

Entre le mariage traditionnel dans le sens d’aujourd’hui et le mariage où l’homme et la femme se mariaient pour l’amour et il y une grande fête avec la mère du bride [/?]

la jeune mariée

le la jeune mariée et le père de la jeune mariée qui paient pour toute//la fête et

//et les parents de l’homme//

paient pour

//Alors vous pensez qu//

//Le mariage traditionnel et un grand fête, et tout ça, ce n’est pas très différent d’un mariage moderne

Et après la fête?

// Ce n’est pas très différent

//Comment sont les rapports entre le mari et la femme?

J’ai pas. [mutters w. head down--appears resentful]

Parlons des mariages modernes.

Uhm peut-être que c’est pour l’amour, ou pour l’argent, ou pour (?)

pour bébé

Pour Shotgun. Qu’est-ce qu’on qu’est-ce qu’on dit pour shotgun? Quel est le mot pour un shotgun wedding?

Pour?

Pour shotgun wedding.

(game-muttering) a déjà eu//

Où où on est obligé de se marier. Oui?

Ça c’est le mariage moderne, vous pensez?/

//Laughs//

Moi, j’espère que non.

Uhm le femme et le mari maintenant uhm ils connaissent très bien le mariage mais au passé ils ne se connaissaient pas uhm uhm souvent jusqu’à (?)

Ils ne se connaissaient pas du tout. Pas dans le temps, oui. Peut-être pas beaucoup, c’est peut-être vrai//

//Oui//

Aujourd’hui les gens choisissent peut-être, ils se connaissent un peu mieux, mais ils y pensent un peu plus.()

D’autres éléments du mariage moderne? de ce que vous//

//Il y a beaucoup de divorces.
157 T: Oui, dans le mariage. Aujourd’hui, c’est vrai. Presque la moitié
158 ( ) Alors le mariage de Marc et Alice, c’est un mariage traditionnel ou plutôt moderne? ou un peu des deux? et pourquoi?
159 S: [Peter] C’est moderne.
160 T: C’est un mariage moderne? Pourquoi vous le dites?
161 S: [Peter] Uh c’est un mariage très (? ) sur l’instinct il (? ) instinct [/?]
162 T: Ils ont suivi à l’instinct?
163 S: [Peter] Oui, ils ont les deux a ou ont senti une émotion de l’amour très fort et il s’agit sur cette émotion et ils se mariaient très vite//
164 T: //Donc, vous pensez que c’était le coup de foudre ([writes])
165 S: [Peter] Coup de foudre ça veut dire?
166 T: Le coup de foudre--love at first sight.
167 S: Oui. Quelque chose comme ça et ils ont (? ) ils ont le coup de foudre et uhm très très vite après ça ils se mariaient//
168 T: //Et pour vous ça c’est un mariage moderne?
169 S: C’est un mariage moderne parce que il n’y a pas beaucoup de différence d( ? ).
170 Je pense qu’ils n’a pas pensé de quelque chose d’autre. Ils seulement pensaient de chaque chaque autre partenaire et l’amour et c’est tout.
171 T: Oui, d’accord, d’accord.
172 Donc, dans un sens on peut contraster ce mariage au mariage d’Henriette dans “Une Partie de campagne” qui était plus ou moins choisi par ses parents.
173 Vous pensez qu’ici il s’agissait de de l’amour, du coup de foudre et (? )?
174 Les autres? Trouvez-vous des éléments du mariage moderne ou du mariage traditionnel chez ce couple? Smita [/?]
175 S: [Smita] Je suis d’accord avec Peter que c’est un mariage moderne.
176 T: Pourquoi?
177 S: [Smita] Uhm ( ) parce que uh l’attitude de Marc à Alice (?)
179 T: Quelle est son attitude envers sa femme?
180 S: Il veut la (? ) Il veut (? )
181 T: Oui, et puis?
182 S: S: Il donne ( ? )
183 T: D’accord, donc pour vous ça fait partie du mariage moderne par-ce qu’il essaie de plaire à sa femme.
184 S: Oui.
185 S: [Barry] Et il essaie de plaire à sa femme car elle a vu son ex-femme.[S snickers]
186 T: Oui, peut-être. Ushma [/?]
187 S: [Ushma] Uhm je pense que c’est un mariage traditionnel.
188 T: Dans quel sens?
189 S: [Ushma] Uhm par-ce que dans le rôle peut-être elle dit que Marc Marc dit à le maître d’hôtel les ordres de le repas.
190 T: Oui, c’est Marc qui commande le déjeuner. Elle ne dit rien. Le mari ici, oui.
191 S: [Ushma] Il ne elle ne il la demande de qu’elle ce qu’elle veut elle est veut mais elle
192 T: //ce qu’elle veut// [repairs]
193 S: [Ushma] ce qu’elle veut mais il commande il dit ce qu’il veut
194 T: Oui, c’est lui qui a choisi, là. Oui, c’est plutôt traditionnel.
195 Je ne sais pas ce que vous faites avec vos amis avec vos petits amis mais s’il y a un homme qui commande pour moi, c’est la dernière fois que je sors avec lui, d’accord. Ça, c’est pas très moderne. C’est un peu trop traditionnel. Il y a toujours des gens qui aiment ça, mais pas moi.
198 S: [Eddie] Donc, uh il y a une chose qui a un mariage traditionnel, l’homme tendre tend à être plus âgé que la femme, elle tend à être plus aînée.
199 T: Et quelle est votre impression de ce couple? Est-ce que Marc est/
200 S: [Eddie]//Je ne sais pas mais le mariage mais il semble que la femme et le mari et Marc sont d’à peu près le même âge, et il me semble que sa nouvelle femme est plus aînée.
201 T: Plus âgée?
202 S: [Eddie] Aînée, aînée--young.
203 T: Ah, plus jeune, que la nouvelle femme, Alice est plus jeune que Marc.
204 Les autres, vous avez cette impression? Que Marc est plus âgé?
205 S: [Chris P] Oui.
206 T: Qu’est-ce qui vous donne cette impression?
207 S: [Chris P] Uh (?) probablement par-ce qu’il voudrait la flatter et (?) uh il lui rend heureux elle souriait quand elle dit qu’elle voudrait ce que ce qu’il voudrait avoir c’est là (?) Voilà.
208 T: D’accord. Moi, je suis d’accord avec vous.
209 Moi, je pense que Alice est sensiblement plus jeune que son mari aussi.
210 S: [Barry] Aussi le mariage je pense que le mariage était très vite car elle ne sait pas beaucoup de lui et de
son ex-femme. Peut-être que le mariage a été très vite car il est plus âgé et il ne désire pas vivre seul. ( )

211 T: Oui, oui. Ou peut-être qu’une jeune femme peut facilement être plus impressionnée par un homme un peu plus âgé, n’est-ce pas.

212 Vous avez noté qu’il a un chauffeur et c’est pas lui qui conduise qui conduit la voiture n’est-ce pas et donc c’est peut-être un homme qui n’est pas riche mais qui a une vie confortable.

213 Donc, on a l’impression que ce n’est pas un très jeune couple.

214 Uh ( ) il commence à parler du premier mariage de Marc.

215 Et nous avons l’impression qu’Alice savait déjà qu’il avait été marié mais qu’elle ne savait pas exactement pourquoi lui et son ex-femme ont divorcé.

216 Et pour moi aussi ça fait partie de l’idée du mariage traditionnel.

217 Cette histoire a été publié, je l’ai mentionné, en 1918.

218 En France, le divorce était assez rare en 1918, d’accord, comme c’était aux Etats-Unis, aussi.

219 Et l’histoire ( ) et vous pensez que l’écrivain est une femme ou un homme? C’est un homme ou une femme qui a écrit cette histoire?


221 T: Vous pensez que c’est un homme? Tout le monde est d’accord?

222 S: (inaudible)

223 S: [Chris P] Je pense que c’est une femme dans un sens//

224 SS: //Laughs//

225 S: [Chris P] Non, non, non, I mean alors je veux dire je je dois dire je dois dire que le personnage de la ex-femme est dans un sens un bon image et dans un autre sens un mauvais image. Uh d’après d’après uh l’homme et d’après Marc et Alice ou d’après uh l’auteur.

226 T: D’accord, d’accord, Je vais vous dire. Je vais vous dire le secret, d’accord. Ce n’est pas un secret: Colette est une femme écrivain. Colette est une femme écrivain très importante du du vingtième siècle

227 et elle a publié cette nouvelle qui s’appelle “l’Autre femme” [writes] dans un receuil de nouvelles qui s’appelle La Femme cachée [writes]. La Femme cachée, c’est le receuil de plusieurs nouvelles avec cette nouvelle.

228 Et ce que vous avez lu c’est le texte intégral. C’est la nouvelle, toute la nouvelle, seulement les deux pages.

229 Uh ( ) mais c’est intéressant que certains ont pensé que c’était un homme qui a écrit le texte
par-ce que c’est vrai que ce texte examine les deux femmes, n’est-ce pas, on sait on ne sait pas on ne connaît pas l’apparence physique de Marc sauf qu’il commence à avoir des cheveux gris. Uh Alice remarque ça à la fin. Mais nous connaissons un peu mieux les détails des deux femmes. Donc, dans un sens, peut-être, on peut dire que le regard est masculin parce que le narrateur examine les deux femmes.

Uhh Marc donne deux versions différentes de son divorce des raisons pour son divorce. Quelle est la première chose qu’il dit pour expliquer à Alice pourquoi il a divorcé de sa première femme? Chris.[/?]

S: [Chris P] Ils étaient in compa-table [/?-appeal for pron.]

T: C’était une question d’incompatibilité. Je ne peux pas dire le nom, hein. Ils ne s’entendaient pas/

S: [Chris P] //Oui, je suis d’accord.

T: D’accord, qu’il y a des problèmes mutuels entre les deux.

Quelle autre chose a-t-il uh a-t-il dit? ( 5 sec)

S: [Chris P] Oh/

T: //pour expliquer son divorce? Ushma?

S: [Ushma] Il dit que ( ) ils sont ( ) ils sont partis en bons termes.

T: Oui, oui. Oui. Il dit qu’ils avaient des problèmes mais que c’était mutuel et qu’ils ont divorcé amicalement sans problèmes et ils sont restés amis. Mais Eddie[/?]

S: Il n’a pas su la rendre heureux.

T: Ça, c’est la deuxième version, d’accord.

Il y a deux versions différentes: La première, tout simplement, ils ont décidé qu’ils ne sont pas contents ensemble. Donc, ils ont divorcé. La deuxième, il admet qu’il ne savait pas plaire à cette femme, que c’était la femme qui n’était pas heureuse ( ) avec lui, d’accord.

Pourquoi est-ce qu’il donne la première version ( ) qui évidemment n’est pas vraie?

S: [Peter] C’est plus facile que dire la vérité.

T: Pourquoi plus facile?

S: [Peter] Par-ce que si elle est uhm accepte son explana son raison pour le divorce qui est possible mais pas vraie et si elle accepte elle ne pose pas des questions plus et c’est fini avec ça ( ? ) et Marc n’a pas besoin de parler et de penser de son ex-femme mais ()
T: Donc, vous pensez qu'il veut tout simplement oublier //
S: [Peter]
Oui // elle ne veut oublier et aussi elle ne veut pas le discuter
T: Elle ou il?
S: [Peter] Il ne veut pas le discuter. C'est la même chose // il ne veut pas
T: // pas exactement //
S: [Peter] Il ne veut pas le discuter par ce qu'il n'est il n'est pas confortable avec ça et uh son ex-femme et //
T: // Donc ça tout le sujet le rend mal à l'aise,
mais est-ce que notre perception de ce personnage change quand il change l'histoire quand il dit "Ah, oui, nous n'étions pas contents ensemble, donc nous avons divorcé" ou "Elle n'a dit, elle a divorcé ce moi par-ce que elle n'était pas heureuse"?
S: [Barry] Le deuxième était la faute de la femme mais dans la première c'est entre les deux.
T: Ahh, vous pensez que dans le deuxième cas Marc dit que c'est la faute que c'était la faute de l'ex-femme.
S: [Chris P] Je crois que c'est c'est l'autre je crois que c'est la faute de Marc.
T: Quand quand il a dit uh je ne peux pas la rendre heureuse heureuse uh
S: [Barry] Mais il décrit sa son ex-femme //
S: [Chris P] // elle est délicieuse
T: // C'est Alice qui suggère le mot qui dit ah "elle est difficile", n'est-ce pas.
Elle essaie de trouver des excuses pour son mari. Elle ne veut pas penser qu'elle vient de se marier avec un homme qui ne sait pas plaire aux femmes.
Ushma? Vous avez quelquechose à dire?
S: [Ushma] Oh, uhm. Je veux dire uh que je pense qu'elle a divorcé uhm ( ? ) Je veux dire que il veut que Alice le défende.
T: Oui, qu'elle prend son côté ( ) oui.
S: [Chris P] Je pensais que la ex-femme était très indépendante et que c'est la raison uh qu'elle n'était pas heureuse uh pendant le mariage entre Marc et elle et ( ) le
nou le nouveau mariage entre Alice et Marc était heureux par ce que Alice était une autre sorte de femme. 
275 T: Donc, pas indépendante.
276 S: [Chris P ] Pas très indépendante par ce qu'elle uh elle veut que Marc commande le repas pour elle.
277 T: Exactement. Exactement.
278 Si son mari lui dit "Tu es belle" et il lui commande un bon déjeuner et est un bon mari assez sympa, elle est heureuse.
279 Est-ce que vous avez noté la description physique des deux femmes? Par ce qu'il y a détails des détails dans le texte qui indiquent que cette femme est vraiment autre, qu'elle qu'elle est très différente d'Alice. Par exemple, qu'elle est beaucoup plus indépendante. Mais, même dans les détails physiques.
280 Comment est-ce que le narrateur décrit les cheveux d'Alice? ( ) Ses cheveux sont de quelle couleur?
281 S: Ondu ondul/
282 T: //cheveux blonds. Elle est blonde et elle a les cheveux ondulés bouclés ([writes])
283 Par contre, l'ex-femme, comment sont ses cheveux?
284 S: Bruns.
286 Et ses cheveux sont ses cheveux sont bouclés?
287 Ss: Non.
288 T: Plutôt raides. Elles a les cheveux plats, d'accord.
289 Elle a les cheveux comme les miens, d'accord, les cheveux plats et fins.// Donc, tout à fait
290 S://et les yeux/
291 T: Oui, elles ont toutes les deux les yeux bleus. Donc, elles ont quelque chose en commun--deux choses en commun--elles se sont toutes les deux mariées avec Marc, d'accord. ()
292 Qu'est-ce qu'Alice porte sur sa tête?
293 S: Chapeau.
294 T: Oui, un petit chapeau.( ) Mercure, d'accord (?) Un petit chapeau mignon.
295 Je crois que c'était des chapeaux à la mode à l'époque; je crois que c'était un de ces petits chapeaux assez ronds, comme ça. [sketches on board] avec des ailes ( )
296 Le l'ex-femme? Elle porte un chapeau?
297 S: Non.
298 T: Non. Tête-nue. ([writes])
299 Que fait l'ex-femme pendant que Marc et Alice déjeune?
300 S: Elle fume.
301 T: Elle fume une cigarette.
302 Et que fait que fait Alice? ( ) Cette femme qui grossit un peu?
303 S: [Chris P] Elle mange.
304 T: Elle mange. ( ) n'est-ce pas.
305 Plusieurs fois dans le texte on voit Alice qui mange des crevettes, qui prend du beurre, qui prend du pain, ils vont boire du café, n'est-ce pas.
306 Donc, on a l'impression qu'Alice est plutôt sensualiste, d'accord, et que l'ex-femme, apparentemment, elle vient de manger.
307 mais on ne on ne la voit pas en train de manger. Elle fume une cigarette.
308 S: [Chris P] Elle est un peu intellectuelle, aussi, je crois//
309 T: Elle est un peu ... [/?]
310 S: [Chris P] Intellectuelle.
311 T: Intellectuelle.
312 Qu'est-ce qui vous donne cette impression?
313 S: [Chris P] Par-ce qu'elle cont elle contemple, elle pense à la mer à la baie uh uh après le repas en fumant une cigarette ( )
314 T: Oui, oui.
315 Une différence c'est elle ne semble pas s'intéresser à Alice, pas vraiment.
316 Elle fume sa cigarette, elle est là, pendant que la la pendant qu'Alice la regarde et pose des questions à son mari.
317 L'ex-femme, est-ce qu'elle a l'air triste ou assez 'satisfaite?
318 S: [Bill] Satisfaite.
319 T: Qu'est-ce qui indique qu'elle est satisfaite?
320 S: [Bill] Uhm elle elle a les yeux comment dit-on [illustres half-closed eyes with gesture]
321 T: Oui. Tout à fait, oui.
322 L'image que cette femme qui elle elle se penche dans sa chaise, elle fume sa cigarette. Elle regarde la mer.
323 Elle ne pense pas à Alice. Ça ne lui est pas important. ( ) Donc, elle a l'air assez satisfaite.( )
324 Alice, au début de l'histoire était plus que satisfaite; elle était très heureuse.
325 Comment est-elle à la fin de l'histoire?
326 S: [Eddie] ( ? )
327 T: Elle est ( ? ) de la vie de son mari.
328 S: [Eddie] Je pense que ça vient de parce qu'il a il lui a donné des raisons pour le divorce qui ne sont pas consistentes. Et les premières raisons et puis les deuxièmes raisons et puis elle elle commence à se méfier et à penser.
330 Elle dit/
331 T: //Elle pense peut-être qu'il lui ment.
332 S: [Eddie] Oui, qu'est-ce qu'il a fait avec lui que sa sa ex-femme n'a pas accepté? [rhetorical question?]
333 T: Oui.
334 Je vais suggérer que la raison est un peu moins concrète ( ) que cela.
335 Qu'est-ce qui change Alice dans cette histoire? ( ) Quel est le seul détail? ( ) Peut-être pour les deux.
336 Pensez à cela.
337 Pour l'essai pour vendredi, je laisse le sujet ouvert.
338 Vous choisissez quelque chose qui vous intéresse dans le texte, un thème, des images, par exemple, et vous développez, vous écrivez une page, d'accord.
339 Notez bien aussi, nous n'avons pas eu le temps d'en parler, que cette histoire termine sans vraiment terminer, donc, il y a trois points qui indiquent que l'histoire continue, elle va continuer.
340 Vous pouvez imaginez ce qui se passe après.

12:56—end lesson
APPENDIX F

NEWELL, SUSZYNISKI, and WEINGART (1989)
TAXONOMY OF LITERARY RESPONSE STATEMENTS

1. Descriptive Statement

1.1 Retelling of the Story: Statements in which some part of the story is literally re-told. Quotes are also descriptive. Low level of inferences are included in this category.

"T.J. then tore the grass off the garden roof."

1.2 Description of Aspects: Statements in which the story's form, language, characters, or setting is described.

"Pete and Richard have a poor relationship throughout the story."

2. Personal Reaction Statements

These are statements of the writer's own reaction to or engagement with the story. Almost always stated in the first person, these may contain elements of interpretation or evaluation, but can be distinguished from both by their focus on the subjective.

2.1 Reaction to Form: Statements in which the writer expresses satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the author's methods.

"I don't like this story because it had no ending."

2.2 Reaction to Content: Statements in which the writer reacts to the world of the story as if it were not fictional. Includes moral appraisals or expressions of liking for specific characters, and personal statements of how people "should" act.

"Richard should shape up too."

3. Associative Statements

These statements include references to writers' experiences and knowledge that they use as examples or illustrations of their understanding of the text.
3.1 Integration of the text and writers' experiences and knowledge of the world. Statements in which the writers' perceptions of the text are through association with their prior knowledge and events and characters in the text. These statements include explicit references to books, movies, actions, and experiences of other people, and aphorisms ("The truth hurts.")

"I once read in a book 'you can never feel inferior to someone without your own permission'."

3.2 Autobiographical Narrative: Statements in which the writer moves to a brief narration of personal facts or experience.

"This story reminds me of a couple of years ago I got interested in our family garden."

4. Interpretive Statements

In general, these are statements that go beyond what can actually be found in the story--an inference is made based on the text.

4.1 Interpretation of Form: Statements in which the writer ascribes meaning to stylistic devices--including symbols. These statements refer to what the author does.

"T.J. was called 'Antaeus' because he gave the gang strength by making a garden."

4.2 Interpretation of Content through the Reader: Statements in which the writer discusses motivations or makes generalizations about characters or settings in the story. Includes summative descriptions of characters' personalities or feelings and references to what characters do. These statements are subjective in nature in that writers interpret events and characters through their own values and perspective. There is a tentativeness in these assertions.

"It seems to me that through the entire selection he tries to be someone he's not."

4.3 Interpretation of Content Based on the Text: Same as 4.2 but in this case the writer takes a more objective stance to the text.

"He tries to make himself so Pete will like him."

4.4 Interpretation of Whole: Statements in which the writer sees the work as a mirror of the world generally.
"'Sucker' is a story about people's insensitivity to each other."

5. Evaluative Statements

5.1 Uses the criteria of affective or aesthetic appeal.
   "The story is beautiful."

5.2 Evaluation of Author's Method: Statements in which the writer speaks of how the author has constructed the work.
   "The author deliberately made the ending confusing."

5.3 Evaluation of Author's Vision: Statements in which the writer judges sufficiency of what the work is presenting, including its credibility, thematic importance, and moral significance. These may be value statements.
   "The story, especially the part about the kids, is very believable because kids act that way."

6. Miscellaneous

6.1 Off task statements.

6.2 Comparison to other authors

6.3 Metastatements such as "I don't know."

6.4 Discussion of the task itself
APPENDIX G

PATTERNS OF DISCOURSE
IN CLASSROOM DISCUSSIONS OF LITERATURE
(MARSHALL, 1989)

I. DIRECT: Any remark (even when it is represented as a question) that intends to move auditors toward an action or shift the attention of auditors or the focus of the discussion (e.g., "Let's open to page 97 and read the first paragraph.").

II. INFORM: Any statement of fact or opinion whose purpose is to represent what the speaker knows, believes, or thinks about a topic. Reading and quoting from texts are included here.

1. Nature of Remark
   A. Classroom logistics: Refers to the management of classroom activities (e.g., homework assignments, roll, reading completed).

   B. Reads or quotes from text

   C. Instructional statements: Refers to the substantive issues under discussion
   If remarks were coded as instructional in focus were further analyzed for knowledge source and kind of reasoning.

   1) Knowledge Source
      a) Personal/Autobiographical (information drawn from the speaker's own experience).
      b) Information drawn from text
      c) Text-in-Context (information about the author, date, or genre)
      d) General Knowledge (information drawn from the media or contemporary culture that is widely available)
      e) Previous class discussions, lectures, or readings
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f) Other

2) Kind of Reasoning
   a) Summary/descriptive (statements that focus on the literal features of the an experience or text)
   b) Interpretation (statements that make an inference about the meaning or significance of information)
   c) Evaluation (statements that focus on the quality of an experience or a text)
   d) Generalization (statements that move toward theoretical speculation about the nature of characters, authors, and texts)
   e) Other

III. QUESTION: Any verbal or non-verbal gesture that invites or requires a response from an auditor.
   A. Classroom logistics
   B. Instructional focus
       If a question was coded as instructional, it was further analyzed for the knowledge source and level of meaning it meant to elicit. Definitions for sub-categories are the same as those for instructional statements.

1) Knowledge Source
   a) Personal/autobiographical
   b) Information drawn from text
   c) Text-in-Context
   d) General knowledge
   e) Previous class discussion
   f) Other

2) Kind of Reasoning
   a) Summary/descriptive
   b) Interpretation
   c) Evaluation
   d) Generalization
   e) Other
IV. RESPOND: Any verbal or non-verbal gesture that acknowledges, restates, evaluates, or otherwise reacts to the nature, quality, or substance of preceding remarks. Responses clearly focus on the form or substance of a preceding remark itself. Answers to questions are coded in the inform category. A remark coded as a response to a question would ask for a clarification or explanation of the question itself or would comment on the value of the question.

Nature of Response

A. Acknowledgement (simple indication that a remark was heard)

B. Restatement (an effort to repeat a previous remark)

C. Positive evaluation (a positive comment on a previous remark)

D. Negative evaluation (a negative comment on a previous remark)

E. Request for explanation/ elaboration/ clarification (any remark that asks for the previous speaker to speak more clearly or at greater length)

F. Elaboration upon a previous remark (any remark that moves beyond a simple restatement of a speaker’s contribution by substantively changing the original speaker’s language or by offering an interpretation of what the speaker is saying).

G. Other.

V. OTHER: Any utterance that cannot be coded within one of the four major categories.
APPENDIX H

CATEGORY V (LANGUAGE LEARNING)
AMENDMENT TO MARSHALL SYSTEM

This category was added to the Marshall system in order to reflect aspects of the foreign language instructional setting that focus specifically on formal properties of the French language and were clearly intended to promote language learning as distinct from literary discussion or understanding. The original system, which was designed for a first language setting, could not accurately accommodate the many utterances that addressed language problems. (Other is labeled Category VI in the amended system.)

The amendments follow as closely as possible Marshall’s original categories while also reflecting the types of language-related utterances that were noted during the lessons.

V. Language Learning: Any remark or question that specifically concerns the usage and meaning of features of the second language. This includes vocabulary, syntax, and pronunciation and translation issues.

A. Inform
   1. Any statement intended to inform auditors through citation or illustration of a grammatical rule, vocabulary item, or pronunciation issue.
   2. This includes answers to vocabulary or grammar questions and appeals.

B. Question: Any utterance that invites or requires a response from an auditor and that focuses explicitly on language-related information. This includes questions or appeals for help concerning syntax, isolated vocabulary words, translation issues, and pronunciation.
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C. Respond: Any utterance that acknowledges, restates, evaluates, or otherwise reacts to the nature, quality, or substance of preceding language-related remarks. Responses clearly focus on the linguistic forms contained in a preceding remark. Answers to language-related questions are coded in the inform category. A remark coded as a response to a question asks for a clarification or explanation of the question itself or comments on the value of the question.

1. acknowledgement - any feedback, positive or negative, spoken or gestured, to indicate that an utterance was heard.
2. repeat - acknowledgement of utterance by repeating it verbatim.
3. repair - acknowledgement of an utterance by repeating it with corrections
4. restatement - a paraphrasal of original utterance
5. elaboration - additional information included in a language-related acknowledgement. This could include cultural or grammatical information about a word or situation. Focus is on the meaning of definition. This also includes translation explanations.

D. Other - any utterance that concerns language learning that does not fit into any of the above categories.
APPENDIX I

PARTICIPATING STUDENT OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Participant #_______

I. Biographical Information

Year of study: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Other

Your GPA: ______

Prior French courses taken at OSU:

101 102 103 104 Other(s)____ ____

Grade: ___ ___ ___ ___ ____ ____

Prior French courses taken elsewhere:

High School___ ___ ___ ___ College___ ___ ___ ___

Grade: ___ ___ ___ ___ ____ ____ ____

II. General Literature Background

1. My experiences with literature prior to college...

2. The classes I have taken in English-language literature in college...
3. I find studying literature...

4. The genre(s) of literature that I prefer is/are
   ________ because...

5. My pleasure reading consists mostly of__________
   because...

6. I believe that the purpose of studying literature is...

7. I believe that the purpose of writing about literature
   is...

8. When I take a literature course I expect...

9. Teachers of literature should...

10. My own definition of literature is...

### III. Experiences in French Language and Literature

1. My visits to and length of stay in countries in which
   French is spoken include...

2. My knowledge of the cultures and countries in which
   French is spoken can be described as...
3. The amount and kinds of reading and writing in my French classes prior to this class can best be described as...

4. My experiences with French-language literary/cultural texts before this class were...

5. The unassigned reading in French that I do is...

6. The purpose of reading and/or studying French literature is...

7. The purpose of writing about French literature is...

8. When I take advanced French courses in the future, I will expect...

9. I find studying French literature...

10. My personal goal(s) in studying French is/are...

IV. Self-assessment

1. On a scale of 1-10, my ability to speak French is____.

2. On a scale of 1-10, my ability to understand spoken French is____.

3. On a scale of 1-10, my ability to read French is____.

4. On a scale of 1-10, my writing ability in French is____.
5. On a scale of 1-10, my vocabulary knowledge in French is_____.

6. Relative to my expectations, this class has been...

7. If I were teaching this class...

8. I would like to learn more about...

9. I would rate my preparedness for further study as____________ because...

10. (Please add any further comments that you would like to offer about French, French literature, this class, or related topics).
To: Prospective participants in dissertation research project

From: John Angell, Department of French and Italian
      Ph.D. student in Foreign Language Education

Dear French 201 student and prospective participant,

The purpose of the study in which you are being invited to participate is to improve the teaching of literature. Your participation would be very much appreciated but is entirely voluntary. Before you decide whether to sign this form (after which time your name will be randomly paired with a number to ensure confidentiality), indicating that you will participate, please read the description below of what you will be asked to do.

During the course of the quarter, you will be asked to read and then write and participate in a class discussion about three brief French-language literary texts. The three class discussions about the texts and two regular class sessions will be video-recorded. What you, your classmates, and your teacher write or say will remain completely confidential. Your teacher and I will brief your class at the end of the quarter about the possible outcome and significance of the study.

If you would like more information, please do not hesitate to ask. If you agree to participate, please sign the attached consent form.

Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX K

PARTICIPATING STUDENT CONSENT FORM

Investigator: John Angell
GTA, Department of French and Italian
Ph.D. student, Foreign Language Education

Participant #______

Name____________________________
Date____________________________

I consent to participate in the research project that has been described to me. I understand that the purpose of the project is to improve the teaching of literature. I further understand that my participation is completely voluntary and that my identity will be protected both in the research records and in the final report of the project.