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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction to the Problem

The study of literature in beginning and intermediate language courses has a long and respected tradition in the history of second-language teaching in the United States. The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages has, for example, dealt with literature, defined as a work of imagination with an esthetic intent, in ten Reports of the Working Committees. In 1967 the Committee proclaimed literature study an important part of the foreign language curricula and also gave practical guidelines as to the time and place of literature study in the second language.

Although the study of literary works is of great importance to many foreign language educators, it is neglected in methods courses. Students, moreover, find little value in it. The apparent loss of interest on the part of the student, as evidenced by enrollment decreases, has led foreign language teachers to examine their techniques for teaching literature—explication de texte, translation, lectures, literary criticism, and seminars. As Santoni (1972) has stated, the encyclopedic gathering of facts has been the traditional emphasis.

The problem of teaching literature is complex. As in any teaching/learning situation, there are many variables, such as the teacher, the class as well as the literary sophistication and the linguistic
fluency of the students. Indeed, the integration of language teaching and literature teaching has been difficult to achieve. Several foreign language educators have suggested using literature as a means to build language fluency. Santoni (1972) suggests a system of exercises dealing with vocabulary and linguistic problems that will aid students to understand better the work in question as well as maintain linguistic fluency. Bostick (1972) uses Afro-French literature as a means to present or review grammatical structures and to teach culture. In choosing poems Bostick uses the criteria established by Gilliam (1969), i.e. the poem must have a strong rhythm, simple structures, and concrete vocabulary.

At least one author minimizes the importance of linguistic skills and emphasizes literary criticism. Hankins (1972) advocates literary criticism in brief English discussions in order to motivate students and to give them something to remember after language requirements are completed.

Some foreign language educators, on the other hand, do not support the study of literature in the beginning stages of language study. Esler (1968) and Bolinger (1968) strongly urge that students be well prepared linguistically before entering into the intricacies of literature. Esler suggests the use of readers in helping students to develop their grammatical skills without emphasis on literary analysis. Only after the student can read well, should he or she be introduced to literature.

It would seem that quite a number of foreign language educators agree with Esler and Bolinger because very little mention of methods
of teaching literature is made in teacher preparation materials. Per-
rusal of basic manuals for language teaching reveals only moderate
concern with literature study for beginning and intermediate students.
Gittner (1969) discusses reading-skill development, graded-readers,
and free reading but makes no suggestions as to the techniques for
literature teaching. Rivers (1968) explains the six stages of reading
and later (1975) refers those interested in literature to other refer-
ences. Chastain (1972, 1976) emphasizes the need for teachers to
determine their goals for literature. He suggests the following as
worthwhile goals that must be explained to students: 1) reading for
enjoyment, 2) reading for the message, and 3) reading for appreciation.
He gives hints on how to help our students read with ease and gives
follow-up suggestions for checking comprehension. He advocates the
preparation of oral questions and summaries by students and the use
of the vocabulary and structures of the reading material to ask personal
questions (1971, p.191). When students can discuss the content of the
work, he suggests that they relate its meaning to their lives (1976).
Allen and Valette (1972) discuss aims of literature teaching and methods
for approaching poetry, drama, and fiction.

Santoni (1972) and Horner (1971) believe that the lack of interest
in literature can be remedied by better teacher preparation. Santoni
(1972) advocates a course in the methodology of teaching literature
while Horner (1970) proposes a refresher course in literature in order
to review and to sensitize prospective teachers to the beauty of lit-
erature.

Some authors stress the need to approach literature teaching
through the use of specific objectives and affective materials.
Steiner (1972) suggests that the students can be led to enjoy and appreciate the work if it is always accessible to the student. She uses performance objectives to ensure that students are led from comprehending the text to considering the work from various points of view, looking for meaning, and comparing and contrasting language use. Steiner's goal is to help the student discover "his pleasure, his interpretation, and his feeling" (p. 312). Corbin (1972) also believes that it is the affective personal response to a literary passage that is essential. His taxonomic model of literature study according to priorities, rank, and natural relationships responds to the needs of teachers who wish to structure their literature teaching so that it will lead students to a true appreciation of literature whether they be elementary or graduate students. His taxonomy begins with "engagement" in appreciation and leads to "cognitive evaluation." The present study relates methods of teaching literature to learning outcomes in the affective and cognitive domains.

Theoretical Bases

It is the researcher's belief that research done in English education may have implications for the foreign language classroom. The researcher assumes that literature study can be approached from the students' experience and that by dealing with their thoughts, feelings, and opinions about a work, the instructor can lead them to a deeper appreciation of literature in the second language. It is recognized that students often lack the necessary linguistic and analytical skills but by capitalizing on what they bring to the teaching/learning situation, they can engage in and enjoy a personal approach to literature
when given the appropriate questions and structures. Just as foreign language teachers avoid making their students feel like linguistic cripples, so should they avoid making them feel like "aesthetic cripples" when expressing their reactions to literary selections (Corbin, 1972, p. 18).

In English, educators have focused on what the students bring to the reading situation and what they internalize as the work is being experienced (Harding, 1968). This ongoing interaction between the individual and the work is called Response to Literature (Purves, 1973). If teachers remember that the experience of art is a thing of each reader's making, then they will quit doing harm to their students by thinking that literary sophistication comes from repeating what their professors before them have said (Britton, 1968).

In Literature Education in Ten Countries, Purves found new methods of measuring student response to literary works (1973). In order to obtain an objective basis for evaluating the teaching of literature, he measured student reaction to works of literature in ten different countries. Results of the study show that patterns of response to literature are learned but are also determined by the culture and by the nature of the stimulus. In the United States, Purves et al. found that students respond, first of all, in a moral-symbolic fashion and, secondly, affectively and evaluatively.

Purves and Rippere (1968) have investigated the affective and evaluative responses to literature and have analyzed elements of writing about a literary work. They concluded that the four main categories are:
1. Engagement-Involvement: Defines the various ways by which the writer indicates his surrender to the literary work.

2. Perception: Encompasses the ways in which a person looks at the work as an object distinct from himself.

3. Interpretation: Encompasses the attempt to find meaning in the work, to generalize about it, to draw inferences from it, and to find analogies to it in the universe that the writer inhabits.

4. Evaluation: Encompasses the statements about why the writer thinks the work is good or bad (pp. 6-8).

Purves and Rippere have established a sophisticated system of elements, categories, subcategories and paradigms which can be used for scoring essays and for researching literature. They believe that the four categories are latent in students and that by helping them to develop their capacity to respond, the process of reading is made exciting and profitable.

Beach and Mertz (1975) have adapted the categories of Purves and Rippere to include:

1. Engagement-Involvement: Statements expressing personal feelings about the work, characters, language, and events.

2. Autobiographical: Statements about one's own life in relationship to the experience with the work.

3. Description: Statements describing the language, literary devices, imagery, point of view, events, characters, plot, and setting in the work.
4. Interpretation: Statements inferring the meaning of events, symbols, language, character's behavior, or overall meaning of the work.

5. Evaluation: Statements judging the quality, worth, composition, meaningfulness, plausibility, and significance of parts or of the whole work.

6. Other: Comparison with other works; digressions.

Birckbichler and Muyskens (1976) have applied the categories of Beach and Mertz and the work of Bloom (1956) to teaching literature in the second language. Their categories include:

1. Engagement/Involvement: Students express personal feeling about the literary work, its characters, events, or ideas. They identify relationships between the work and their lives.

2. Interpretation: Students identify motives, find evidence to support generalizations, solve problems, and make predictions. They synthesize and analyze information in order to infer the meaning of character's behavior, the language, and the overall significance of the work.

3. Evaluation: Students judge the quality, worth, composition, meaningfulness, plausibility, and significance of parts or all of the work. They make judgments about the value of ideas, characters, language, and overall meaning of the work. The criteria by which they make judgments are determined by the students, themselves.
Birckbichler and Muyskens have added activity types through which the teacher can control the amount and difficulty of the second language that students will use. These activities include ranking, agree/disagree, completion, questions, and role-playing. (See Appendix A.)

Because little research has been conducted in the foreign language classroom in the area of teaching literature, and because improvement in the teaching of literature is imperative, the need for research is clearly underlined. Foreign language researchers might do well to base their work on the personalized, student-centered approach to literature pioneered by curriculum developers in English.

Statement of the Problem

The study is intended to be an exploratory, quasi-experimental study, whose purpose is to compare the effects of two teaching strategies (personal questions versus non-personal questions) on measures of student achievement both affective and cognitive. Specifically, the study deals with the following questions:

1. Does personalizing literature affect student achievement?
2. Does personalizing literature affect student attitude toward French study and toward literature study?
3. Does personalizing literature affect student attitude toward the work of literature?
4. Is it feasible to personalize questions about literature in the intermediate college classroom?
Definition of Treatment Techniques

The treatments differ in degree of personalization in the manner the play, *Le Malentendu* by Albert Camus, is taught. The levels of the independent variable:

1. **Personalized approach:** Question strategies that require the student to express an attitude toward some facet of a work of literature.

2. **Non-personalized approach:** Question strategies that require students to apply facts or concepts and to analyze reading materials but not to express an attitude toward the work in questions.

Value of the Study

The study is not designed to discredit the traditional approaches to teaching literature. It has been pointed out, however, that teaching literature at the beginning levels of language learning has had serious shortcomings. It has lacked relevancy to the students' lives and had not always been interesting to them.

If the results of this study indicate that personalized questions influence students' cognitive performance and their affective response to literature, then this study would benefit teachers of literature in beginning language classes by indicating teaching strategies that would interest students and help them understand literature. Thus, by focusing activities on the feelings, interpretation, and judgments of the students, they will be led to a more profound appreciation of literature in the second language, which could be a foundation for more sophisticated analyses in advanced courses (Birckbichler and Muyskens, 1976).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Research in English education on teaching literature and more specifically on response to literature provides data of interest to foreign language educators. The literature related to research in these areas has contributed to the conceptualization of this study. Research conducted within the English classroom will be discussed first. Second, research on and suggestions for teaching literature in the second-language classroom will be considered. Finally, personalization of teaching material will be discussed as it relates to the present study.

Research on Response to Literature

Researchers in English education have long been interested in the interaction between the reader and the work of literature. As early as 1929, responses to 13 poems were collected by Richards in a British University. He wanted to determine methods of understanding the development of discrimination of what is read, the assertions that students make, and the difficulties when critiquing a poem. He hoped to find new techniques for discovering what people feel about poetry and to arrive at an understanding of the development of opinions. He discovered that readers need to understand the sense, feeling, tone, and intention of a poem before they can fully discuss it and that problems in
assertions come when students misunderstand imagery, use stock responses, become confused by their preconceptions, and distort the meaning through sentimental or inhibited responses.

Other educators interested in the reaction of the student to the work of literature have focused on the experience of reading literature as an active one as did Richards. The act of reading is active because it involves the "full play of human personality - the rational power, the emotional reactions, the ethical commitments" (Squire, 1971, p. 92). Loban, Ryan, and Squire (1941, p. 142) believe that literature can bring self-understanding, imaginative illumination, and a balanced perspective on life. If students experience the work of literature rather than read critical analyses, they will be influenced emotionally, attitudinally, and intellectually by what they read (Purves and Beach, 1972). The interaction between the work and the reader (the response to literature) is complex. Many factors influence this interaction such as personality, understanding, past experience, the process of response, complexity of the work, literary learning, and preconceptions. These factors could also contribute to problems in reading in the second language and were investigated because of their relationship to this study.

Squire (1964) acknowledged that the studies on response to literature have been "fragmentary and intuitive." Referring to past studies, he states that because of individual variation in reaction to characters and works, no one theory of response can be accepted. Squire states that past studies have revealed 1) the operation of a general factor influencing appreciation, 2) the importance of sex differences, and 3) the impact of personal predispositions (p. 7). In order to investigate
further the factors in response, he coded the responses of 52 ninth 
and tenth grade students to four short stories. By interviewing students, 
he hoped to describe the ways responses develop and to relate these re-
ponses to the personal characteristics of the students. The patterns 
of response identified by him were:

1. Literary judgments: The reader judges the story as an 
   artistic work.

2. Interpretational responses: The reader attempts to dis-
   cover the meaning of the story, the motivational forces, 
   and the nature of the characters. The three types of 
   interpretation are a) interpretations of characters and 
   plot, b) interpretations of ideas and themes, and c) 
   visual reconstructions of scenes which represent visual 
   interpretation of specific facts.


4. Associational responses: The reader associates ideas, 
   events, or places, and people with his own experience 
   but does not associate a character with himself.

5. Self-Involvement: The reader associates himself with the 
   behavior and emotions of characters.

6. Prescriptive judgments: The reader prescribes a course 
   of action for a character based on some absolute stand-
   ard.

7. Miscellaneous: Responses not recorded elsewhere (pp. 
   17-18).

Squire concluded that involved readers are superior because they make
statements about literary judgments and have the widest literary experience (p. 23). More than 42 percent of all responses were coded as interpretational. High percentages of interpretational scores are associated with interest and ability in intellectual activity. His general hypothesis that universal group tendencies are observable in the reading responses of adolescents is proved only in part. He concludes that the relationship between literary responses and individual variety is so great that no easy generalization can be made.

Purves and Rippere (1968) did not agree with Squire's categories and, therefore, developed their own. (See Chapter I.) They felt that Squire's categories overlapped and were not substantiated. Studying the essays of students, they found four general relationships: the direct interaction of writer and work, the writer's viewing the work and author as objects, the writer's relating of the universe in the work to the universe as he perceives it, and the writer's judging the work in relation to the artist, the universe, and the writer himself (p. 6). They believed that their four categories (engagement-involvement, perception, interpretation, and evaluation) were latent in all students and that if teachers understand this, they can help their students attain a responsible attitude toward literature.

In an effort to expand the work of Purves and Rippere, Beach and Mertz (1975) have further revised the categories by adding levels of response and by making some definitions more specific. (See Chapter I.) Ring (1968) and Ash (1969) have also investigated response to literature. Ring studied the responses of 62 twelfth grade students to three short stories. In results very different from those of Squire (1964), he found that students tended to evaluate the stories in terms of personal
preference and description and to a lesser degree interpretation on the part of the students. He suggests assistance to students in broadening their awareness of forms of literary expression and teaching interpretation. Ash (1969) proposed to construct a test of literary judgment and to investigate responses of 123 eleventh grade students who took listening and reading tests on literature. Thirty-six of these students recorded explanations of the reasons for their choices. In analysis of the transcripts, the eleven responses that Ash (1969) found were a mixture of those mentioned by Squire and by Purves and Ripper: guess, misreading, unsupported judgment, poetic preconceptions, isolated elements, narrational answers, technical responses, irrelevant association, interpretation, and self-involvement.

The main functions of response categories such as those mentioned above include use in doing research, in scoring student compositions, in choosing questions to ask while teaching, and in identifying differences in reading. As can be seen from the many kinds of responses recorded, however, there are numerous ways to react to a work of literature. Because of the many types of responses received from students, researchers have focused on the psychological interaction between personality and the work of literature in order to understand more fully the responses. Empathy and past experience of the students have become important because they will affect involvement of a reader with the work of literature. Involvement, as Squire (1964) has stated, will influence student reaction to the work. Alpert (1955), for example, studied the relationship of empathy to reading comprehension of literary works. From his studies of 101 university students who took literary
tests devised by him, he inferred that empathetic tendencies are not related to reading ability. He found that women have significantly greater empathetic ability than men and that for females the tendency to project their feelings and attitudes does enhance comprehension. Meckel (1946) also found evidence of involvement of readers with the work of literature. Among high school students he showed that identification with a work of literature reflects a strong value-orientation. Eighty-four percent of the responses reflected an identification between the readers and the characters because of past experiences. Unfavorable comments on a work of literature stem from reader reactions to ideas rather than from reactions to the technical matters of the work.

In an effort to define further the psychological dynamic of response to literature in adolescents, Petrosky (1975) did case studies of four adolescents reading the same text. He recorded their reactions to twelve separate works of literature and discovered that the three main factors which influence response are stage-specific operations (thought processes), identity themes (personality patterns), and past experience. Petrosky also found that response is learned in the sense that it takes the form that the respondent thinks is expected as judged by the questions posed.

Thayer and Pronko (1958, 1959) have also investigated the psychological factors in reading. Their first studies (using 112 college students who checked a personality profile of the main character described in the passage read) emphasized that description of characters by readers depended on past reading or on other experiences. Also, mental images of a character are dependent on the readers' subjective interpretation.
of the circumstances in the work of literature. If a reader hates a fictional character, the character will appear to that reader with traits that he or she dislikes. Reading is also a very individualistic activity in that each individual's psychological history is unique and specific to the person (1958). Thayer and Pronko's studies confirmed the findings of Petrosky (1975) and Meckel (1946), who found that the past experience of the reader had more influence on the individual's reaction to the literary work than the reading matter itself. In an effort to understand further factors in reading, Thayer and Pronko (1959) undertook another study to determine how implied ethical and moral values can affect the reader's perception of the people and ideas about which he or she is reading. One hundred and twelve college sophomores indicated their attitudes to controversial issues and to certain personality traits. They were given an ambiguous passage and, after reading it, answered multiple choice questions about the character and ranked his personality traits. As they had discovered previously, when confronted with absence of description, readers give a character they like traits that they see as likeable. The authors found, however, that undesirable moral issues color the reader's conceptualization and that as morals are implied, the reader finds it more difficult to extend the story. Moral and ethical implications affect a reader's conceptualization and provide stereotypical frames of reference for structuring an ambiguous reading situation. The authors state that by knowing the reader's affective predispositions, one may be able to predict after further research an individual's reactions to and conceptualizations of a situation in fiction after further study in the area
of personality and response to literature (1959).

Most of the research done focuses on the importance of the past experience of the reader. This must be taken into account along with the stages of development of the reader's personality or the preoccupations of the readers at the particular moment of encounter with the work. Rosenblatt (1938) stresses that teachers must be aware not only of the students' past experience, but also of their present frustrations and needs. She feels that the teachers' role is to help the student "to understand and organize his personal attitudes and to gain the knowledge and the sense of values that will enable him to respond more fully and more justly to the work of literature" (pp. 124-128). She believes that each time an individual experiences a work of art, it is created anew. A work will carry its own message to each reader, but the reader must possess flexibility if he or she is going to experience reading fully. Students may come with crystallized ideas and habits of response that will influence their understanding and judgment of what is read. The preconceptions may interfere with their reading unless teachers help them to become perceptive readers.

If the primary goal of literature study is to encourage students to read perceptively (so that they detect the relationships between form and content, the development of characters and plot, and the multiplicities of meaning, certain attitudes must be cultivated (Loban, Ryan, and Squire, 1941), and much literature should be read (Britton, 1959). Loban, Ryan, and Squire (1941) believed that to appreciate literature, students should be encouraged to respond with genuineness, suspend judgment, weigh evidence objectively, search for several
meanings, and fuse intellectual and emotional reaction. Britton (1959) showed that judgment of poetry matures with amount of reading. He compared reactions to goodness and badness in eight true poems and to seven counterfeit ones. The reactions of 221 readers were analyzed. More experienced readers tended to respond to a poem either by committing themselves fairly positively or by suspending judgment, whereas less experienced readers rejected that which they did not understand on the grounds that they could not comprehend it. The main obstacle to poetic judgment seemed to be the intervention of preconceived ideas, attitudes, and sentiments between the reader and the expression of the poet. A retest revealed an increase in preference for true poems. Britton concluded that poetry should be read and reread.

Students are influenced by what they read. Not only does their judgment change but also their concepts, attitudes, and behavior (Shirley, 1966). Among tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students, the number of influences is related to intelligence, reading proficiency, number of books and articles read, and the situation in which reading was done. Only 26 out of 420 adolescents reported no influence from their reading. In other studies (1969) of ten highly influenced students and ten lowly influenced students chosen from 420 public high school students, Shirley found during interviews that intelligence and reading proficiency did not appear to be related to maximal and minimal influence. In addition, as revealed in the students' self-evaluations, students know what they feel about reading and how they experience it.

If students do indeed know how they feel about literature and how they experience it, this should be taken into account when discussing
a literary work. One must also recognize that class discussion can change the dimensions of literary response. To study the effects of literature discussion, Wilson (1962) investigated the progress of 54 college freshmen reading the novels The Catcher in the Rye, The Grapes of Wrath, and A Farewell to Arms. The objectives of the class discussion, led by the instructor and panels of students, had been to stimulate the student to create his or her own insights. Wilson collected written reactions to the novels and compared the students' observations before and after class discussion using Squire's categories. In addition, nine subjects were chosen for individual analysis. Wilson found that students' ways of responding to literature were changed both statistically and individually after class discussion because it caused an increase in interpretative reactions and a decrease in self-involvement, literary judgments, and retelling of the story. One can conclude that the study, teaching, and discussion of literature can affect the student's response to a literary work.

The present study is based on the theory that college students receiving preparation in foreign language literature will cognitively and affectively achieve differently as a result of special teaching procedures. The study relates type of presentation to outcomes of the students in the foreign language classroom. The study is based 1) on the importance of students' reaction to a work of literature and to its characters and 2) on the importance of the past experiences of the students. The teacher should take these factors into account when teaching a work of literature so that he or she may lead students to examine more closely not only the work but also their personal experience and basic
assumptions while at the same time defending the validity of their understanding and judgment of the work (Rosenblatt, 1938).

Research in the Foreign Language Classroom

Relevant empirical research in the foreign language classroom to the teaching of literature is almost nonexistent. Most discussion on the teaching of literature is theoretical and experiential. The ideas of many authors do, however, suggest directions for further research. The principle articles on literature teaching will be discussed here because they have influenced the theoretical basis of this experiment and the lesson plans used in implementation of the experiment.

One of the few empirical studies on literature examined the relationship between intensive reading of literature and its impact on the student's attitude toward the foreign culture and foreign language (Young, 1963, p. 629). French students in three public high schools read works of Barrès, Duhamel, Gide, Hugo, Loti, Michelet, Rostand, Vercors, and Voltaire. The 78 participants were measured before and after reading by the same three instruments: Dressel's Inventory of Beliefs, Allport-Wernon-Lindzey's Study of Values, and Osgood's semantic differential scale. The reading affected some changes of attitude but not to the degree expected. The concepts which changed significantly were the value of English language, the potency of war, and the potency of silence. The values that decreased significantly in importance were: foreigners, home, national liberty, a pastor, religious, and the French language. The author suggests continued study in the area of reading in the foreign language to see 1) what amount of time is required to
affect attitude change, 2) whether intensive reading affects more significant changes in cultural attitudes than extensive reading, and 3) whether prejudice and ethnocentrism can be diminished through study of a foreign language (p. 632).

Most articles on teaching literature in the second-language classroom are concerned with how to keep literature study in the curriculum, how to make it interesting, and how to combine language and literature goals. Steiner (1972) stresses that teaching literature should not be excluded from the secondary school curricula. Reading selections, however, should be reexamined to ascertain if new works or new methods need to be included. She suggests 1) that thematic units be used at different levels of language study, and 2) that students be divided into interest groups such as literature, history, and culture groups that would meet with the teacher at different times throughout the week. She finds that students who have had good experiences in high school literature courses (where attention is not given to petty detail) will enroll for college literature classes. Good experience in literature study can be provided if works of literature meet the following criteria:

1) Will the students enjoy what they are going to read?

2) Is it relevant to their needs?

3) Will it be within the range of their language competence (Stewart, 1967, p. 38)?

Even if interesting works of literature are chosen, they must be used effectively in class so that students will appreciate them. Many authors have suggested methods that they have found effective in their classrooms. Christensen (1972) proposes paraphrasing, role playing the
characters, using drawings to serve as a visual reminder or review, and studying basic literary analysis. He believes that these activities will foster free conversation in order to further language skills.

Smith (1976) agrees that literature should be used to develop second-language skills. Although he does not think a literary piece should be deformed for the sake of grammar review, he believes that language and literature teaching can be effective combined. By using drills for structural practice and reading comprehension, the students will be prepared for conversation activities that follow. He suggests substitution, expansion, transposition, question/answer, and role-playing exercises.

Hunting (1976) emphasizes the use of role playing alone. During her course entitled "literature in action" or French theatre workshop students performed plays. The course goals were to develop self-discipline, cooperation, and student creativity. Students improved their fluency and discovered new options in the literary text. Hunting felt that the course gave students the opportunity to share a unique human, cultural, and linguistic experience.

Klein (1976) has approached literature study in another way. He has developed individualized approaches to literary texts because language teachers have too often stressed literary analysis — even in early language classes. He urges continued development of the four skills through oral presentation, tapes, and compositions. He hoped that students would be able to enjoy literature if they were led step by step to comprehension.
Hester (1972) approaches literature study in a very practical manner. He does not adhere to one philosophy for teaching literature but states that for different levels of study, distinctly different methods of teaching are needed. Writing must precede and accompany reading so that the student can appreciate the skill of the writer. Translation, on the other hand, will hinder any literary appreciation and growing reading skill. For intermediate students he suggests audiovisual supplements to enhance reading experience. He feels that original compositions which reflect the student's contact with a work are important in helping the student analyze his or her reaction to literature and in encouraging the student to speak about literary topics using the proper literary terms.

The genre of a literary work has been another area of emphasis because some educators feel that study of one genre may be more beneficial than another. Because of the compactness of impression of the short story, Leal (1972) believes that it is a means for making students aware of their own personalities. He proposes short stories which provoke varied emotional reactions and which emphasize different themes so that students may examine their personalities and the social conditions in other cultures. Even immature readers can learn something of literary analysis because they are able to recognize images and symbols as well as the predominant elements of the story. Because short stories can be discussed in a limited amount of time, they lend themselves to the classroom hour.

teaching of poetry at all levels of language study beginning with recurring sound and new vocabulary and advancing to the *explication de texte*. She believes that poetry can add a valuable dimension to the study of language. O'Neill (1968) develops a series of strategies for teaching French poetry and prose but stresses the use of poetry for beginning students. Aspinwall (1970) also discusses priorities in the teaching of poetry in the second language for appreciation and knowledge of literature. She proposes teaching appreciation of poetry by the following techniques: using questions to serve as guides for reading, comparing English translations, giving reasons to admire a poet, agreeing or disagreeing with critics, reading after a model, and using slides which set the poetry in a historical perspective or illustrate it. She suggests that students understand that they may offer any interpretation if they defend it. This technique leads to a feeling of pride on the part of the students because their own ideas are important. Many literature students have bad memories of teachers who have forced them to have one point of view.

Other authors have focused on the role of the student's affective reaction to a literary work. They have felt that the student must have a personal encounter with the text and have tried to de-emphasize the study of literature as the learning of a critic's opinion. Dietz (1972) followed the devise of Socrates that "nothing is learnt which does not become part of his experience" and asked students in his Spanish novel course to keep a diary. He hoped that this diary would be a means to make literature relevant to students because their own experience with the literary work would be dramatized. Tilles (1972), who was also
concerned with the need for "experience-based learning" and with literature as communication, taught a course whose basic purpose was to produce a Spanish-American play before a student audience (p. 304). He believed that the students acquired a profound understanding of the "human qualities of literature and the relationship of these vital aspects to academic questions of internal structure" (p. 305).

Analysis of the structure of literary works is of prime importance to some educators. They are willing to spend less time on language skill development in order to expand critical analysis of the work. Holby (1968) fails to see how one can "combine reading, conversation, and literature effectively if the instructor is going to include literary analysis to any great extent" (p. 476). Cárdenas (1968) suggests that by choosing reading selections that are relevant to the reader, literary analysis can be meaningful and challenging to the students. His outline of activities for the implementation of literary analysis in advanced high school classes includes the following: significance of the title, summary statements of the main theme, surface plane (semantics) and content of the work, metaphorical plane and content of the work, grammatical analysis, external analysis (metrics), and lasting value of the work. He feels that literary discussion including items of this nature will be interesting for students.

The present study is based on the theory that literature study can be one of the most fulfilling parts of the language learning process. Literature can be challenging so that it arouses the students' curiosity. If literature study emphasizes student contact with the work and the past experience of the learner, the student will enjoy literature study
in the second language, understand himself or herself more fully and appreciate the problems of humanity more fully.

**Personalizing Teaching Materials**

The trend in present-day education is toward dealing with the students' basic needs. The teacher is urged to foster student affective, cognitive, and social growth (Chastain, 1976, p. 242). The language program at Kenston High School bases its classes on values clarification, human development, and transactional analysis (Stoller et al., 1974). This program offers an opportunity to satisfy the students' need to become more aware of themselves, to interact with others, and to develop more positive self-concepts. They believe that the sharing of one's self can be developed by communicating in the foreign language and by adopting the creative tasks of Simon et al. (1972) such as incomplete sentences, rank orders, and values continua.

Simon et al. (1972) believe that every decision that a person makes is based on consciously or unconsciously held beliefs, attitudes, and values. The authors' goal is to help students examine their values and make them aware of the beliefs they prize. They propose presenting the values-clarification strategies at the same time as the subject matter so "as to advance both the search for knowledge and the search for values" (p. 22).

Brown (1971) refers to the flowing together of affective and cognitive domains as confluent education. To deny the existence of feelings in communication is to build a house without a framework because thinking is accompanied by feeling and vice versa. The highest form of
abstract thinking is coupled with congruent feeling on the part of the thinker.

Galyean (1976) feels that the principles of confluent education can be applied in the foreign language classroom. She believes that self-reflective language will enhance language learning and at the same time benefit the student in his or her search for self-fulfillment. She suggests teaching to energizing naturally "meaning modes"—needs, concerns, feelings, interests, wants, moods—and using them as a basis for language practice. She illustrates the teaching of the beginning of L'Etranger using the three levels of confluent education: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and extrapersonal. To contemplate the theme of death, the students are asked to write letters to close relatives informing them of a death. The students exchange letters and then imagine how they would feel upon receiving a letter telling them of the death of someone important to their lives. The author believes that the following three objectives were accomplished: 1) clarification of one's own experience and attitude toward death; 2) awareness of other's experiences; and 3) contrastive understanding of Meursault's character and values (p. 230). In order to take into account the varied personality styles of teacher and student, teachers need to work on developing expertise in cognitive, interactive, and affective teaching skills. Affective programs tend to alleviate tension and create atmospheres of openness where students can interact among themselves and make the "disclosure of meaningful content possible" (p. 231).

Hoping to foster insightful understanding of literature, Evanston Township High School (English as Exploration, 1969) adopted a
personalized approach to teaching English. The program strives to promote personal growth through English and hopes to encourage the development of the student as a whole person by permitting him or her to exercise both imagination and cognitive facilities in coming to grips with experience, rather than by asking him or her to do solely intellectual work. The authors have developed cognitive and affective goals for reading and writing and believe that learning takes place on a deeper, more lasting, and more useful level if these goals are linked. The project writers quote DeMott commenting on what English is, in its best and true sense:

It is the place—there is no other in most schools—wherein the chief matters of concern are particulars of humaneness...as these can be known through the written expression (at many literary levels) of men living and dead, and as they can be discovered by student writers seeking through words to name and compose and grasp their own experience. English in its sum is about my distinctness and the distinctness of other human beings. Its function, like that of some books called great, is to provide an arena in which the separate man, the single ego, can strive at once to know the world through art, to know what, if anything, he uniquely is, and what some brothers uniquely are (p. 31).

Literature is the route to self-knowledge because readers can learn from observing the world around them (Shoban, 1967). The words of literature can be charged with meaning if used to appeal to one's own experience. The student becomes acquainted with a work and finally assimilates it if it is not regarded as simply an intellectual exercise. The 1967 Northeast Conference Report states that what matters is that the student have a "direct and personal confrontation" with the work (Lohnes, 1972, p. 84).
Text-centered approaches such as the *explication de texte*, lectures, translation, and seminars are often successful in advanced courses but do not fully capitalize on what the student brings to the learning/teaching situation or on the personal encounter with the text. Such approaches may result in a lack of response and interest because the students are ill-equipped to handle sophisticated critical analysis. They may be able, however, to handle a personalized analysis of literature when given appropriate questions and carefully structured activities which focus on the student's reaction to the text, characters, events, ideas, and style. This reaction is sought through questions eliciting student feelings, experiences, imagination, interests, values, opinion, and attitudes (Birckbichler and Muyskens, 1976).

In a personal approach to literature, the essential is that the potential relationship between language study, literature, and the student is explored. Brown (1974) stated:

> To study another language in which people live out their lives and to study the literature that has expressed their dreams and the limits of their possibilities is a new way by contrast to introduce the student to himself and the human condition (p. 31).

The students will not only enjoy such an approach but through this personal encounter with the text, they will develop a deeper appreciation for the literature in the second language. This appreciation will provide a framework for more sophisticated analysis in advanced courses because abstract thinking in its highest form is coupled with congruent feelings (Brown, 1971).

In response to the lack of interest that students are showing in literature and to the feeling that students need a more personal
confrontation with the work of literature, Lohnes (1972) suggests research to establish optimum conditions for the introduction of literature into the language curriculum. He feels that students should be attracted to literature as a vital part of the human condition. The present study is an attempt to research those conditions as well as an attempt to do experimental work in the area of response to literature in the second language.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES AND DESIGN

Population and Sample

The study was conducted in the Spring Quarter of 1976 in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at The Ohio State University. The sample for this study consisted of ten intact classes of students enrolled in French 103. Three other sections of 103 were omitted from the study because the researcher desired to use only teachers who had never taught Le Malentendu before, so that teacher bias concerning the book and preconceptions about teaching it could be minimized. The experiment was conducted during the teaching of this play because it is the first full work of formal literature that students read in the Elementary and Intermediate French program at The Ohio State University. The students were, therefore, not influenced by previous foreign literature experience at the college level. The students were told that the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures was conducting a survey concerning their attitudes toward language study and that their cooperation would be appreciated but not required.

Involved in the study were 114 students enrolled in the ten French 103 classes (54 in the personalized group and 60 in the non-personalized group). Some students in each treatment were eliminated because they were absent for one or more of the criterion measures.
A profile of those students for whom scores are available is summarized in Table 1.

At the beginning of the study, a questionnaire was administered in order to obtain information about each student's background in language and literature study. Students were asked to give their grade in the previous French class, in order to determine achievement up to this point and to check whether the experimental groups were equivalent. As summarized in Table 2, there was no significant difference between the treatment groups on previous grade ($x^2 = 5.19$).

The large majority of the students involved in the study were enrolled in French 103 in order to fill a four-quarter language requirement of the College of Arts and Sciences. There were no foreign language majors in the personalized group and only one in the non-personalized group. Because this study also concerns literature, the participants were asked how much literature they had studied and whether they were English literature or comparative literature majors. Two students in the personalized group and two in the non-personalized group were majoring in literature.

A Chi Square was performed on other factors which might have influenced the outcome measures. It was found that the groups were not significantly different on the following factors: previous French study, years of previous French study, study of other foreign languages, reason for choosing French in college, English study, reason for studying English in college, sex, grade level, and foreign languages spoken in the home. There was, however, a difference significant at the .003 level between how much French literature the two groups had previously read.
Table 1. Breakdown of Sample by teacher, grade level, and sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Sex of Students</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total by Sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-PERSONALIZED GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Chi Square—Previous Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Previous Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Group</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-personalized Group</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 5.19 with 4 degrees of freedom  Significance = .27
It was determined that 30% of the personalized group had read a work of literature in French compared with 59% of the non-personalized group. (See Table 3.)

**Design of the Study**

The null hypotheses were tested using a basic two-factor hierarchical analysis of variance (ANOVA) and a three-factor partial hierarchical analysis of variance with repeated measures. The teaching methodology was the independent variable. Because all classrooms were not exposed to both levels of the teaching methods variable, the classrooms were nested within levels of the methods variable. The hierarchical arrangement statistically controlled for any extraneous teaching and classroom effect occurring because of the use of intact classes. In the first design, the two principle variables were 1) the treatment and 2) the levels nested within the treatment. A within-subjects variable was added to the two-factor arrangement in the second design because repeated measures (pre- and posttests) were used for measures of attitude toward foreign language and toward literature study.

The independent variable was amount of personalization used in activities and questions while teaching *Le Malentendu*. The questions and activities used were based on the work of Beach and Mertz in English education and that of Birckbichler and Muyskens in foreign language education.

One of the dependent variables of this study was designed to measure attitude and the second to measure amount of information. The two dependent variables were as follows:
Table 3. Chi Square—Read literature in French previously

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Group</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-personalized Group</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ChiSquare=8.87 with 1 degree of freedom (p < .003)
1. The posttest attitude questionnaire was in three-parts, requiring students to respond to Likert-type scales concerning their attitudes toward foreign language study, literature study, and Le Malentendu.

2. The achievement test was in three-parts, consisting of ten quote identifications, five true/false questions, and four essay questions.

The Cooperating Instructors and Instructional Materials

The ten experimental sections were taught by ten different teaching associates, all with excellent fluency in French and all working toward advanced degrees in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures or in Foreign Language Education. None of them had ever taught French 103 at The Ohio State University, but because some had had more teaching experience than others, all were given detailed, prescriptive lesson plans, in order to minimize the impact of individual differences in teaching methods.

The cooperating instructors, who were fully informed about the nature of the study, were assigned to treatment groups by stratified random assignment. The research surmised, as a result of observation and consultation with the instructors, that some of them had a penchant for teaching either personal or non-personal classes, and, in order to control for this factor, the instructors were divided into strata according to their judged teaching preference. Two instructors' names from each stratum were drawn at random and put in the treatment judged not to be their preference. This was done so that there would be a balance
between those teaching in a manner natural to them and those teaching in a manner to which they were not accustomed.

All experimental classes had eleven instructional periods dealing with *Le Malentendu* by Albert Camus and followed an identical syllabus prescribing the course content, daily student assignments, and dates for assigned quizzes and compositions.

**Experimental Treatments and Preparation of Activities**

During discussions with the Chairman of the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures and the directors of the Elementary French program, it was agreed that the experiment would be designed so that ongoing instruction would not be interrupted and so that the experimental treatments would not decrease student learning as described on the departmental course syllabus. Therefore, the materials were developed with careful attention to the existing 103 syllabus.

The experimental treatments involve arrangement of instruction. The teaching associates were given specific questions, handouts, and activities to use while dealing with the assigned pages for each of the eleven days. Their classes were visited during the instructional time in order to ensure that they were adhering carefully to the experimental treatments to which they were assigned. The treatments affected approximately 25 minutes daily of class time. The remainder of the period was used for idiom and vocabulary work as prescribed by the course syllabus. The latter was constant in all classes of both experimental conditions and was not considered as part of the experimental study.
Each day students in the personalized treatment group were asked personalized questions on the work. The response to the questions involved expressing an attitude. An attitude, according to Rokeach (1970, p. 112) is "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner." The content or belief may describe the object of belief as true or false, correct or incorrect; evaluate it as good or bad; or advocate a certain course of action or a certain state of existence as desirable or undesirable. The criteria for judgment by the student are internally imposed.

Comprehension questions were asked in order to determine how well students had understood their reading assignments. These questions were personalized by role playing or by having the students formulate their own questions. After the comprehension activities, general discussion questions were asked of the students. Depending on the level of discussion, questions were drawn from the following categories of Beach and Mertz (1975) which have been adapted for foreign language study by Birkbichler and Muyskens (1976, Appendix A):

1. **Engagement/Involvement**: Students express personal feelings about the work, characters, events, or ideas. They try to identify relationships between the work and their lives.

2. **Interpretation**: Students identify motives, find evidence to support generalizations, solve problems, and make predictions. They both synthesize and analyze information in order to infer the meaning of a character's behavior, the language, and the overall meaning of the work.
3. **Evaluation:** Students make statements judging the quality, worth, composition, meaningfulness, plausibility, and significance of parts of all of the work. They make judgments on the value of ideas, characters, language, and overall meaning of the work. The criteria by which students make judgments are determined by the students, themselves.

The students participating in the non-personalized approach were asked comprehension questions that required them to recount dimensions of the plot or to state the main ideas of the play (Gall, 1975). The general discussion questions were based on the following categories:

1. **Application:** The students must relate facts or concepts that they have already learned to phenomenon under consideration (Bloom, 1956, p. 205). The students apply their knowledge of literary terms and biographical information to the work under consideration (Corbin, 1972, p. 156) and solve problems that have a single correct answer (Gall, 1975).

2. **Analysis:** Bloom (1956, p. 205) has defined analysis thusly: "The breakdown of a communication into its constituent elements or parts such that the relative hierarchy of ideas is made clear and/or the relations between the ideas expressed are made explicit." The students analyze both linguistic and literary aspects of the play in order to clarify its meaning, its organization, and its effects on the reader. (For instance, they may discuss
double meanings and style.)

3. Evaluation: Criteria for evaluation of the work are externally imposed. The students are given a statement of evaluation and discuss why the statement was made.

The lesson plans for the two approaches are found in Appendix B.

Instrumentation

The following instruments were used:

1. Pretest. At the same time that the information questionnaire was distributed, an attitude questionnaire was given consisting of 22 questions of Likert-type scales measuring student attitude toward foreign language study and 16 questions measuring their attitude toward the study of literature in general. The administration of the pre-treatment information and attitude questionnaire required approximately 13 minutes of class time. Items for the questionnaire were devised by the researcher except for some that were adapted from questions used by Savignon (1972).

The attitude questionnaires were constructed according to standard procedures and guidelines by Kennedy (1976) and Edwards (1957). A summated rating scale, Likert-type, was chosen because these scales allow a broad range of expression (Kerlinger, 1973). The researcher chose the following categories of response: agree strongly (+3), agree moderately (+2), agree slightly (+1), disagree slightly (-1), disagree moderately (-2), and disagree strongly (-3). No neutral point was given in order to encourage respondents to express their opinions. The mean group response to each item was used in the analysis of variance.
The group means for responses to the pretest questionnaires were nearly equivalent (Personalized group=4.68; Non-personalized group=4.63 on attitude toward foreign language study and Personalized group=4.99 and Non-personalized group=5.23 on attitude toward literature study). Analyses of variance performed on these pretest scores reveal F-ratios of less than one. Hence, there are no significant differences between the treatments on pretest scores.

The alpha coefficient for reliability of the Likert-type scales was determined to be .91 for the pretests on attitude toward foreign language study and .93 on attitude toward literature study.

2. **Attitude Posttest.** At the end of the eleven-day period, another attitude questionnaire including a separate questionnaire on *Le Malentendu* was distributed by the researcher. The directions were identical to the first, and the measure was prepared according to the same procedures. Students were told that the Department wanted to know whether they had changed their opinions concerning language and literature study. The first two subtests were identical to the pretest. The third section consisted of 18 questions measuring student attitude toward *Le Malentendu*. The administration of this instrument required 11 minutes of class time.

The alpha coefficient for internal consistency reliability was determined to be .95 for the posttest on foreign language attitude, .93 for attitude toward literature study, and .93 for *Le Malentendu*. The attitude questionnaires are included in Appendix C.

3. **Achievement Test.** This test was designed to measure comprehension of the text and ability to interpret it. Comprehension was
measured by ten "Qui a dit" test items and five true/false items. Four essay questions were included to measure how effectively students could discuss the work of literature. Two of the essay questions were personal- alized while the other two were analytical. This was done to ascertain whether students in the treatment groups could effectively answer ques- tions that they had not dealt with in class. Achievement instruments are found in Appendix D.

In developing the achievement measures the methods of Clark (1972) were used and the testing was divided into the two areas of literature information (Qui a dit and true/false) and literature interpretation (essay questions). He suggests that open-ended questions be used in order to test ability to use material actively. He gives guidelines stating that 1) a novel situation be presented and 2) the subject be clearly stated and delimited. He states that scoring procedures will vary according to what is being stressed and that separate grades can be given for content and for linguistic writing. In order to evaluate linguistic categories, Clark suggests three-to-five point scales of quality for each category. Possible categories are vocabulary, struc- ture, and fluency.

Valette (1967) discussed the problems of essay-type tests because of scoring unreliability. She suggests, however, that expression as well as acquisition of literary vocabulary be tested by essay questions. Scoring reliability can be improved by asking for specific information and by making tests short and precise. Thought questions that present the student with an interpretation not previously mentioned, but that deal with a clearly defined problem, are suggested.
Other means of evaluating were explored. Schulz (1974) devised evaluation criteria for scoring an oral simulated communication test using six-point scales for fluency, comprehensibility, amount of communication, and quality of communication. Savignon (1972) used scales to measure effort to communicate, amount of communication, comprehensibility, fluency, naturalness and poise, and comprehension by native speakers. The Foreign Service Interview (FSI), as described by Clark (1972, pp. 122-23), uses five levels of proficiency from "elementary" to "native or bilingual proficiency."

The researcher used four categories: two to ascertain linguistic and vocabulary correctness, one to measure general comprehension, and one to determine whether students can support their interpretations of literature by citing relevant details.

The evaluation criteria were:

**Grammatical Accuracy**
1. No sentences are written correctly
2. Very few sentences are structurally correct
3. Some sentences correct, but many structural problems remain
4. Many correct sentences, but structural problems remain
5. Most sentences correct, only minor structural problems
6. All sentences correct

** Appropriateness of Vocabulary**
1. Vocabulary is incorrect throughout
2. Vocabulary is usually inaccurate, except for occasional correct words
3. Some vocabulary is correct, but many inaccuracies remain
4. Vocabulary is generally appropriate, except for minor lexical problems
5 Vocabulary is almost always appropriate, except for minor lexical problems
6 Consistent use of appropriate words

Comprehensibility of Response
1 No response
2 Incomprehensible or inappropriate response
3 Barely comprehensible response
4 Attempt at response, but generally incomprehensible
5 General comprehensible response, except for occasional lapses in clarity
6 Totally comprehensible response

Quantity and Quality of Supportive Detail
1 No response
2 No appropriate textual examples and no supportive detail
3 Few appropriate textual examples and little supportive detail
4 Some appropriate textual examples and supportive detail
5 Many appropriate textual examples and much supportive detail
6 Rich in textual examples or supportive detail

The researcher scored all the essay responses. In order to avoid scoring bias, she used a number system so that she was never aware of any student's class or treatment group. Two judges independently scored the students' compositions in order to determine how reliable the researcher's estimation of them was. Both judges were native-born Americans experienced in teaching French and with an excellent command of the language. Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients between the researcher's ratings of the compositions and the judges' ratings over 72
randomly chosen subjects were found to be .76 for one rater and .67 for the other.

A total achievement score was computed by averaging the 16 essay item scores determined by the researcher and adding that score to the number correct on the true/false and the quote identification. An average of those scores was used in the analysis of variance.

**Pilot Study**

Prior to the principal study, a pilot study was conducted in two French 103 classes. One class was taught by the researcher and the other by an instructor who had taught *Le Malentendu* several times.

A three-part questionnaire was prepared, including an information questionnaire and sections on attitude toward foreign language study and attitude toward literature study. The questionnaire was given at this time in order to determine its reliability and the length of time necessary to administer it. The students were given as much time as they needed. The researcher deemed these administrative procedures satisfactory and appropriate for use in the main experiment. The KR3 coefficient for total test reliability was found to be .91 for attitude toward foreign language study and .93 for attitude toward study of literature. Some items on the test for attitude toward foreign languages were excluded because of low inter-item correlation, but an even number of positive and negative items were retained in order to maximize the test reliability. Four items were deleted from the original twenty-six. Because the instrument measuring attitude toward study of literature had such a high reliability, it was not altered.
The classes participating in the pilot study were given a questionnaire to measure attitude toward *Le Malentendu*. The KR3 coefficient for total test reliability was determined to be .89. Two items with low inter-item correlation were excluded as a result of the pilot test.

All materials included in the pilot study are found in Appendix E. The pilot study statistical computations were made by the Office of Evaluation at The Ohio State University using the Johnson-McCabe program for item analysis of Likert-type scales.

**General Procedures**

After choosing the classes which were to participate in the experiment, the researcher contacted all instructors and asked their help in carrying out the study. All instructors agreed to give their fullest cooperation. At a meeting to prepare them for teaching literature, the instructors were given copies of the research proposal and information describing in detail their roles in the experimental procedures. They understood that students should not be informed of the experimental nature of the study and were instructed in how to deal with questions that might arise if students discovered that their hand-out materials were different from those in other class sections.

The day before the experiment, each instructor was assigned randomly to a treatment group. At the same time, he or she received the lesson plans for two days of the study. It was decided that lesson plans would be distributed two or three days at a time in case adjustments of time or clarity needed to be made. During the eleven-day period, instructors were asked daily for informal evaluation of the
materials they were receiving. Instructors reported satisfaction with the lesson plans.

Two quizzes were given during the course of the experiment. The first was identical in both experimental treatments, and the second differed only in the essay questions—non-personal and personal for the respective groups.

Statistical Analysis

Because of differences in the dependent variables, two types of Analysis of Variance were performed. The researcher submitted the dependent variables (the achievement test and the questionnaire on attitude toward Le Malentendu) to a basic two-factor hierarchical analysis of variance where type of activity served as the independent variable. The dependent variables (questionnaires on attitude toward foreign language study and toward literature) were tested using a three-factor partial hierarchical design with repeated measures.

All data were analyzed at either the Educational Research Center of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University or the Instruction and Research Computer Center at The Ohio State University.

The analysis of variance was used to test the following null hypotheses:

(1) $H_0$: There are no significant differences between the effectiveness of the two teaching methods in developing positive attitudes toward foreign language study and toward literature study.
(2) $H_0$: There are no significant differences in the effectiveness of the two teaching methods in developing positive attitudes toward *Le Malentendu*.

(3) $H_0$: There are no significant differences between the two experimental groups in student achievement on 1) tests of factual knowledge and on 2) essay questions interpreting or analyzing *Le Malentendu*. 
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study was designed to test the hypotheses of no difference between two treatments in their effects on achievement, attitude toward foreign language study, toward literature study, and toward Le Malentendu. The levels of the independent variable are personal and non-personal questions and activities. (For definitions of the independent variable, the reader is referred to Chapter I.)

At each level of instruction the criterion measures consisted of an attitude questionnaire on foreign language study, literature study, and Le Malentendu as well as an achievement test on Le Malentendu consisting of quote identification, true/false, and four essays. (Discussion of the dependent variables appears in Chapter III.)

The results of the analysis are discussed in this chapter and the findings are related to the three null hypotheses that were tested. A summary of findings and conclusions are found in Chapter V.

Hypothesis I: There are no significant differences between the effectiveness of two teaching methods in developing positive attitudes toward foreign language study and toward literature study. The hypothesis remains tenable. For the attitude scores toward a) foreign language study and b) literature study, the pre- and posttest means for the treatment and for each of the subgroups within treatments are
presented in Tables 4 and 5. If one examines first the measure on attitude toward foreign language study, the means are revealed to be 4.68 for the personalized treatment group on the pretest and 4.53 on the posttest. Comparison with the non-personalized treatment reveals little variation (pretest 4.63; posttest 4.61). Second, with respect to the measure on attitude toward literature study, the personal treatment group mean was 4.99 on the pretest and 4.87 on the posttest. The mean for the non-personal group was 5.23 on the pretest and 5.16 on the posttest.

As might be expected from inspection of these data, the analysis of variance revealed no significant difference associated with the treatment factor on either of the dependent variables (attitude toward a) foreign language study and b) literature study). The summary ANOVA tables are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

It is interesting to note that the subgroups factor (A/B) was significant with respect to attitude toward foreign language study ($p < .10$). This significant effect associated with the teacher variable, which recurs in subsequent analysis, suggests that in this study, the teachers rather than the types of programs tended to have the greater influence over attitudinal outcomes.

The interaction between teacher and pre- and posttest within the treatment factor (BC/A) was significant at the .01 level. These results suggest that the variation between pre- and posttest means was inconsistent across subgroups. Figures 1 and 2 depict the subgroup means for the pre- and posttests by treatments. The interaction between subgroup and mean test scores is ordinal. There was no marked difference
Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttests of Attitude toward Foreign Language Study by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments Variable A</th>
<th>Subgroups Variable B</th>
<th>Pretest $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Pretest sd</th>
<th>Posttest $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Posttest sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$ (personal)</td>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_6$</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_7$</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_{10}$</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$ (non-personal)</td>
<td>$B_3$</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_4$</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_5$</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_8$</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_9$</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A_1 \bar{x}$: 4.68</th>
<th>$A_1$ sd: .95</th>
<th>$A_1 \bar{x}$: 4.53</th>
<th>$A_1$ sd: 0.16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest: $A_2 \bar{x}$: 4.63</td>
<td>$A_2$ sd: 1.20</td>
<td>Posttest: $A_2 \bar{x}$: 4.61</td>
<td>$A_2$ sd: 1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean: 4.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Mean: 4.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for Pre- and Posttests of Attitude toward Literature Study by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments Variable A</th>
<th>Variable B</th>
<th>Pretest $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Pretest sd</th>
<th>Posttest $\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Posttest sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$ (personal)</td>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_6$</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_7$</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_{10}$</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$ (non-personal)</td>
<td>$B_3$</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_4$</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_5$</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_8$</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_9$</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$A_1 \bar{x}: 4.99 \quad A_1 sd: 1.29 \quad A_1 \bar{x}: 4.87 \quad A_1 sd: 1.23$

Pretest: $A_2 \bar{x}: 5.23 \quad A_2 sd: 1.11 \quad$ Posttest: $A_2 \bar{x}: 5.15 \quad A_2 sd: 1.24$

Grand Mean: 5.11

Grand Mean: 5.02
Table 6. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Attitude toward the Study of Foreign Languages by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/A (Subgroups)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16929.37</td>
<td>2116.17</td>
<td>1.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/AB (Subjects within AB)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>129401.50</td>
<td>1244.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Pre- and Posttests)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184.91</td>
<td>184.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235.34</td>
<td>235.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1919.50</td>
<td>239.94</td>
<td>2.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/AB</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9587.41</td>
<td>92.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10
**p < .01
Table 7. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Attitude toward Literature Study by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>774.84</td>
<td>774.84</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/A (Subgroups)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5005.12</td>
<td>625.64</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/AB (Subjects within AB)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>73840.88</td>
<td>710.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Pre- and Posttests)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137.51</td>
<td>137.51</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>664.47</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/AB</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5371.39</td>
<td>51.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Pretest and Posttest Means on Attitude toward Foreign Language Study for Subgroups in the Personalized Treatment.
Figure 2. Pretest and Posttest Means on Attitude toward Foreign Language Study for Subgroups in the Non-Personalized Treatment.
between pre- and posttest scores but examination of the subgroup means for both treatment groups reveals that in the personalized group, the means score on the posttest was lower in all classes except for the class of teacher 10. Results are very different in the non-personal group. The posttest means were higher than or equal to the pretest means for all classes except for the class of teacher 4. It is likely that these results are attributable to the teacher factor in that the teacher affected the students' attitudes toward foreign language study more than the main treatment effect. The teacher effect was not significant, however, for attitude toward literature study (Table 7).

Hypothesis II: There are no significant differences in the effectiveness of two teaching methods in developing positive attitudes towards Le Malentendu. The F-ratio for the treatment effect was not significant and therefore this hypothesis cannot be rejected. (See Table 9.) Examination of the treatment means in Table 8 shows that the groups were almost equal (Personal group=4.32; Non-personal group=4.39).

For subgroups or classrooms, the mean scores varied slightly. The highest mean score was 5.16 (non-personalized group) compared with a mean score of 3.9 (personal group), but the difference was not great enough to be significant.

Hypothesis III: There are no significant differences between the two experimental groups in student achievement on 1) tests of factual knowledge or 2) essay questions interpreting and analyzing Le Malentendu. Examination of treatment group means for the achievement test reveals that the personal group, with a mean of 2.35 outperformed
Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations for Measures on Attitude toward *Le Malentendu* by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor A (Treatments)</th>
<th>Factor B (Subgroups)</th>
<th>B Means</th>
<th>B Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ (personal)</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₇</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₁₀</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₃</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ (non-personal)</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₈</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₉</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A₁ mean: 4.32  
A₁ standard deviation: 1.21  
A₂ mean: 4.39  
A₂ standard deviation: 1.32  
Grand mean: 4.36
Table 9. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Attitude toward *Le Malentendu* by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B (Subgroups)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>31.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>36.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the non-personal group having a mean of 2.04 (Table 10). The difference is not, however, significant and the null hypothesis remains tenable (Table 11).

The teacher factor was significant at the .05 level, $F(8, 104)=2.08 \ (p < .05)$. This significant effect suggests that in this experiment the teachers rather than types of programs tended to have greater influence over achievement outcomes. The scores in the subgroups ranged from a mean of 1.6 in the non-personal group to 2.6 in the personal group.

Additional Research

The researcher desired further information on the effects of treatment on specific student attitudes. Questions were chosen from the questionnaire on attitude toward Le Malentendu. The questions chosen reflected the goals and foundations of the study. A two-factor nested ANOVA was performed on the mean group responses on the attitude toward Le Malentendu. Neither the treatment nor the teacher effect were found to be significant. (Most of the F-ratios were less than one.) The responses to the following questions were analyzed separately using ANOVA:

I saw little relationship between this play and my own life.

I found the reading of Le Malentendu to be a worthwhile part of my overall experience in French this quarter.

I feel that I have gained deeper appreciation of literature through reading Le Malentendu.

I feel that I was given adequate time to express my feelings on and evaluation of Le Malentendu.
Table 10. Means and Standard Deviations for Measures on Achievement (Quote Identification, True/false, and Essays) by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor A (Treatments)</th>
<th>Factor B (Subgroups)</th>
<th>B Means</th>
<th>B Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ (personal)</td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₇</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₁₀</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₃</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ (non-personal)</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₈</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₉</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A₁ mean: 2.35          A₂ mean: 2.04
A₁ standard deviation: .70 A₂ standard deviation: .50

Grand mean: 2.18
Table 11. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Achievement Measures by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/A (Subgroups)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34.76</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
I felt as though most discussion during class on *Le Malentendu* was directed to the experts in literature.

The researcher wished to determine whether the treatment affected performance on the two types of essay questions (personal and non-personal) asked of the students on the achievement test. It was found that there were no significant F-ratios (Tables 13 and 14). Neither the treatment nor the teacher effects influenced student performance on these essays. Examination of the means (Table 12) reveals that students in the personalized treatment group performed almost equally as well on the personalized essays as they did on the non-personalized ones. The same is true of students in the non-personalized treatment group.

In order to investigate the possible influence of literature read previously in French on scores of students, crossbreaks were performed. This was done in order to control for the teacher variable while studying whether previously reading French literature influences attitude scores. Examination of the crossbreaks showed that no student in the class of teacher 1 (personalized group) had read French literature previously. Of that class, 78.6% had a low score on attitude toward literature. On the questionnaire on attitude toward foreign language study, 64.3% had a low attitude score. It is interesting to note that this class had the highest mean score on the achievement test. In every other class at least 27.3% of the students had read literature in French before the study. Careful examination of the crossbreaks does not reveal any evidence that those having read literature in French have a more positive or more negative attitude toward foreign language study or toward literature study than those not having read French literature.
Table 12. Means and Standard Deviations on the Personalized and Non-personalized Essays of the Achievement Test by Group and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments Variable A</th>
<th>Subgroups Variable B</th>
<th>Personalized Essay</th>
<th>Non-personalized Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$sd$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$ (personal)</td>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_6$</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_7$</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_{10}$</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$ (non-personal)</td>
<td>$B_3$</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_4$</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_5$</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_8$</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_9$</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personalized Essays
$A_1$ mean: 4.48 $A_1$ $sd$: .67
$A_2$ mean: 4.26 $A_2$ $sd$: .70
Grand mean: 4.36

Non-personalized Essays
$A_1$ mean: 4.45 $A_1$ $sd$: .75
$A_2$ mean: 4.18 $A_2$ $sd$: .87
Grand mean: 4.30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/A (Subgroups)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>46.38</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Analysis of Variance of Scores on the Non-Personalized Essays of the Achievement Measure by Treatment and by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/A (Subgroups)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69.38</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>53.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in that language. This, then should not have been a confounding factor in the study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Overview

This study was designed to examine the effects of two methods of teaching on the achievement and attitudes of students in third-quarter college French. The effects of one independent variable were studied, i.e. personalized versus non-personalized teaching of literature. The methods-of-teaching variable had its theoretical bases in Response to Literature, a movement in English education, which maintains that if the students are made to feel that what they have to say about literature is important and that the experience they bring to the reading situation is relevant, then greater appreciation and understanding of literature will result.

Students participating in the eleven-day experiment were enrolled in third-quarter French at The Ohio State University. There were two treatment conditions. In each condition, Le Malentendu was taught with activities that had been prepared by the researcher. The two treatment conditions were:

1. **Personalized activities**: Question strategies that require the student to express an attitude toward some facet of a work of literature.

2. **Non-personalized activities**: Question strategies that require the student to apply facts or concepts and to
analyze reading materials, but not to express an attitude toward the work in question.

The study investigated the effects of the independent variable on student learning as measured by a three-part achievement test (quote identification, true/false, and essay questions). Student attitude was measured by a three-part attitude questionnaire (attitude toward foreign language study, toward literature study, and toward Le Malentendu). ANOVA was the tool for analysis.

**Summary of Findings**

No significant differences beyond the .05 level between the treatment groups were found with respect to any of the dependent variables considered. At the subgroup level (classes nested within treatment groups) there were significant differences in attitude toward foreign language study and in achievement which suggest that the teachers were a causative factor influencing student attitude. A summary of the findings of the experiment with respect to the four research questions follows.

**Question I:** Does personalizing literature affect student achievement?

The data from this study suggest that there were no differential learning effects attributable to the treatment variable. Failure to detect significant differences may be a function of extraneous factors. Such factors include the following:

1. **Criterion measures:** The achievement test was a typical
classroom examination, but criterion measures other than those used might have been more sensitive and more able to detect differences.

2. Teacher variable: The use of only ten teachers may have been a contributing factor. The variance attributable to teachers could have been minimized if it had been possible to have more teachers under each treatment condition or alternatively assign each teacher to instruct one class under each condition.

3. Limited treatment time: If the treatment time had been longer, the method may have had greater impact on learning and attitude.

Question II: Does personalizing literature affect student attitude toward foreign language study and toward literature study?

This was the most important of the research questions and the one having the strongest a priori hypothesis. The data from this study, however, suggest that there were no differential attitude changes attributable to the treatment. Any differences that exist seem to be a function of the following factors:

1. Teacher attitude: The teacher's attitude toward the class and toward his or her work may have been a confounding factor. Also the relationship that each teacher had with the class was established before the study and therefore difficult to change.
2. **Sample size**: An increase in the number of classes would have resulted in a more powerful statistic increasing the probability of detecting any differences.

3. **Effects of testing**: The pretest may have resulted in memory effects on the posttest.

**Question III**: Does personalizing literature affect student attitude toward the work of literature?

The methods resulted in no differential attitude effects toward the *Le Malentendu*. Both groups responded to the work with the same attitude. This factor was confounded by many of the same variables mentioned above: teacher attitude, short treatment phase, sample size, and criterion measures. More data on teacher implementation of the study could have been collected if the classes had been visited more frequently. The teacher's voice, delivery, and interpersonal relationships with the students, however, are factors that cannot be controlled.

**Question IV**: Is it feasible to personalize questions about literature in the intermediate college classroom?

Using personalized material, as defined by the researcher, does not pose any special problems as far as instructional planning is concerned. Students were invited to comment on the way *Le Malentendu* had been taught in their classes. Many students did not respond, but it is interesting to inspect how those who did respond viewed the instruction and how they reacted to the play. Students in the personal treatment group said:
No complaints. It was interesting.

I feel Le Malentendu was a little too hard for this level. Continuity is lost when every phrase and word must be looked up.

I thought that the way of teaching Le Malentendu was fine and the handouts were very helpful. I enjoyed the play very much.

Much of the discussion was repetitious. The same ideas were discussed over and over.

I was extremely disappointed. The philosophy of existentialism should have been brought out.

Maybe you could study French newspapers and magazines, since I think more people could relate to some current events, human interest, and modern French life.

I believe literature should be saved for a section of French 104.

I think it was handled poorly. There was too much emphasis on plot and not on other aspects of the play, but I think it had to be handled this way. I honestly don't think that the majority of people were ready for the transition between the structuredness of the grammar text and the play.

The responses of students in the non-personal treatment group follow:

I think more of the underlying irony could be discussed.

Hated Le Malentendu with a passion.

I think Le Malentendu would have been more worthwhile if the discussion of the characters and plot had been in English.

I enjoyed the play and discussion immensely.

I'm sure no one got any great "insight into life" from Camus. He caused no revelations with me.

I would enjoy reading and discussing plays a lot more if I weren't tested on them.

I think Le Malentendu was too philosophical for this course. Why didn't we read an adventure story or something with not such deep meaning like that of Camus?
Throw out the play. Why read a pitiful edition of some French master instead of a series of stories that progressively challenges our grammar?

I would enjoy more literary insights into hidden meaning, symbolism, importance in history, etc.

Most frustration from reading Le Malentendu was related to inability to understand the play. The researcher found that most students who responded had negative replies and that these came from the students of specific teachers.

Because there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups, the researcher can only propose that personal questions be used at the same time as other questions to add variety to literature classes. It is believed, however, that personalized questions are important in developing student pride in their interpretations and evaluations of literature because they will feel that what they have to say about literature is important. These questions will lead to an exploration of the potential relationship between language study, literature, and the student.

Limitations of the Study

The reader is reminded of the following limitations of the study:

1. **Sample of students:** Findings can be generalized only to third-quarter French students with characteristics similar to those in this study.

2. **Instruments:** As in any study, a limiting factor is the extent to which instruments used to evaluate student learning and attitude are valid and reliable.

3. **Treatment interaction effects:** Most comparisons of two or
more curricula have resulted in no significant difference. Good, Biddle, and Brophy (1975) note that these negative hypotheses do not prove as established fact that there was no difference. Hence, there were probably some changes brought about by the treatment in this study, but these main effects were cancelled out by other variables such as student aptitude and personality (Cronbach and Snow, 1969).

Discussion of Teacher Effects

Because there was a significant teacher effect in the experiment, a discussion seems appropriate. Educational researchers are increasingly recognizing that teacher characteristics and styles affect learning and attitude of pupils (Cronbach and Snow, 1969). It is impossible to gage the magnitude of these effects but a review of the literature suggests its existence. It is clear that the effects depend upon the complex relationship between the teacher and the students as well as the context and circumstances of the class. No teacher behavior has been shown to have the same effects on all learners in all situations (Good, Biddle, and Brophy, 1975).

It has been found that teachers, especially at the college level, differ from one another in their relative effectiveness. Because the learners themselves have become more unique in interests, personality, and learning styles, the definition of effective teaching becomes a value judgment. The affective reaction to the teacher takes precedence over learning gains as the criterion for judgment (Good, Biddle, and Brophy, 1975). The complexity of student reaction to the teacher was surely a contributing factor in the present study and one which affected
the results in ways which cannot be discerned. The teacher effect was significant at the .05 level for achievement and at the .10 and the .01 level for attitude toward foreign language study. In the complexity of the interaction between the student and the teacher, the importance of the teacher is reaffirmed because it has been shown that the teacher does make a difference in the affective and cognitive domains.

Relation to Other Studies

As has been stated, this study was based on work done by Squire (1964) and Purves (1973) in English education. While precise comparisons are inappropriate because of differences among the studies with respect to conceptualization and instrumentation, some remarks are in order.

The researcher applied the categories of response used by Beach and Mertz (1975) to one treatment group and the work of Bloom (1956), Gall (1975), and Corbin (1972) to the other group. By manipulating what happened in the classes, the researcher hoped to discover whether student attitude and achievement would be affected. She also wanted to determine whether students in a personalized class would respond to essay questions differently than those in a more traditional class.

The results of this study do not support Purves (1973) and Petrosky's (1975) contention that student response to literature is learned and determined in part by the stimulus. Wilson (1962) has also investigated this question and reported an increase in "interpretational judgment" among students after studying novels in Freshman English using class discussion. Perhaps the researcher could have coded the essay responses differently to investigate the treatment effects. Wilson, for
example, used the following categories originally established by Squire (1964): literary, interpretational, narrational, associational, self-involvement, and prescriptive judgment. In general, findings in English education on response to literature indicate that students respond to literature in learned ways and that they will respond with mature perception if taught to do so.

In an experiment with goals similar to those of the present study, the effects of a humanistic approach to physics were investigated (Welch and Walberg, 1972). A group of 46 teachers taught physics using a variety of media and emphasized the relevance of the subject to the students' lives by teaching the aspects which interested them most, i.e. laboratory experiments, historical readings, or rigorous mathematics. After one year, there were no significant differences in the cognitive criteria between the humanistic group and the control group. Those in the experimental approach perceived their classes as being more diverse and egalitarian. They found their textbook to be more enjoyable and physics to be less difficult. Students in the present study did not perceive any differences in their classes or display any attitude changes.

Recommendations for Further Research

It is believed that the lack of significant main effects is largely a function of a) the fact that there is no difference between the two treatments, b) the teacher factor, and c) the length of the treatment phase. Specifically, it is recommended that the study be implemented over an extended period of time. In addition, it is suggested that the
relationship between personalizing literature and student attitude be investigated in a setting more closely supervised in order to control for confounding variables. Also, a situation which allowed more teachers to participate would have made the statistic more powerful and would have enhanced the chances of finding significant differences. It seems important to consider criterion measures which analyze the types of responses that students give to essays and the elements of their responses. Case studies which investigate the responses of different personality types might also be of value.

Many authors in foreign language education have stressed the importance of an affective encounter with the literature text without testing their claims (Dietz, 1972; Tilles, 1972; Leal, 1972; Aspinwall, 1970; O'Neill, 1968; Galyean, 1976). It is therefore recommended that the relationship between affective education and student achievement in the cognitive and affective domains be studied.
APPENDIX A

Birckbichler and Muyskens

Materials
"A Personalized Approach to Teaching Literature
at the Elementary and Intermediate Levels of
High School and College Instruction"

Diane W. Birkbihler, The Ohio State University
Judith Muykens, VPI & SU

I. Introduction

II. Definition of personalization of literature:
"In the personal approach, every question is centered on
the student's personal encounter with the text and the
criteria for the judgment of a work is internally imposed.
Student reaction to characters, events, ideas and style
is actively sought through questions eliciting student
feelings, experiences, imagination, interests, values,
opinions and attitudes. Each question or activity must,
by definition, contain or imply "you" (the student) and
the student's response will be his/her own feelings about,
interpretation of, or evaluation of a work."

III. Discussion of classroom activities and question types

Copyright 1976—Diane W. Birkbihler
Judith Muykens
ENGERAGEMENT/INVOLVEMENT

Students express personal feelings about the work, characters, events, or ideas. They try to identify relationships between the work and their lives.

RANKING
1. Rank the characters in the work in order of preference according to whom you would like to have as a friend/son/daughter/next-door neighbor/teacher of your language class/roommate.
2. On a scale of 1 to 5, indicate whether the character makes you feel happy/sad/indifferent/angry/hostile. Rank several characters and compare your reactions.
3. What do you like about the work? Rank the following according to your personal preferences: style/characters/plot/ideas/setting?
4. Which of the characters did/do you like? Rank them according to preference.

AGREE/DISAGREE
1. If I were in ...'s situation, I would have acted the same way.
2. If I were stranded on a desert island, I would want ... with me.
3. I know someone like ....
4. I find ...'s philosophy applicable to my life.
5. I have never felt like ... did.
6. ... reminded me of an experience in my childhood.
7. I would want to have someone like ... as a friend.

INTERPRETATION

Students identify motives, find evidence to support generalizations, solve problems, and make predictions. They both synthesize and analyze information in order to infer the meaning of a character's behavior, the language, and the overall meaning of the work.

1. Which of the characters is most/least dedicated to a cause? (jealous, ambitious, honest, etc.) Rank the characters according to how much you feel they possess this quality.
2. Rank the following adjectives according to how well you feel they describe a character:
   - Rank the list on the following list according to how important you think each is for a character: friendship/love/money/security/family.
3. Would the character have a clear idea of his/her values/character on an extram/desire to live in a city/value friendship?

EVALUATION

Students make statements judging the quality, worth, composition, meaningfulness, plausibility, and significance of parts or all of the work. They make judgments about the value of ideas, characters, language, and overall meaning of the work. The criteria by which students make judgments may be either those determined by the students or those which are given to them.

1. Based on the continuos below, how would you (your parents? Liberals? Conservatives?) evaluate the play?
2. If you had several hours of free time, what would you do? Play tennis/read another work by the same author/see a movie.
3. Who would benefit most from reading this work? Friends/parents/teachers?

1. If I could go to see a play, ... is one of the plays that I would like to see.
2. Critics are right in judging the work one of the best of the century.
3. The characters are lifelike.
4. A better ending would have been ...
5. The life of ... can serve as a model for everyone.
6. ... is a good title for the work.
7. The author works out a clear plot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If I were in ...'s situation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I admire ... because....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I prefer ... because....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I like the way ... writes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would like to eat the part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of ... because....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The words of ... make me feel...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What sentence do you remember from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passage for today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What was your reaction to ...'s state-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment? If you had been the other character,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what would you have said?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Did the character remind you of anyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which character do you admire the most/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Which character would you want for a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roommate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If you had to be one of the characters,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who would you be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Which character do you prefer?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE PLAYING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If you were to find yourself in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same situation as a character, what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be your reaction? How would you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel? What would you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If you were to cast one of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characters, what would you like to say?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. The most honest/happiest/nicest character is ... because.... |
| 2. The most tragic/dramatic/happiest character was ... because.... |
| 3. The main weakness of ... was.... |
| 4. The language and style represent... |

| 1. What would be the attitude of ...  |
| toward love? honestly? Family? Money?  |
| happiness?  |
| 2. What if...?  |
| a. text related  |
| b. beyond the text  |
| 3. Which actors and actresses would you  |
| choose to perform in this play?  |

| 1. Take the role of a character and  |
| the instructor asks you questions.  |
| 2. Take the role of a different  |
| character and ask other students  |
| questions.  |
| 3. Act out a scene.  |
| 4. Questionnaire Proust. Interview  |
| the character.  |
| 5. Retell the story--  |
| a. from the point of view of another  |
| character  |
| b. as a journalist, reporter,  |
| neighbor.  |

| 1. I would pay $... to see the  |
| play because....  |
| 2. ...'s style is effective  |
| because....  |
| 3. The author kept me interested  |
| because....  |
| 4. The work was not important to  |
| my life because....  |

| 1. Would you like to see the play?  |
| 2. Was the ending effective? plausible?  |
| 3. Would you change the ending? How?  |
| 4. Did the events seem plausible?  |

| 1. You are one of the characters and you  |
| speak or write to the author evaluating  |
| his/her creation and characterization of  |
| you.  |
| 2. You are representing a magazine with a  |
| different point of view and you have just  |
| seen a play. In a round table discussion,  |
| evaluate the work, characters, ideas, style,  |
| and appeal to your audience.  |
| 3. You are a literary critic. Give your  |
| evaluation of the play.  |
APPENDIX B

Lesson Plans
Day 1—Personalized Approach—Introduction 1-10 and 11-13

I. Questionnaire

II. Le Malentendu—Background

1. Qui a écrit Le Malentendu?
2. Quelles autres œuvres de Camus avez-vous lues? en anglais ou en français?
3. Où est-il né?
4. Etait-il d'une famille riche ou pauvre?
5. Est-il vivant? Comment est-il mort?
6. Comment s'appelle la philosophie de Camus? (l'absurde)
7. Qu'est-ce que c'est que l'absurde?
   One explanation follows:
   Ce n'est pas le monde qui est absurde. Ce n'est pas l'homme non plus qui est absurde. L'absurdité, c'est que l'homme est dans ce monde inexplicable. L'homme va mourir et il ne va pas comprendre pourquoi il est au monde. Il ne faut pas se désesperer. L'homme doit faire tout son possible pour atteindre le meilleur des mondes. La citation de Pindar peut nous aider à comprendre: O my soul, strive not for immortal life, but exhaust the fullness of the possible.

III. Discussion of the meaning of a malentendu.

1. Qu'est-ce qu'un malentendu?
2. Donnez des situations dans votre vie où il y a eu un malentendu. (See handout.)
3. Qu'est-ce qu'on peut faire pour éviter des malentendus? (See handout.)

IV. General questions on the text.

1. Où est située la pièce?
2. Quels sont les personnages?
3. Qui est venu à l'auberge?

V. Questions on pages 11-13. (The students are the mother. They respond with je....)

1. Quelle heure est-il? (midi)
2. Est-ce que la salle de l'auberge est propre? (oui)
3. Qui est venu à l'auberge? (un voyageur)
4. Est-il riche? (Il ne s'est pas inquiété du prix.)
5. Comment allez-vous aujourd'hui? (Je suis fatiguée.)
6. Que voudriez-vous faire? (me reposer)
7. A quoi pensez-vous quand vous cherchez la paix et la tranquillité? (la religion)
8. Que pense votre fille de la religion? (Elle ne l'aime pas.)
9. Votre fille et vous, avez-vous commis des folies? (oui)

VI. Sujets de discussion. Students complete the sentences using the adjectives on the handout.
1. En lisant les mots de Martha, je me sens ... parce que ....
2. En lisant les mots de la mère, je me sens ... parce que....
3. En pensant à ces trois premières pages, je me sens ... parce que ....

VII. Idioms. Choose the most important ones from the list you have been given.

VIII. Reading aloud. (Pages 11-13)
Il y a eu un malentendu entre moi et ... 

un professeur qui m'a donné une mauvaise note.
mes parents qui ne voulaient pas me donner de l'argent.
mon/ma petit(e) ami(e) qui ne voulait pas faire la même chose que moi.
ma femme/ mon mari qui ne voulait pas faire la vaisselle.
mon/ma voisin(e) qui faisait trop de bruit.
mon/ma camarade de chambre qui voulait écouter les disques que je n'aimais pas.
mon frère/ ma soeur qui voulait m'emprunter (borrow) quelque chose.

Si on veut éviter des malentendus, il faut....

Adjectifs pour exprimer vos réactions

content(e)  
indifférent(e)  
triste  
fâché(e)  
apathique  
hostile  

naïf-naïve  
stupide  
joyeux-euse  
crasintif-ive  
optimiste  
pessimiste  

?
Day 2—Personalized Approach—pages 14-20

I. A. Questions on pages 14-20. Today the students are Martha.
   1. Souriez-vous souvent?
   2. Quand souriez-vous? Pourquoi?
   3. Comment est votre visage selon la mère? Etes-vous d'accord?
   4. Où voulez-vous aller quand vous aurez amassé beaucoup d'argent?
   5. Avez-vous l'intention de tuer ce voyageur?
   6. A quel étage allez-vous mettre ce voyageur?
   7. Pourquoi?

   B. Qui a dit? (Have the students identify the quote then continue with the other questions.)
   1. "C'est que je souris dans ma chambre aux heures où je suis seule." (Martha)
      Complétez la phrase: Moi, je souris quand ....
   2. "Tuer est terriblement fatigant." (la mère)
      Complétez la phrase: Moi, je me fatigue quand ....
   3. "Mais il faut beaucoup d'argent pour vivre libre devant la mer." (Martha)
      Complétez la phrase: Moi, je veux vivre libre .... Où?
      Connaissez-vous d'autres gens qui voudraient vivre libres devant la mer comme Martha? Qui?
   4. "Il est plus facile de tuer ce qu'on ne connaît pas." (la mère)
      (Have the students complete the following sentence looking at the handout in small groups. Ask them to choose the three adjectives that describe the mother best and then rank these adjectives. You may follow with whole group discussion to see if all groups agree.)
      A mon avis, les citations de la mère prouvent qu'elle est ....

II. Idioms.

III. Reading. pages 14-15

IV. Composition au tableau. Comparez le paysage de vos rêves à celui de Martha.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>fatiguée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duro</td>
<td>modeste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sincère</td>
<td>analytique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sympathique</td>
<td>dynamique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bizarre</td>
<td>réservée</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solitaire</td>
<td>indépendante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>douce</td>
<td>émotive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hypocrite</td>
<td>pensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>énergique</td>
<td>généreuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timide</td>
<td>consciencieuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimiste</td>
<td>impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affectueuse</td>
<td>snob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agressive</td>
<td>pessimiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brutale</td>
<td>irresistible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idéaliste</td>
<td>réaliste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gentille</td>
<td>mélancholique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humaine</td>
<td>inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentimental</td>
<td>autoritaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 3—Personalized Approach—pages 20-27

I. Assign composition topic. (Écrivez une biographie de Jan. Employez le comme si vous étiez Jan.)

II. Chanson. Ne me quitte pas.

III. A. Board composition and work on pages 20-27.

Women students write the following composition at the board: Vous êtes Maria. Expliquez à Jan pourquoi vous ne voulez pas le quitter. Dites-lui ce qu'il devrait dire à sa mère et à sa soeur.

While this is being done discuss the following with the men students. They will answer as though they are Jan.

1. Aimez-vous votre femme? Pourquoi la quittez-vous?
2. Il y a combien d'années que vous avez quitté l'auberge?
3. Décrits votre mère maintenant.
4. Votre père, est-il vivant?
5. Pourquoi êtes-vous venu à l'auberge?
6. Votre femme aime-t-elle ce pays?
7. Vous avez poussé votre femme derrière la porte. Pourquoi?
8. Depuis quand êtes-vous mariés?

While the women students are still at the board, have them read key lines from their compositions. Now the men students will write a response to Maria. Directions: Vous êtes Jan. Expliquez à Maria pourquoi vous êtes obligé de rester à l'auberge.

Questions for the women students while the men are writing: (They are Maria.)

1. Pourquoi avez-vous suivi votre mari?
2. Quand votre mari a-t-il quitté l'auberge?
3. Comment va sa mère maintenant?
4. Selon vous une mère reconnaît-elle toujours son fils?
5. Êtes-vous contente d'avoir quitté votre pays?
6. Aimez-vous votre mari?
7. Que voulez-vous que votre mari dise à sa mère et à sa soeur?

Men students read from their compositions.
Day 3—Personalized—Continued

B. Sujets de discussion. Complétez les phrases suivantes.

1. Si j'étais à la place de Jan, je ....
2. Si j'étais à la place de Maria, je ....
3. En ce qui concerne le conflit entre Jan et Maria, je suis d'accord avec... parce que ....
4. Le personnage le plus honnête est ... parce que ....
5. Le personnage le plus sympathique est ... parce que ....

(heureux, fatigué)

IV. Idioms.

V. Read pages 20-21 aloud.
Day 4—Personalized Approach—pages 28-42

I. Idioms.

II. Reading of pages 32-35.

III. A. Hand out the fiche de voyageur. The students fill out the fiche as though they are Jan. Directions: Vous êtes Jan. Répondez à ces questions et remplissez la fiche pour lui.

1. Comment vous appelez-vous?
2. Quel âge avez-vous?
3. Où êtes-vous né?
4. Quelle est votre profession?
5. Etes-vous riche?
6. Quel est votre domicile habituel?
7. Quelle est votre nationalité?
8. D'où venez-vous?
9. Où habitez-vous en Afrique?
10. Avez-vous une pièce d'identité?
11. Pourquoi n'avez-vous rien dit quand Martha n'a pas lu le passeport?
12. Comment trouvez-vous le domestique?
13. Avez-vous de la famille?
14. Etes-vous marié?
15. De quoi ne pouvez-vous pas parler avec Martha?
16. De quoi pouvez-vous parler avec Martha?
17. Pourquoi Maria n'est-elle pas contente?
18. Qu'est-ce que Maria vous conseille de faire?

B. Discussion questions.

1. À la page 28, ligne 55, Maria dit: "Non, les hommes ne savent jamais comment il faut aimer. Rien ne les contente. Tout ce qu'ils savent, c'est rêver, imaginer de nouveaux devoirs, chercher de nouveaux pays et de nouvelles demeures."

Etes-vous d'accord? Expliquez.

Elle continue:"Tandis que nous, nous savons qu'il faut se dépêcher d'aimer, partager le même lit, se donner la main, craindre l'autrui."

Etes-vous d'accord? Croyez-vous que les femmes s'intéressent plus aux sujets sentimentaux?
2. A la page 37, ligne 75, Martha demande: "Avez-vous de la famille?"
Regardez ce que Jan dit. Qu'est-ce que vous auriez dit à sa place?

3. Quel a été le malentendu aujourd'hui? Si le vieux domestique n'était pas entré, qu'est-ce qui serait arrivé?
Imaginez que vous êtes Camus, quelles autres techniques ou événements auriez-vous employés pour empêcher Martha de lire le passeport?

4. Martha a dit que Jan n'a que "les droits d'un client" et qu'il doit tenir le langage d'un client (p. 40, ligne 132). Faites une liste des choses dont Jan peut parler et puis une liste de sujets interdits. Faites une liste aussi de sujets que vous discuteriez facilement avec quelqu'un que vous ne connaissez pas et une liste de choses que vous ne discuteriez pas. Comparez cette liste à celle de Martha.

Jan a-t-il raison de vouloir poser des questions personnelles à Martha? Croyez-vous que ses questions soient trop personnelles?

V. Remplir la fiche de voyageur. (Have students fill out the fiches de voyageur in groups of two.)
FICHE DE VOYAGEUR

Ch. N

NOM: .................................................. (écrire en majuscules)
Name in capital letters
Name (In Druckschrift)

Nom de jeune fille: ........................................
Maiden name
Mädchen Name

Prénoms: ............................................................
Christian names
Vorname

Né le: ......................................................, à ..............
Date and place of birth
Geburtsdatum - Geburtsort

Département: ..................................................
Country - Für Ausländer Angabe des Geburtslandes
(ou pays pour l'étranger)

Profession: ......................................................
Occupation
Beruf

Domicile habituel: ...........................................
Permanent address
Gewöhnlicher Wohnort

NATIONALITÉ
Nationality
Nationalität
T.S.V.P.

(Please turn over - Bitte wenden)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Nombre d'enfants de moins de 15 ans</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accompagnant le chef de famille:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zahl der Kinder unter 15 Jahren die den Familienvorstand begleiten</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIECE D' IDENTITE PRODUITE**

**Nature:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pour les étrangers seulement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(For aliens only) - (Nur für Ausländer)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CARTE D'IDENTITE OU PASSEPORT</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CERTIFICATE of IDENTITY or PASSPORT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(cross out word not available)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUSWEIS - PASS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>N°</strong></th>
<th><strong>par</strong></th>
<th><strong>by</strong></th>
<th><strong>in</strong></th>
<th><strong>durch</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date d'entrée en France</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date of arrival in France</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Datum der Einreise in Frankreich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Signature</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unterschrift</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 5—Personalized Approach—pages 43-54

I. Short discussion in English (5-7 minutes).

II. Reading of pages 42-45.

III. A. Questions (vrai/faux) on the text. (See handout. Give the students time to answer true or false for each question. Then ask them to choose three sentences that they think are important to the work and read them for everyone. Quickly go over the remaining ones to make sure the students have answered them correctly.)

B. Discussion.

1. Regardez la description de Jan que Martha donne à la page 52, lignes 17-21. Étes-vous d'accord avec elle? Cherchez trois adjectifs qui, à votre avis, décrivent Jan. Dites pourquoi vous les avez choisis. (See handout.)

2. À votre avis, quels sont les défauts de caractère de Jan? Quelles sont ses forces? Connaissez-vous quelqu'un qui se ressemble à Jan? (Ideas for answers: Il est trop idéaliste. Il ne dit pas la vérité. Il accepte la fatalité et le hasard. Il ne lutte pas.) À votre avis, quels sont les défauts de caractère de Martha? Quelles sont ses forces? Connaissez-vous quelqu'un qui se ressemble à Martha?

3. Regardez le passage à la page 49, lignes 105-08. ("Laissez, mon fils, je ne suis pas infirme. Voyez ces mains qui sont encore fortes. Elles pourraient maintenir les jambes d'un homme.") Si vous aviez été Jan, qu'est-ce que vous auriez dit? Comment auriez-vous réagi?

4. À votre avis, quel est le bonheur de Jan? de Maria? de la mère? de Martha? Lequel vous semble le plus important? Pourquoi? (This can be done in small groups.)

IV. Idioms.

V. Cartes de Conversation.
Day 5-Personalized Approach

Répondez vrai ou faux aux phrases suivantes. Choisissez les 3 phrases que vous considérez les plus importantes et lisez-les pour la classe. Dites pourquoi vous avez choisi ces phrases.

1. Martha n'a pas rempli la fiche de voyageur.
2. Jan dit qu'il est venu à l'auberge pour des raisons de tourisme.
3. Jan a voulu revoir la région qu'il a connue autrefois.
4. Le village où est située l'auberge est bien petit.
5. Tous les voyageurs restent longtemps à l'auberge.
6. Jan ne sait pas combien de temps il va rester à l'auberge.
7. La mère a appelé Jan "mon fils" parce qu'elle l'a reconnu.
8. La mère est d'accord avec Jan qu'elle a besoin de l'aide d'un homme.
9. Martha reçoit tous les voyageurs avec une indifférence bienveillante.
10. Jan ne pourrait pas payer d'avance.
11. Martha a failli demander à Jan de partir.
12. La mère aurait préféré que Jan parte.
14. La mère veut tuer ce voyageur tout de suite.

Choisissez 3 adjectifs qui décrivent Jan. Expliquez pourquoi vous les avez choisis.

sensible intelligent logique
sympathique généreux illogique
naïf méticuleux idéaliste
égoïste (selfish) impulsif réaliste
sincère pensif optimiste
extroverti perceptive pessimiste
précis loyal calme
agressif honnête nerveux
patient hypocrite
impatient ambitieux
timide
Day 6—Personalized Approach—pages 55-59

I. Quiz (25 minutes).

II. Announcement about composition topics for Monday. Students choose one topic from the following:

2. Expliquez pourquoi Jan a décidé de quitter l'auberge? Qu'est-ce que vous auriez fait à sa place?
3. Choisissez deux malentendus. Expliquez-les et dites ce que vous auriez fait pour éviter ces malentendus si vous aviez été un personnage de la pièce.

III. Questions on the reading for today. The students are Jan.

1. A qui pensez-vous?
2. Comment vous sentez-vous?
3. Qui entre?
4. Que veut-elle faire?
5. Comment trouvez-vous la chambre?
6. Y a-t-il de l'eau courante?
7. Y a-t-il une ampoule électrique au-dessus du lit?
8. Voulez-vous dessiner la chambre pour nous? (Sometimes there will be an artist in the class who can do this.)
9. Comment trouvez-vous Martha?
10. Martha dit-elle qu'elle a hésité à vous recevoir?
11. Quelle raison donne-t-elle?
12. Combien de jours voulez-vous rester?
13. Que cherchez-vous?

IV. General discussion questions.

1. A la page 55, lignes 1-5, Jan pense à Maria. Il pose la question: "Quo fait-elle, que pense-t-elle dans sa chambre?" A votre avis, que fait-elle? A quoi pense-t-elle à votre avis?
2. Imaginez l'entrée de Jan dans l'hôtel. Comment a-t-il demandé la chambre? Qu'est-ce qu'il a dit? (In small groups, have the students role play Jan and the mother. If you have the time, you may want a few students to
act out what they would have done upon entering the hotel if they had been Jan.

ascenseur? prix?

V. Idioms.
Day 7—Personalized Approach—pages 60-69

I. Hand back quizzes.

II. Collect compositions.

III. Idioms.

IV. Reading of pages 60-61.

V. A. Oral résumée. (Write the following on the board to act as cues for the students. Ask first the question: De quelles phrases de la leçon vous souvenez-vous?)

le pays de Jan
plages/mer/ fleurs/saisons
l'Europe selon Martha
laisser les conventions--langage humain
écraser tout sur son passage
Martha /changer d'avis
réveiller les désirs qui s'endormaient
désirs moins forts de la mère
la chambre d'hôtel selon Jan
envie de partir
sonner
le vieux domestique
le chê
Jan/trouver les mots

B. General questions.


   a. A mon avis, les personnages dans l'auberge sont des portraits vivants.

   b. A mon avis, Jan a raison de trouver l'auberge et le langage de Martha étranges.

   c. A mon avis, Maria est le personnage le plus raisonnable.

   d. La vie de Martha peut servir de modèle à mes amis.

   e. La mise-en-scène me rend mal à l'aise.

2. En groupes de trois personnes, discutez la cause de chaque personnage. Classez les personnages qui ont le plus de dévotion à une cause. (Have the students decide in groups of three what is each character's cause. Following that, have them rank the characters according to their dedication to their cause. Ask the groups to defend their choices.)
I. Discussion in English for five minutes. Remind students about the quiz.

II. Idioms.

III. A. Questions on the text. (See handout. You will find indirect questions on the handout. Ask the students to choose two questions they think are the most important to the play today. They are to pose these to others in the class.)

B. Qui a dit?

1. "Je viens de prendre une décision, je partirai après le dîner." (Jan)
2. "Je l'envie de dormir et de devoir mourir bientôt." (la mère)
3. "Si j'avais su qu'il voulait partir, j'aurais agi de même." (Martha)
4. "J'ai l'impression que cette maison n'est pas la mienne." (Jan)
5. "Il m'a parlé du pays dont je rêvais." (Martha)

C. Discussion questions.

1. A la page 76, lignes 4-7, la mère hésite beaucoup à tuer Jan. A votre avis, pourquoi hésite-t-elle? Quand vous hésitez à faire quelque chose, quelle est votre réaction?

2. Quel a été le malentendu (page 77, lignes 20-24)? Pourquoi le vieux domestique n'a-t-il rien dit? Imaginez encore une fois que vous êtes Camus. Quelles autres techniques auriez-vous employées?

3. Regardez la page 78, ligne 38. Qu'est-ce que Jan essaie de dire? Si vous aviez été la mère, qu'est-ce que vous auriez dit?

4. Quelle serait l'attitude de Martha (la mère, Jan ou Maria) envers l'amour, l'honnêteté, la famille, l'argent, le bonheur? (This can be done in small groups or whole class.)

5. Checklist on handout. Have the students in small groups or individually check all that they think apply. Then have them explain their reasons and see if other students agree.
Choisissez la question que vous considérez la plus importante et posez-la à quelqu'un.

1. si Jan a bu le thé.
2. si Jan avait commandé le thé.
3. si Jan veut partir le soir.
4. si Jan était à son aise.
5. pourquoi Jan commence à se sentir fatigué.
6. qui entre après que Jan dort.
7. ce que Martha trouve dans la poche de Jan.
8. ce que Martha prend du portefeuille
9. ce qui glisse derrière le lit.
10. qui ramasse le passeport.
11. où elles vont prendre le corps de Jan.
12. si Jan est mort.
13. si Martha savait que Jan voulait partir.
14. si Martha aurait tué Jan si elle avait su qu'il voulait partir.
15. pourquoi la mère était montée voir Jan.

CHECKLIST—Check all that apply in your opinion.

1. Je crois que Martha....
   _______ voudrait habiter une grande ville
   _______ trouve que l'amitié est importante
   _______ se comprend bien
   _______ tricherait (cheat) à un examen

2. Je crois que Jan....
   _______ donnerait de l'argent aux pauvres
   _______ a beaucoup d'amis
   _______ déteste l'hypocrisie
   _______ se comprend

3. Je crois que Maria....
   _______ va à l'église
   _______ aime être indépendante
   _______ préfère passer le samedi soir chez elle
   _______ travaille pendant la journée
Day 9—Personalized Approach—pages 81-90

I. Quiz (25 minutes).

II. A. Questions on the text.

Mettez-vous à la place de la mère. Répondez je....

1. Comment vous sentez-vous ce matin?
2. Pourquoi votre fille a-t-elle l'air si heureux ce matin?
3. Qui a apporté le passeport à Martha?
4. Pourquoi ne voulez-vous pas le lire?
5. Quel nom avez-vous trouvé sur le passeport?
6. Où est votre fils maintenant?
7. Qu'est-ce que vous avez l'intention de faire?
8. Pourquoi allez-vous le rejoindre?
9. Pourquoi votre fille est-elle jalouse de votre fils?
10. Pourquoi n'avez-vous pas reconnu votre fils?
11. Que pense votre fille de votre amour pour Jan?
12. Votre fille regrette-t-elle d'avoir tué son frère?
13. Pourquoi voulait-elle quitter ce village?

B. General questions.

1. Classez les personnages par ordre de préférence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>comme ami(e)</th>
<th>voisin(e)</th>
<th>professeur de français</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la mère</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le vieux domestique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Students will rank the characters according to whom they would prefer as friend, neighbor, or French professor. You can put this on the board while they are taking their quiz and then have them do the exercise individually or in groups and discuss their choices.)

2. La mère dit à la page 85, lignes 82-84, que l'amour d'une mère pour sa fille est moins fort que l'amour pour un fils. Étes-vous d'accord avec la mère.
3. On voit aux pages 85-89 que Martha est jalouse de son frère. A votre avis, a-t-elle raison d'être jalouse? (You may want the students to form small groups quickly to find the references to jealousy made by the sister and let them discuss the jealousy of Martha. References: p. 85, line 86; p. 86, lines 92-93; p. 87, lines 128-33; p. 88, lines 141-57.)

4. Regardez ce que la mère dit de ce monde irraisonnable (p. 87, lignes 119-22).
"Je sais aussi que cette souffrance non plus n'a pas de raison. Mais ce monde lui-même n'est pas raisonnable...."

Etes-vous d'accord avec la mère? Cette phrase peut-elle s'appliquer à votre vie?

III. Idioms.
Day 10—Personalized Approach—pages 91-95

I. Hand back quizzes.

II. Reading of pages 92-95.

III. A. Discussion of the text. (Ask the first three questions as though they were Martha. Then using the handout, play the role of Martha in small groups or before the whole class.)

1. Votre mère vous a-t-elle rejetée?
2. Etes-vous aimée?
3. Pourquoi détestez-vous votre frère?

Vous entendez quelqu'un à la porte. Vous dites:

Vous: (Qui est là?)
Maria: Une voyagoule.
Vous: (On ne reçoit plus de clients.)
Maria: Je viens rejoindre mon mari.
Vous: (Qui est votre mari?)
Maria: Il est arrivé hier et devait me rejoindre ce matin.
Vous: (Il a dit que sa femme était à l'étranger. Il n'est plus ici.)
Maria: Il n'a pas pu partir sans moi. Je ne vous comprends pas. Vous a-t-il quittées définitivement ou a-t-il dit qu'il reviendrait?
Vous: (Il nous a quittées définitivement.)
Maria: L'homme qui est arrivé chez vous était votre frère.
Vous: (Je le sais déjà.)
Maria: Qu'est-ce qui s'est passé? Pourquoi n'est-il pas dans cette maison? N'avez-vous pas été heureuses de le revoir?
Vous: (Il est mort.)
Maria: Vous plaisantez.

B. General Questions. These are on a handout so that the students can work in small groups and choose which ones they want to do.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maria</th>
<th>la mère</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>le vieux domestique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Imaginez que vous êtes à une surprise-party et que Martha est là. Qu'est-ce que vous lui diriez? Et si Jan était là, que lui diriez-vous?

3. Imaginez qu'un agent de police est venu à l'auberge au lieu de Maria. Il est soupçonneux. (Role play the conversation between l'agent et Martha.)

4. Racontez l'histoire du Malentendu du point de vue du vieux domestique ou du point de vue d'un voisin. (Students can write a composition if they wish.)

5. De quelle façon Jan espérait-il se faire reconnaître par sa mère et sa soeur? Expliquez ce que vous auriez fait à la place de J-

6. La mère préfère-t-elle sa fille ou son fils? Pourquoi se suicide-t-elle? Est-elle raisonnable?

7. Pourquoi est-ce que Martha et la mère tuent les voyageurs? En quoi leurs raisons sont-elles différentes? Leurs raisons sont-elles suffisantes à votre avis?

8. Qui est le personnage le plus égoïste de la pièce à votre avis? Pourquoi?

9. Martha ne semble pas regretter la mort de son frère. Expliquez pourquoi elle aurait agi de la même façon si elle avait su que Jan était son frère. À votre avis, quelle sorte de femme est-ce? Trouvez des adjectifs pour la décrire.

10. La mère et Martha ne voulaient pas connaître les voyageurs qu'elles allaient tuer. Pourquoi vaut-il mieux avoir seulement des relations superficielles dans des situations semblables? Dans votre propre vie, dans quelles circonstances vaut-il mieux avoir des relations superficielles?

IV. Idioms.
Vous êtes Martha.
Vous entendez quelqu'un à la porte. Vous dites:

Vous:
Maria: Une voyageuse.
Vous:
Maria: Je viens rejoindre mon mari.
Vous:
Maria: Il est arrivé hier et devait me rejoindre ce matin.
Vous:
Maria: Il n'a pas pu partir sans moi. Je ne vous comprends pas. Vous a-t-il quittées définitivement ou a-t-il dit qu'il reviendrait?
Vous:
Maria: L'homme qui est arrivé chez vous était votre frère.
Vous:
Maria: Qu'est-ce qui s'est passé? Pourquoi n'est-il pas dans cette maison? N'avez-vous pas été heureuses de le revoir?
Vous:
Maria: Vous plaisentez.

Choisissez les questions qui vous intéressent et discutez-les avec les autres de la classe.


   ____ Maria
   ____ Martha
   ____ la mère
   ____ Jan
   ____ le vieux domestique

2. Imaginez que vous êtes à une surprise-partie et que Martha est là. Qu'est-ce que vous lui diriez? (You can role-play this if you want.)
   Et si Jan était là, que lui diriez-vous?

3. Imaginez qu'un agent de police est venu à l'auberge au lieu de Maria. Il est soupçonneux. Une personne peut jouer le rôle de Martha et l'autre peut jouer le rôle de l'agent de police.

4. Racontez l'histoire du Malentendu du point de vue du vieux domestique ou du point de vue d'un voisin. (Vous pouvez écrire une composition ensemble si vous voulez.)
5. De quelle façon Jan espérait-il se faire reconnaître par sa mère et sa soeur? Expliquez ce que vous auriez fait à la place de Jan.

6. La mère préfère-t-elle sa fille ou son fils? Pourquoi se suicide-t-elle? A votre opinion est-elle une femme raisonnable?

7. Pourquoi est-ce que Martha et la mère tuent les voyageurs? En quoi leurs raisons sont-elles différentes? Est-ce que leurs raisons sont suffisantes—à votre avis?

8. Qui est le personnage le plus égoïste (selfish) de la pièce à votre avis? Pourquoi?

9. Martha ne semble pas regretter la mort de son frère. Expliquez pourquoi elle aurait agi de la même façon si elle avait su que Jan était son frère. À votre avis, quelle sorte de femme est-ce? Trouvez des adjectifs pour la décrire.

10. La mère et Martha ne voulaient pas connaître les voyageurs qu'elles allaient tuer. Pourquoi vaut-il mieux avoir seulement des relations superficielles dans des situations semblables? Dans votre propre vie, dans quelles circonstances vaut-il mieux avoir des relations superficielles?
Day 11--Personalized Approach--pages 96-106

I. Idioms.

II. A. Questions on the pages.

Vous êtes Maria.
1. De quoi Martha vous a-t-elle informé?
2. Pouvez-vous la croire?
3. Martha avait-elle appris qu'il était son frère?
4. Où est la mère de Martha?
5. Quelle décision Martha a-t-elle prise? Pourquoi?
6. Et Martha que lui reste-t-il à faire? Consoler ou désespérer Maria (pp. 102-03)?
7. Quel choix avez-vous selon Martha? (p. 105, lignes 253-256)
8. Qui appelle-t-elle?
9. Qui répond?
10. Que dit-il?
11. Pourquoi? De qui pouvez-vous recevoir de l'aide?

B. Discussion Review questions. (These are on a handout which you can give to your students to use during your discussion or after. You may of course use small groups if you want.)

1. Qu'est-ce qui vous a plu dans la pièce? Classez selon vos préférences.
   Dites pourquoi.
   ______le style ______les idées de Camus ______l'intrigue
   ______les personnages ______la mise-en scène ______?

   Complétez les phrases suivantes:
2. Le style de Camus est ... à mon opinion. Pourquoi?
3. Le moment le plus dramatique de la pièce était ....
4. Si je devais choisir des acteurs et des actrices pour jouer un rôle dans la pièce, je choisirais ....
   Si je devais jouer un rôle dans la pièce, j'aimerais jouer le rôle de ...
   parce que ....
5. Le titre Le Malentendu est bon parce que ....
6. La fin de la pièce m'a plu/ne m'a pas plu parce que .... Comment
7. Les critiques n'ont pas/ont raison de dire que c'est une bonne pièce parce que ....

Questions.


9. Quel est le rôle de la fatalité? Vient-elle de Dieu, des êtres humains, ou des événements? Croyez-vous que Jan ait eu raison de se fier à la fatalité?

10. Qu'est-ce qui empêche des personnages d'être honnêtes et francs? Est-ce vrai pour des gens que vous connaissez?

11. Comment les personnages auraient-ils pu éviter les malentendus de la pièce?

12. Que trouvez-vous comme faiblesses de la pièce? Le rôle du vieux? Le fait que si Jan avait dit "C'est moi" il n'y aurait pas eu de pièce?

13. Voulez-vous voir la pièce? Combien paierez-vous pour la voir?
Day 11--Personal

Review questions

1. Qu'est-ce qui vous a plu dans la pièce? Classez selon vos préférences. Expliquez vos choix.
   - le style
   - les personnages
   - les idées de Camus
   - la mise-en-scène
   - l'intrigue (plot)

Complétez les phrases suivantes:

2. Le style de Camus est ... à mon opinion. Pourquoi?

3. Le moment le plus dramatique de la pièce était... Pourquoi?

4. Si je devais choisir des acteurs et actrices pour jouer dans la pièce, je choisirais... Pourquoi?
   Si je devais jouer un rôle dans la pièce, j'aimerais jouer le rôle de ...
   parce que....

5. Le titre Le Malentendu est bon parce que....

6. La fin de la pièce m'a plu/ ne m'a pas plu parce que.... Comment est-ce que vous changeriez la fin?

7. Les critiques n'ont pas/ ont raison de dire que c'est une bonne pièce parce que....

Questions


9. Quel est le rôle de la fatalité? Vient-elle de Dieu, des êtres humains, ou des événements? Croyez-vous que Jan ait eu raison de se fier à la fatalité?

10. C'est-ce qui empêche (prevents) des personnages d'être honnêtes et francs? Est-ce vrai pour des gens que vous connaissez?

11. Comment est-ce que les personnages auraient pu éviter les malentendus de la pièce?

12. Que trouvez-vous comme faiblesses de la pièce? Le rôle du vieux? Le fait que si Jan avait dit "C'est moi" il n'y aurait pas eu de pièce?

13. Voulez-vous voir la pièce? Combien paieriez-vous pour la voir?
Day 1—Non-personalized Approach—Introduction 1-10 and 11-13

I. Questionnaire

II. Le Malentendu—Background

1. Qui a écrit Le Malentendu?
3. Quelles autres œuvres littéraires Camus a-t-il écrites?
4. Quand est-il né?
5. Où est-il né?
6. Était-il d'une famille riche ou pauvre?
7. Est-il vivant?
8. Comment est-il mort?
9. Quand est-il mort?
10. Comment s'appelle la philosophie de Camus? (L'absurde)
11. Qu'est-ce que c'est que l'absurde?

One explanation follows:

Ce n'est pas le monde qui est absurde. Ce n'est pas l'homme non plus qui est absurde. L'absurdité c'est que l'homme est dans ce monde inexplicable. L'homme va mourir et il ne va pas comprendre pourquoi il est au monde. Il ne faut pas se désespérer. L'homme doit faire tout son possible pour atteindre le meilleur des mondes. La citation de Pindar peut nous aider à comprendre:

"my soul, strive not for immortal life, but exhaust the fullness of the possible.

III. A. General questions on the text.

1. Où est située la pièce?
2. Quels sont les personnages?
3. Qui est venu à l'auberge?


1. Quelle heure est-il?
2. La salle de l'auberge est-elle propre?
3. Qui est venu à l'auberge?
4. Reviendra-t-il?
Day 1—Non-personalized—Continued

5. Est-il riche?
6. Comment va la mère?
7. Qu'est-ce qu'elle voudrait faire?
8. A quoi pense-t-elle quand elle cherche la paix et la tranquillité?
9. Martha et la mère ont-elles commis des folies?

C. Discussion questions
1. Quels adjectifs Camus emploie-t-il pour décrire la mise-en-scène?
   Voyez-vous un contraste entre la mise-en-scène et l'attitude de Martha et de
   la mère envers la vie?
   Cherchez les mots et les phrases qui montrent que la vie est sombre et morne
   chez elles.
2. On dit que le commencement d'une œuvre littéraire devrait donner une
   impression de mystère et devrait garder le suspense pour qu'on continue à la
   lire. Camus a-t-il fait cela? Relevez les phrases qui donnent une impression
   de mystère ou de suspense.

IV. Idioms.

V. Reading aloud, pages 11-13.
Day 2—Non-personalized Approach—pages 14-20

I. A. Questions on the pages for today.

1. Martha sourit-elle souvent?
2. Quand sourit-elle?
3. Décrit-le visage de Martha.
4. Pourquoi Martha veut-elle amasser beaucoup d'argent?
5. Où veut-elle aller?
6. Est-il plus facile de tuer ce qu'on ne connaît pas?
7. Martha a-t-elle l'intention de tuer ce voyageur?
8. A quel étage vont-elles mettre le voyageur? Pourquoi?
9. Qui a vu Jan et Maria à la porte?

B. Qui a dit? (Have the students identify the quote then continue with the other questions.)

1. "Il est plus facile de tuer ce qu'on ne connaît pas." (la mère)
   Quelle est l'ironie de cette phrase?
   En écrivant cette phrase l'auteur voulait montrer que la mère était
   une personne .... Expliquez. (Using the handout, have the students
   complete the above sentence using these adjectives. Please make sure that they
   apply the adjectives to the above quote.)

2. "C'est que je souris dans ma chambre aux heures où je suis seule." (Martha)
   Camus voulait montrer dans cette phrase que Martha était une personne ....
   (Students choose from the same list.)

3. "Tuer est terriblement fatigant." (la mère)
   Regardez les pages 14-20. Relevez les phrases qui indiquent son fatigue.

II. Idioms.

III. Reading, pages 14-15.

IV. Composition au tableau. Comparez le rêve de Martha à celui de la mère.
## Day 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensible (Sensitive)</th>
<th>Fatiguée</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dure</td>
<td>Modeste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincère</td>
<td>Analytique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathique</td>
<td>Dynamique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizarre</td>
<td>Réservee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitaire</td>
<td>Indépendante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douce</td>
<td>Émotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypocrite</td>
<td>Péjorative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Énergique</td>
<td>Généreuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timide</td>
<td>Conscienteuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimiste</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectueuse</td>
<td>Snob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agressive</td>
<td>Pessimiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brutale</td>
<td>Irresistible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idéaliste</td>
<td>Réaliste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentille</td>
<td>Mélancolique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humaine</td>
<td>Inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental</td>
<td>Autoritaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 3—Non-personalized Approach—pages 20-27

I. Assign composition topic. (Écrivez une biographie de Jan.)

II. Chanson. Ne me quitte pas.

III. A. Composition at the board.

Topic: Décrivez le conflit entre Maria et Jan. Pourquoi Maria ne veut-elle pas quitter son mari? Pourquoi Jan croit-il qu'il est obligé de rester à l’auberge?

B. Questions.

1. Il y a combien d’années que Jan a quitté l'auberge?
2. Maria pouvait-elle rester avec Jan?
3. Selon Maria une mère reconnait-elle toujours son fils?
4. Que Maria veut-elle que Jan dise à sa mère et à sa sœur?
5. Maria est-elle contente d'avoir quitté son pays?
6. Le père de Jan, est-il vivant?
7. Pourquoi Jan est-il venu à l'auberge?
8. Depuis quand sont-ils mariés?
9. De quoi Maria a-t-elle peur?
10. Pourquoi Jan pousse-t-il Maria derrière la porte?

C. General discussion questions.

1. On dit que Martha est le personnage le plus dure de la pièce. Choisissez des phrases qui montrent que Martha est dure. (On handout.)
2. On dit que Maria est le personnage le plus amoureux de la pièce. Choisissez des phrases qui montrent son amour. (On handout.)
3. Jan a dit qu'il attendait le repas du prodigue. A quoi fait-il allusion? Qu'est-ce qu'il a reçu?
4. Maria a dit "C'est Europe est si triste." Pensez à la vie de Camus. Pourquoi aurait-il écrit cela?

IV. Idioms.

V. Read pages 20-21.

For tomorrow you may want to ask your students to prepare three questions concerning the life of Jan.
Martha:

Leurs folies ne sont rien auprès des nôtres.
Mais il faut beaucoup d'argent pour vivre libre devant la mer.
C'est que je souris dans ma chambre, aux heures où je suis seule.
S'il est suffisamment riche, ma liberté commencera peut-être avec lui.
Le crime est le crime, il faut savoir ce que l'on veut.
De quel air vous a-t-il demandé sa chambre?
Mère, il faudra le tuer.
Nous partirons et ce sera une grande heure!
Oui, nous avons trop peiné, la dernière fois, dans les deux étages.

Maria:

Mais laisse-moi voir où je te laisse.
Mais pourquoi n'avoir pas annoncé ton arrivée?
Mais je ne peux pas me reposer de toi.
Je ne veux pas que tu m'y laisse seule.
J'ai peur de ce lit désert où tu me renvoies et j'ai peur aussi que tu me renvoies.
Tu sais bien que ce n'était pas difficile et qu'il suffisait de parler.
Partons, Jan, nous ne trouverons pas le bonheur ici.
Day 4—Non-personalized Approach—pages 28-42

I. Idioms.

II. Reading aloud, pages 32-35.

III. A. Answer the following questions.

1. Faut-il que Jan soit inscrit sur leur livre?
2. Comment Jan trouve-t-il le domestique?
3. Le domestique est-il muet?
4. Quand parle-t-il?

(You may want the students to ask questions of each other concerning Jan’s life—especially if you assigned it yesterday. If you do not want to do that, here are some questions.)
5. Quel nom Jan a-t-il employé?
6. Quel âge a-t-il?
7. Où est-il né?
8. Quelle est sa profession?
9. Quelle est sa nationalité?
10. D'où vient-il?
11. Quelle est sa destination?
12. A-t-il une pièce d'identité?
13. Pourquoi Martha n'a-t-elle pas lu le passeport?
14. Jan est-il marié?
15. Selon lui, où est sa femme?

B. Discussion questions.

1. À la page 37, lignes 75-76, Martha demande à Jan s'il a de la famille. Regardez la réponse de Jan. Pourquoi a-t-il dit cela? Qu'est-ce qu'il aurait pu dire à ce moment-là?
2. À la page 40, lignes 123-24, qu'est-ce que Jan essaie de dire? Qu'est-ce qu'il aurait pu dire?
3. À la page 39, lignes 107-08, Martha dit: "Ce que vous recherchons, c'est justement le bon client." Du point de vue de Martha, qu'est-ce
que cela veut dire? Du point de vue de Jan, qu'est-ce que cela veut dire?
4. Martha dit que Jan n'a "que les droits d'un client" et qu'il doit tenir le langage d'un client. (In small groups or whole class discussion)
Faites une liste des choses dont Jan peut parler et puis une liste de sujets interdits. Discutez pourquoi ils sont inacceptables ou acceptables selon Martha.
5. Jan a dit à la page 31, ligne 105: "Tu me confies pour une nuit à ma mère et à ma sœur, ce n'est pas si redoutable." Quelle est l'ironie de cette phrase?
6. Quel a été le malentendu aujourd'hui? Pourquoi Camus a-t-il fait entrer le vieux domestique à ce moment-là?

IV. Remplir la fiche de voyageur. En groupes de 2 remplissez les fiches de voyageur comme si vous étiez en France.
FICHE DE VOYAGEUR

Nom: ......................................................... (écrit en majuscules)

Nom de jeune fille: .....................................
Maiden name
Mädchen Name

Prénoms: .................................................
Christian names
Vornamen

Né le: ............................................. à .......... 
Date and place of birth
Geburtsdatum - Geburtsort

Département: ........................................
Country - Für Ausländer Angabe des Geburtslandes

Profession: ............................................
Occupation
Beruf

Domicile habituel: ...................................
Permanent address
Gewöhnlicher Wohnort

NATIONALITÉ
Nationality
Nationalität
T.S.V.P.

(Please turn over - Bitte wenden)
Nombre d'enfants de moins de 15 ans
accompagnant le chef de famille: ........................................
Accompanying children under 15
Zahl der Kinder unter 15 Jahren die den Familienvorstand begleiten

PIECE D' IDENTITE PRODUITE

Nature: .................................................................

Pour les étrangers seulement
(For aliens only) - (Nur für Ausländer)

| CARTe D'IDENTITE OU Passeport |
| CERTIFICATE of IDENTITY or PASSPORT |
| (cross out word not available) |
| AUSWEIS - PASS |

N° ................................................................. par. .............
at ......................................................... by .............
in ......................................................... durch .............

Date d'entrée en France ........................................
Date of arrival in France
Datum der Einreise in Frankreich

................................................................. le .............
Signature
Unterschrift
Day 5—Non-personalized Approach—pages 43-54

I. Short resumée or question time in English (5-7 minutes).

II. Reading of pages 42-45.

III. A. Questions about pages for today (oral true/false).

1. Martha n'a pas rempli la fiche de voyageur.
2. Jan dit qu'il est venu à l'auberge pour des raisons de tourisme.
3. Jan a voulu revoir la région qu'il a connue autrefois.
4. Le village où est située l'auberge est bien petit.
5. Tous les voyageurs (vivants) restent longtemps à l'auberge.
6. Jan ne sait pas combien de temps il va rester à l'auberge.
7. La mère a appelé Jan "mon fils" parce qu'elle l'a reconnu. Pourquoi?
8. La mère est d'accord avec Jan qu'elle a besoin de l'aide d'un homme.
9. Martha reçoit tous les voyageurs avec une indifférence bienveillante.
10. Jan ne pourrait pas payer d'avance.
11. Martha a failli demander à Jan de partir.
12. La mère aurait préféré que Jan parte.
14. La mère veut tuer ce voyageur tout de suite.
15. Martha ne veut pas attendre.

B. Discussion.

1. A la page 47, on voit les mots "un fils" mentionnés trois fois. Qui mentionne "un fils" et quelle sorte de sentiment ces mots évoquent-ils chez chaque personnage?
2. A la page 52, lignes 17-21, Martha décrit Jan. Lisez ensemble ce qu'elle dit. Aux pages 39-48, cherchez les passages où Jan parle de son cœur. Qu'est-ce qu'il dit que Martha pourrait considérer indiscret?
3. A la page 53, ligne 60, la mère dit "C'est par lui peut-être que nous nous sauverons." Qu'est-ce qu'elle veut dire? Quelle est l'ironie de cette phrase?
4. Un des thèmes de la pièce est la recherche du bonheur. Quel est le
bonheur de la mère? Quel est le bonheur de la fille? Quel est le bonheur
de Maria? Quel est le bonheur de Jan? Pourquoi traduit-on le titre
"Cross Purposes" en Angleterre?

5. Quel est le défaut de caractère de Jan? Selon Camus, faut-il tout accepter?
Quel est le défaut de caractère de Martha? Maria et la mère ont-elles
des défauts de caractère?

IV. Idioms.

V. Cartes de Conversation.
Day 6—Non-personalized Approach—pages 55-59

I. Quiz (25 minutes).

II. Announce composition topics for Monday. Students choose one topic from the following:

1. A un certain moment Martha a failli dire à Jan de partir. Expliquez pourquoi elle a fini par changer d'avis.
2. Expliquez pourquoi Jan a décidé de quitter l'auberge.


1. A qui Jan pense-t-il?
2. Comment se sent-il?
3. Qui entre dans la chambre?
4. Que veut-elle faire?
5. La salle est-elle propre?
6. Y a-t-il de l'eau courante?
7. Y a-t-il une ampoule électrique au-dessus du lit?
8. Comment Jan trouve-t-il Martha?
9. La mère et Martha avaient-elles hésité à recevoir Jan?
10. Pourquoi selon Martha?
11. Combien de jours Jan va-t-il rester?

B. Discussion questions.

1. A la page 55, ligne 9, Jan dit "C'est dans cette chambre que tout sera réglé."
   A quoi pense-t-il? Quelle est l'ironie de cette phrase?

IV. Simulation: Imaginez que vous entrez dans un hôtel en France. Vous voulez une chambre. Que dites-vous au patron? (Students may role play this in small groups or before the whole class. You may want to put the following on the board for the students: chambre libre? pour combien de nuits? combien de personnes? combien de lits? lit à deux personnes? lit à une personne? avec ou sans salle de bains? avec ou sans petit déjeuner? vue? étage? ascenseur? prix?)

V. Idioms.
Day 7—Non-personalized Approach—pages 60-69

I. Hand back quizzes.

II. Collect compositions.

III. Idioms.

IV. Reading pages 60-61.

V. A. Oral résumée. (Write the following on the board to act as cues for the students.)

le pays de Jan
plages/mar/fleurs/saisons
l’Europe selon Martha
laisser les conventions—langage humain
écraser tout sur son passage
Martha/changer d’avis
réveiller les désirs qui s’endormaient
désirs moins forts de la mère
la chambre d’hôtel selon Jan
envie de partir
sonner
le vieux domestique
le thé
Jan/trouver les mots

B. Discussion.


   a. Jan reçoit enfin le vrai festin du prodigue. (faux)
      Qu’est-ce qu’il reçoit? En quoi consiste son festin du prodigue?

   b. Cette chambre d’hôtel se ressemble à toutes les chambres d’hôtel. (vrai)
      Selon Jan c’est vrai. Pourquoi?

   c. Jan sonne et il reçoit la réponse qu’il voulait. (faux)
      Qui répond? Où est la réponse?

   d. On dit que la mise-en-scène doit refléter l’ambiance d’une pièce.
      La mise-en-scène du Malentendu fait cela. (vrai)
      Donnez des exemples.

   e. Les saisons du pays de Jan et de celui de Martha sont les mêmes. (faux)
      Décrivez l’été et l’hiver chez Jan?
2. Aux pages 60-64, on voit deux aspects de Martha. Lesquels? En groupes de trois relevez les phrases qui indiquent son humanité et celles qui indiquent sa violence. Écrivez-les au tableau. Pourquoi ce changement? Qu'est-ce qui a encouragé Martha à tuer Jan?
Day 8—Non-personalized Approach—pages 70-80

I. Discussion in English for five minutes. Remind students about the quiz.

II. Idioms.

III. A. Questions on the text. (See handout. You will find these indirect questions on the handout. Ask one student to ask the question and another to answer it.)

B. Qui a dit?
   1. "Je viens de prendre une décision, je partirai après le dîner." (Jan)
   2. "Je l'envie de dormir et de devoir mourir bientôt." (la mère)
   3. "Si j'avais su qu'il voulait partir, j'aurais agi de même." (Martha)
   4. "J'ai l'impression que cette maison n'est pas la mienne." (Jan)
   5. "Il m'a parlé du pays dont je rêvais." (Martha)

C. See handout. Have the students match the adjectives with the quote that proves Jan possesses that quality.

D. Discussion questions.
   1. Regardez la ligne 78, page 73. Qu'est-ce que Jan essaie de dire? Pourquoi change-t-il d'avis?
   2. Quel a été le malentendu (p. 77, lignes 20-24)? Camus a employé le vieux domestique pour que Martha et la mère ne voient pas le passeport en ce moment. Quels techniques ou événements emploie-t-on au cinéma et à la télévision pour qu'un acteur ou une actrice ne remarque pas quelque chose?
   3. À la page 75, ligne 110, Jan dit: "Je tiens aussi à ce que vous le sachiez, ce n'est pas comme un hôte indifférent que je quitterai cette maison." Quelle est la triste ironie de cette phrase?
Posez ces questions aux autres.

1. si Jan a bu le thé.
2. si Jan avait commandé le thé.
3. si Jan veut partir le soir.
4. si Jan était à son aise.
5. pourquoi Jan commence à se sentir fatigué.
6. qui entre après que Jan dort.
7. ce que Martha trouve dans la poche de Jan.
8. ce que Martha prend du portefeuille.
9. ce qui glisse derrière le lit.
10. qui ramasse le passeport.
11. où Martha et la mère vont prendre le copps de Jan.
12. si Jan est mort.
13. si Martha savait que Jan voulait partir.
14. si Martha aurait tué Jan si elle avait su qu’il voulait partir.
15. pourquoi la mère était montée voir Jan.

Here are several quotes from Jan. Each quote demonstrates something about Jan's personality. Match an adjective from the list below with a quote.

1. Je viens de prendre une décision: je crois que je partirai ce soir, après le dîner.
2. ... je ne suis pas à mon aise ici, je préfère ne pas prolonger mon séjour.
3. ... je vous suis très reconnaissant de m’avoir acceuilli comme vous l'avez fait.
4. Pour tout vous dire, j'ai l'impression pénible que cette maison n'est pas la miennne.
5. Je n'oublierai pas votre maison, croyez-le bien, et j'espère que, le jour où j'y reviendrai, je serai dans de meilleures dispositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sensible(sensitive)</th>
<th>intelligent</th>
<th>hypocrète</th>
<th>optimiste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sympathique</td>
<td>impulsif</td>
<td>ambitieux</td>
<td>pessimiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naïf</td>
<td>pensif</td>
<td>logique</td>
<td>calme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sincère</td>
<td>perceptive</td>
<td>illogique</td>
<td>nerveux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>précis</td>
<td>loyal</td>
<td>idéaliste</td>
<td>gentil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentimental</td>
<td>honnête</td>
<td>réaliste</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Quiz (25 minutes).

II. A. Questions on the text.

1. Comment la mère se sent-elle ce matin?
2. Pourquoi Martha est-elle si heureuse ce matin?
3. Qui a apporté le passeport à Martha?
4. Pourquoi la mère ne veut-elle pas lire le passeport?
5. Quel nom est écrit sur le passeport?
6. Où est le fils maintenant?
7. Qu'est-ce que la mère a l'intention de faire?
8. Pourquoi va-t-elle le rejoindre?
9. Pourquoi Martha est-elle jalouse de son frère?
10. Pourquoi la mère n'a-t-elle pas reconnu son fils?
11. Que pense Martha de l'amour de la mère pour Jan?
12. Martha regrette-t-elle d'avoir tué son frère?
13. Pourquoi Martha voulait-elle quitter ce village?

B. General questions.

1. On voit aux pages 85-89 que Martha est jalouse de son frère. En groupes de deux ou trois cherchez les phrases où Martha parle de sa jalousie.
   (References: p. 85, ligne 86; p. 86, lignes 92-93; p. 87, lignes 128-33; p. 88, lignes 141-57. You may want to have students write compositions at the board on this.)

2. A la page 81, ligne 5, Martha dit: "Vous voyez bien que cette aube est arrivée." Que signifie "l'aube"? Qu'est-ce que Martha a envie de faire?

3. Camus a voulu écrire une tragédie moderne. Selon les règles pour écrire une tragédie classique, il faut suivre trois unités: 1) l'unité de temps; 2) l'unité d'action; et 3) l'unité de lieu. Camus a-t-il suivi la règle des trois unités? La pièce s'est-elle déroulée en 24 heures? Où a lieu l'action? Combien d'intrigues y a-t-il?
4. À la page 85, lignes 78-79, la mère parle de "l'amour d'une mère pour son fils." Comment "l'amour d'une mère pour son fils" contribue-t-il à l'action de la pièce? Que pensent les personnages de l'amour d'une mère pour son fils?

5. À la page 87, la mère fait allusion à l'absurdité du monde. D'après elle qu'est-ce qui n'est pas raisonnable?

III. Idioms.
I. Hand back quizzes.

II. Reading of pages 92–95

III. A. Discussion of the text. (Ask the first three questions and then go to the handout.)

1. La mère rejette-t-elle Martha?
2. Martha est-elle ainée?
3. Pourquoi Martha déteste-t-elle son frère?
Il y a quelqu'un à la porte. Martha dit:
Martha: (Qui est là?)
Maria: Une voyageuse.
Martha: (On ne reçoit plus de clients.)
Maria: Je viens rejoindre mon mari.
Martha: (Qui est votre mari?)
Maria: Il est arrivé hier et devait me rejoindre ce matin.
Martha: (Il a dit que sa femme était à l'étranger. Il n'est plus ici.)
Maria: Il n'a pas pu partir sans moi. Je ne vous comprends pas. Vous a-t-il quittées définitivement ou a-t-il dit qu'il reviendrait?
Martha: (Il nous a quittées définitivement.)
Maria: L'homme qui est arrivé chez vous était votre frère.
Martha: (Je le sais déjà.)
Maria: Qu'est-ce qui s'est passé? Pourquoi n'est-il pas dans cette maison?
N'avez-vous pas été heureuses de le revoir?
Martha: (Il est mort.)
Maria: Vous plaisantez.

B. General questions. These are on a handout and you may do them whole class and/or small groups.

3. La mère préfère-t-elle son frère ou sa fille? Pourquoi se suicide-t-elle?

4. Pourquoi Martha et la mère tuent-elles les voyageurs. En quoi leurs raisons sont-elles différentes?

5. Camus aurait probablement dit que Martha est le personnage le plus égoïste de la pièce. Pourquoi? Donnez des exemples du texte.

6. Martha ne semble pas regretter la mort de son frère. Expliquez pourquoi elle aurait agi de la même façon si elle avait su que Jan était son frère?

7. La mère et Martha ne voulaient pas connaître les voyageurs qu'elles allaient tuer. Pourquoi?

IV. Idioms.
L'arrivée de Maria à l'auberge.

Il y a quelqu'un à la porte. Martha dit:

Martha:

Maria: Une voyageuse.

Martha:

Maria: Je viens rejoindre mon mari.

Martha:

Maria: Il est arrivé hier et devait me rejoindre ce matin.

Martha:

Maria: Il n'a pas pu partir sans moi. Je ne vous comprends pas. Vous s-t-il quittées définitivement ou s-t-il dit qu'il reviendrait?

Martha:

Maria: L'homme qui est arrivé chez vous était votre frère.

Martha:

Maria: Qu'est-ce qui s'est passé? Pourquoi n'est-il pas dans cette maison?

N'avez-vous pas été heureuses de le revoir?

Martha:

Maria: Vous plaisantez.

Choisissez les questions qui vous intéressent et discutez-les avec les autres de la classe.


2. De quelle façon Jan espérait-il se faire reconnaître par sa soeur et sa mère?

3. La mère préfère-t-elle son fils ou sa fille? Pourquoi se suicide-t-elle? À cause de sa culpabilité (guilt) ou à cause de la fatigue ou pour une autre raison?

4. Pourquoi est-ce que Martha et la mère tuent les voyageurs? En quoi leurs raisons sont-elles différentes?

5. Camus aurait probablement dit que Martha est le personnage le plus égoïste (selfish) de la pièce. Pourquoi? Donnez des exemples du texte.

6. Martha ne semble pas regretter la mort de son frère. Expliquez pourquoi elle aurait agi de la même façon si elle avait su que Jan était son frère?

7. La mère et Martha ne voulaient pas connaître les voyageurs qu'elles allaient tuer. Pourquoi?
I. Idioms.

II. A. Questions on the pages.

1. De quoi Martha informe-t-elle Maria?
2. Maria peut-elle la croire?
3. Martha avait-elle appris qu'il était son frère?
4. Où est la mère?
5. Quelle décision Martha a-t-elle prise? Pourquoi?
6. Et Martha que lui reste-t-il à faire? Veut-elle consoler ou désespérer Maria (pp. 102-03)?
7. Quel choix Maria a-t-elle?
8. Qui appelle-t-elle?
9. Qui répond?
10. Que dit-il?
11. Pourquoi? De qui peut-elle recevoir de l'aide?

B. Discussion review questions. (These questions are on a handout which you can give to your students to use during or after your discussion. You may use small groups if you wish.)

1. En parlant de L'Etranger Camus a dit que L'Etranger c'est l'histoire "d'un homme qui, sans aucune attitude héroïque, accepte de mourir pour la vérité." Commentez sur cette citation en pensant à Jan.
2. Camus a dit en 1943 dans un essai que "Etre classique c'est se répéter et savoir se répéter." (To be classical means to repeat oneself and to know how to repeat oneself.) Donnez des exemples de la répétition dans Le Malentendu. Désirvez le langage.
3. Le moment le plus dramatique est peut-être quand le passeport glisse derrière le lit. Comment ce moment contribue-t-il à l'action de la pièce?
4. Désirvez le vieux domestique et son rôle dans la pièce.
5. Expliquez pourquoi le titre de la pièce est bon.
6. Camus a dit: "Tout le malheur des hommes vient de ce qu'ils ne prennent pas un langage simple." Commentez sur cette citation en pensant au Malentendu.


8. À la fin de la pièce, le domestique a refusé d'aider Maria. Pourquoi?

9. Quel est le rôle de la fatalité? Vient-elle de Dieu, des êtres humains, ou des événements?

10. Qu'est-ce qui empêche les personnages d'être honnêtes et francs?

11. Comment les personnages auraient-ils pu éviter les malentendus de la pièce?

12. On dit que le rôle du vieux domestique est une des parties faibles de la pièce. Pourquoi pourrait-on dire cela?
Day 11—Non-personal

Discussion Review questions
Le Malentendu

1. En parlant de l'Étranger Camus a dit que L'Étranger c'est l'histoire "d'un homme qui, sans aucune attitude héroïque, accepte de mourir pour la vérité." Commentez sur cette citation en pensant à Jan.

2. Camus a dit en 1943 dans un essai que "Être classique c'est se répéter et savoir se répéter." (To be classical means to repeat oneself and know how to repeat oneself.) Donnez des exemples de la répétition dans Le Malentendu. Décrivez le langage.

3. Le moment le plus dramatique est peut-être quand le passeport glisse derrière le lit. Comment est-ce que ce moment contribue à l'action de la pièce?

4. Décrivez le vieux domestique et son rôle dans la pièce.

5. Expliquez pourquoi le titre de la pièce est bon.

6. Camus a dit: "Tout le malheur des hommes vient de ce qu'ils ne parlent pas un langage simple." Commentez sur cette citation en pensant au Malentendu.


8. À la fin de la pièce, le domestique a refusé d'aider Maria. Pourquoi?

9. Quel est le rôle de la fatalité? Vient-elle de Dieu, des êtres humains, ou des événements?

10. Qu'est-ce qui empêche les personnages d'être honnêtes et francs?

11. Comment est-ce que les personnages auraient pu éviter les malentendus de la pièce?

12. On dit que le rôle du vieux domestique est une des parties faibles de la pièce. Pourquoi pourrait-on dire cela?
APPENDIX C

Attitude Questionnaires
Pretest

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is a survey of the opinions of French students. We would like to find out what you think about a number of things.

All your answers will be kept strictly confidential. No one will see them except the researchers who are conducting the study. They will not know who you are, since you are asked only to give your student identification number. We need to know your identification number in case we want to give another questionnaire later. Your instructor will never see this questionnaire.

It is very important that you answer each question as accurately and honestly as you can. The success of the study depends on this.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please answer all questions in order, even if you have never really thought of them before. Just give your first impression.

2. To answer most questions, you just circle a number or a letter.

3. Please pay no attention to the numbers in brackets and in the right hand margin. They are to help us punch your answers onto IBM cards.

4. Thank you for being a part of this project!
PART A

This part of the questionnaire asks you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with a series of statements about Foreign Language Study and Literature Study.

Please read each statement carefully and then circle the number that best describes how you feel. (The numbers are explained right above the statements.)

REMEMBER: 1. Please mark each statement according to your first impression—it is not necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.
   2. Respond to every statement.
   3. Please give your own point of view.
   4. Your instructor will never see this.

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>MODERATELY AGREE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY AGREE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>MODERATELY DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1. Foreign Language Study

1. I enjoy studying French. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 10___
2. I wish there were less emphasis on speaking and listening comprehension in this course. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 11___
3. French is my least preferred class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 12___
4. I resent having to spend so much time on French at the expense of my other studies. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 13___
5. I am anxious to learn to read well in French. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 14___
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>MODERATELY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>MODERATELY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I would study a Foreign Language in school even if it were not required. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 15
7. I do not feel that language study has any practical application to my life. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 16
8. I want to read the literature of a foreign language in the original. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 17
9. I wish that I could speak another language well. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 16
10. I am relieved each day when French class is over. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 19
11. Knowledge of a foreign language is not necessary for travel or business abroad since well-educated foreigners speak English. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 20
12. If I planned to stay in another country, I would make an effort to learn the language even though I could get along in English. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 21
13. The study of a foreign language is in general a waste of time. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 22
14. I feel good after French class because the class hour has been valuable. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 23
15. It is just as valuable to read English translations of works of literature than to read them in the original language. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 24
16. I feel that I have gained new insights into myself and others through my French class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 25
17. I enjoy expressing my thoughts in French. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 26
18. I feel that as an individual I am not important in my French class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 27
19. I feel that I am not learning much in French class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 28
20. I generally look forward to coming to French class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 29
21. I like to study French before my other subjects. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 30
22. The activities in my French class are not very interesting. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGRÉE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGRÉE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGRÉE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. Literature Study

1. The study of literature is very interesting to me.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  32

2. If given the time, I would read more great works of literature.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  33

3. I have found my previous literature courses to be a waste of time.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  34

4. I have found literature irrelevant to my life.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  35

5. I feel that I have something worthwhile to say about literature.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  36

6. I enjoy analyzing literary texts.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  37

7. I would rather read newspapers, magazines, and bestsellers than classic authors.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  38

8. I do not believe it is true that literature gives us more insight into ourselves and others.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  39

9. I have enjoyed my literature courses in the past.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  40

10. If I had the choice, I would never take another literature class.  
    +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  41

11. Some of the greatest minds of history have lifted their thoughts to us through literature.  
    +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  42

12. Literature has expanded my world view and appreciation of the past.  
    +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  43

13. Literature has helped me to understand myself.  
    +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  44

14. I cannot relate to anything written more than 20 years ago.  
    +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  45

15. Most literature is written by people who are upset about something.  
    +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  46

16. Rarely do I find a character in literature who resembles me, my family, or my friends.  
    +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  47
PART B

In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to tell us a little about yourself. This information is very important to the study—otherwise we would not ask for it.

Of course, your answers to all questions will be kept strictly confidential. No one will see them except the researchers, and they will know you only by number.

There are two sections to this part of the questionnaire.

Section 1. These questions ask you to tell us something about your experiences in school.

1. What is your rank in the university? (CHECK ONE) [9]
   ( ) Freshman
   ( ) Sophomore
   ( ) Junior
   ( ) Senior
   ( ) Other (please write in:______________) [6]

2. What grade did you receive in your last French course? (CHECK ONE) [7-9]
   ( ) A
   ( ) A-
   ( ) B+
   ( ) B
   ( ) B-
   ( ) C+
   ( ) C
   ( ) Incomplete
   ( ) Audit
   ( ) Other (please explain:______________________) [11-12]

3. Did you ever study French in high school? (CHECK ONE) [10]
   ( ) Yes ———— If YES: For how many years?
   ( ) No ———— How many years ago?
   [11-12] [13-14]
4. Have you ever studied any other foreign languages? (CHECK ONE) [19]  
( ) Yes _______ IF YES: What languages did you study and for how many years? (CHECK EACH LANGUAGE YOU HAVE STUDIED AND WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF STUDY.) [16-26]  
( ) Spanish: _______ years  
( ) German: _______ years  
( ) Italian: _______ years  
( ) Latin: _______ years  
( ) Other: _______ years  
(WRITE LANGUAGE HERE: _______)  
(Do not write in this column.)

5. Why did you decide to study French? (CHECK ONE) [27]  
( ) Language study is a requirement for me.  
( ) I like languages.  
( ) Languages support my major field.  
( ) I am planning to travel or work in France or a French-speaking country.

6. Have you ever read any literature in French? (CHECK ONE) [28]  
( ) Yes _______ IF YES: What have you read? [29-30]  
( ) No  
(WRITE IT HERE: _______)  

7. Have you taken any English or Comparative Literature courses at the college level? (CHECK ONE) [31]  
( ) Yes _______ IF YES: How many? [32-33]  
( ) No  
(WRITE NUMBER HERE: _______)  
Why did you decide to take these courses? (CHECK ONE) [34]  
( ) Literature is my major field.  
( ) To fill a requirement.  
( ) I like literature.  
( ) Literature supports my major.  
( ) I had been told about an interesting course.

8. Are you planning to take any English or Comparative Literature courses? (CHECK ONE) [35]  
( ) Yes _______ IF YES: Why? (CHECK ONE) [36]  
( ) To fill a requirement.  
( ) I like literature.  
( ) Literature supports my major field.  
( ) I know of a good course.
Section 2: These questions ask you to tell us a little more about yourself.

1. What is your DATE OF BIRTH? [month day year] [37-39]

2. What is your sex? (CHECK ONE) [40] ( ) Male ( ) Female

3. My major is ___________________. (PLEASE WRITE IN) [41-44]

4. Is any language other than English spoken in your family? (CHECK ONE) [45]

   ( ) Yes __________ IF YES:

   ( ) No a. What language? [46-57]

      WRITE IN HERE:________________

   b. Who speaks it? (CHECK ALL WHO DO) [58-66]

      ( ) yourself

      ( ) your husband/wife

      ( ) your father

      ( ) your mother

      ( ) your grandfather

      ( ) your grandmother

      ( ) other (please write in)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!
Posttest

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is a survey of the opinions of French students. We would like to find out what you think about a number of things.

All your answers will be kept strictly confidential. No one will see them except the researchers who are conducting the study. They will not know who you are, since you are asked only to give your student identification number. We need to know your identification number in case we want to give another questionnaire later. Your instructor will never see this questionnaire.

It is very important that you answer each question as accurately and honestly as you can. The success of the study depends on this.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please answer all questions in order, even if you have never really thought of them before. Just give your first impression.

2. To answer most questions, you just circle a number or a letter.

3. Please pay no attention to the numbers in brackets and in the right hand margin. They are to help us punch your answers onto IBM cards.

4. Thank you for being a part of this project!
PART A

This part of the questionnaire asks you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with a series of statements about Foreign Language Study and Literature Study.

Please read each statement carefully and then circle the number that best describes how you feel. (The numbers are explained right above the statements.)

REMEMBER: 1. Please mark each statement according to your first impression—it is not necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.
2. Respond to every statement.
3. Please give your own point of view.
4. Your instructor will never see this.

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1. Foreign Language Study

1. I enjoy studying French. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
2. I wish there were less emphasis on speaking and listening comprehension in this course. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
3. French is my least preferred class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
4. I resent having to spend so much time on French at the expense of my other studies. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
5. I am anxious to learn to read well in French. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would study a Foreign Language in school even if it were not required.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not feel that language study has any practical application to my life.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I want to read the literature of a foreign language in the original.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I wish that I could speak another language well.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am relieved each day when French class is over.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Knowledge of a foreign language is not necessary for travel or business abroad since well-educated foreigners speak English.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If I planned to stay in another country, I would make an effort to learn the language even though I could get along in English.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The study of a foreign language is in general a waste of time.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel good after French class because the class hour has been valuable.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It is just as valuable to read English translations of works of literature than to read them in the original language.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel that I have gained new insights into myself and others through my French class.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I enjoy expressing my thoughts in French.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel that as an individual I am not important in my French class.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel that I am not learning much in French class.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I generally look forward to coming to French class.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I like to study French before my other subjects.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The activities in my French class are not very interesting.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2. Literature Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The study of literature is very interesting to me.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If given the time, I would read more great works of literature.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have found my previous literature courses to be a waste of time.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have found literature irrelevant to my life.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel that I have something worthwhile to say about literature.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I enjoy analyzing literary texts.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would rather read newspapers, magazines, and bestsellers than classic authors.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not believe it is true that literature gives us more insight into ourselves and others.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I have enjoyed my literature courses in the past.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>If I had the choice, I would never take another literature class.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Some of the greatest minds of history have lifted their thoughts to us through literature.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Literature has expanded my world view and appreciation of the past.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Literature has helped me to understand myself.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I cannot relate to anything written more than 20 years ago.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Most literature is written by people who are upset about something.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rarely do I find a character in literature who resembles me, my family, or my friends.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: In this column, do not write anything.*
### Section 3. *Le Malentendu*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I enjoyed reading <em>Le Malentendu</em>.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I would rather have continued grammar than read <em>Le Malentendu</em>.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I do not feel that analysis of the text is important.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I think that reading <em>Le Malentendu</em> was a waste of time.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>When I have time, I will read another play in French.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I saw little relationship between this play and my own life.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I feel that I have gained new insights into literature through reading <em>Le Malentendu</em>.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I like the way we discussed <em>Le Malentendu</em> in class.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I found the reading of <em>Le Malentendu</em> to be a worthwhile part of my overall experience in French this quarter.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I will be relieved when I never have to read another work of French literature.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Reading <em>Le Malentendu</em> did not make me feel any better about studying French.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I feel that reading and studying <em>Le Malentendu</em> has prepared me to read more literature in French.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I feel that I have gained deeper appreciation of literature through reading <em>Le Malentendu</em>.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td><em>Le Malentendu</em> was too difficult for me to read.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I feel that I was given adequate time to express my feelings on and evaluation of <em>Le Malentendu</em>.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
149

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. I found studying *Le Malentendu* boring.  
17. I feel that I have gained new insights into myself through working with *Le Malentendu*.  
18. I felt as though most discussion during class on *Le Malentendu* was directed to the experts in literature.

(Do not write in this column.)

63____
64____
65____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

Any comments or suggestions concerning the way *Le Malentendu* was taught and discussed are welcome below:
APPENDIX D

Achievement Measures
1. Quand est-ce que vous donnez un conseil à un de vos amis?

2. Avec qui vous sentez-vous à l’aise et pourquoi?

3. Quand est-ce que vous n’êtes pas d’accord avec vos parents?

4. Allez-vous garder de bons souvenirs de Ohio State ? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas?

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS: Please do this part of the test in 7 minutes. I have put time suggestions on the test. Suggest to the students that they follow these suggestions. I want them to do as well as they possibly can on the essay questions.
I. Write an answer to each of the following questions. Each question will be read twice. (12 points: 2 pts. content; 1 pt. grammar)

1.

2.

3.

4.

II. Reading.
A. Circle the answer that corresponds to the best completion for each statement. (16 points) (Time suggestion: 5 minutes)

1. Parce que Pierre a trop travaillé, il ne fait rien....
   a. du moins
   b. de plus
   c. d'ailleurs

2. Il a dû quitter l'auberge parce qu'il ne pouvait pas....
   a. la déranger
   b. s'en douter
   c. la supporter

3. Jacques veut quitter Columbus; à vrai dire, il ... visiter Paris.
   a. tient à
   b. s'habite à
   c. se plaint de

4. Quand mon ami m'a dit qu'il ne voulait pas aller en classe, j'ai dit "... parce que je suis malade."
   a. "à mon aise"
   b. "à mon tour"
   c. "moi non plus"

5. Marie est une bonne étudiante; elle a ... fini son travail.
   a. tout à fait
   b. à peine
   c. à nouveau

6. Ce n'est pas un garçon gentil, mais ... je l'aime bien.
   a. à nouveau
   b. au fond
   c. ailleurs

7. Quand vous faites une erreur, vous ....
   a. êtes reconnaissant
   b. vous trompez
   c. avez raison

8. Dans la pièce, il ... d'un malentendu.
   a. agit
   b. tient
   c. s'agit

B. Translation. Translate into English the underlined words or sentences below. (12 points) Time suggestion: 5 minutes)

1. Ce n'est pas la peine d'étudier, ont dit les étudiantes.

2. Cela leur arrive souvent, a dit le professeur.
3. *He vous en effrayez pas. Il n'y a personne.*


5. *Ne la déranges pas; elle est fatiguée.*

6. *Beaucoup d'étudiants peuvent se passer de leur classe de français.*

### III. Content

A. *Cui l'a dit? Fill in the blanks with the name of the character in the play who made each statement: Maria, Jan, la mère, Martha, le vieux domestique.*

1. *Mais laisse-moi voir l'endroit où je te laisse.*

2. *On dirait vraiment que vous cherchez à me persuader de partir.*

3. *Je suis venu ici apporter ma fortune et, si je le puis, le bonheur.*

4. *Tuer est terriblement fatigant.*

5. *Car si je l'avais reconnu, je sais maintenant que cela n'aurait rien changé.*

6. *Je suis montée ici pour l'empêcher de boire, mais il était trop tard.*

7. *Mais ici j'ai peur de ce lit désert où tu me renvoies et j'ai peur aussi que tu m'abandonnes.*

8. *Mais naturellement, ce serait quelque chose aussi si je trouvais, à la fois le sommeil et l'oubli.*

9. *C'est que je souis dans ma chambre aux heures où je suis seule.*

B. *Indicate whether the following statements about Le Malentendu are vrai (V) or faux (F).*

1. *Martha était jalouse de Jan parce qu'il a obtenu ce qu'il voulait.*

2. *Jan a reçu le festin du fils prodigue qu'il voulait.*

3. *Maria a suivi Jan à l'auberge pour l'aider dans son projet.*

4. *Selon Maria, les hommes ne savent pas aimer comme il le faut.*

5. *La mère croit que l'amour d'une mère pour sa fille est moins fort que l'amour d'une mère pour son fils.*
C. Answer the following questions. You are asked to write about 5 sentences for each answer. Your questions will be evaluated on quality of response (5 points) and grammar (3 points). You should give examples and supportive details to defend your answer. (32 points) Time suggestion: 20 minutes.

1. Quelle est l'importance du rôle du vieux domestique dans la pièce? Donnez deux ou trois exemples.

2. Comparez l'attitude de Martha et celle de Maria envers l'amour et envers la famille. Donnez des exemples du texte.


4. Vous êtes critique littéraire. Vous écrivez un article pour une magazine et on vous demande d'évaluer deux choses: le style, les personnages, ou le vraisemblance (likelihood) de la pièce.
APPENDIX E

Pilot Study
OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is a survey of the opinions of French students. We would like to find out what you think about a number of things.

All your answers will be kept strictly confidential. No one will see them except the researchers who are conducting the study. They will not know who you are, since you are asked only to give your student identification number. We need to know your identification number in case we give another questionnaire later. Your instructor will at no time see this questionnaire.

It is very important that you answer each question as accurately and honestly as you can. The success of the study depends on this.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please answer all questions in order, even if you have never really thought of them before. Just give your first impression.

2. To answer most questions, you just circle a number or a letter.

3. Please pay no attention to the numbers in brackets and in the right hand margin. They are to help us punch your answers onto IBM cards.

4. Thank you for being a part of this project!
Part A

This part of the questionnaire asks you to indicate how much you agree or disagree with a series of statements about Foreign Language Study and Literature Study.

Please read each statement carefully and then circle the number that best describes how you feel. (The numbers are explained right above the statements.)

REMEMBER: Please respond to every statement according to your first impression—you will not have to spend much time on each item. Your instructor will not see your answers.

MY STUDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER IS: __________________________________________

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY (+5)</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY (+2)</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY (+1)</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY (-1)</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY (-2)</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY (-3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section 1. Foreign Language Study

1. On the whole, I feel that I am doing well in French. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 10____
2. I enjoy studying French. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 11____
3. I wish there were less emphasis on speaking and listening comprehension in this course. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 12____
4. French is my least preferred class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 13____
5. I am generally not prepared for class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 14____
6. I resent having to spend so much time on French at the expense of my other studies. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 15____
7. I am anxious to learn to read well in French. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 16____
8. I would study a Foreign Language in school even if it were not required. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 17____
9. Knowledge of a foreign language would help solve many of our political difficulties abroad. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3 18____

(Do not write in this column.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>MODERATELY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>MODERATELY</td>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>19_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I do not feel that language study has any practical application to my life.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>19_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I want to read the literature of a foreign language in the original.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>20_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I wish that I could speak another well.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>21_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I am relieved each day when French class is over.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>22_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Knowledge of a foreign language is not necessary for travel or business abroad since well-educated foreigners speak English.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>23_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If I planned to stay in another country, I would make an effort to learn the language even though I could get along in English.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>24_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The study of a foreign language is in general a waste of time.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>25_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel good after French class because the class hour has been valuable.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>26_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It is just as valuable to read English translations of works of literature than to read them in the original.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>27_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel that I have gained new insights into myself and others through my French class.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>28_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I enjoy expressing my thoughts in French.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>29_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel that as an individual I am not important in my French class.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>30_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I feel that I am not learning much in French class.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>31_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I generally look forward to coming to French class.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>32_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I like to study French before my other subjects.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>33_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The activities in my French class are not very interesting.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>34_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I usually wait until the last minute to study my French.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td>35_____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGREE STRONGLY</td>
<td>AGREE MODERATELY</td>
<td>AGREE SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>DISAGREE MODERATELY</td>
<td>DISAGREE STRONGLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2:**

**Literature Study**

1. The study of literature is very interesting to me.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

2. If given the time, I would read more great works of literature.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

3. I have found my previous literature courses to be a waste of time.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

4. I have found literature irrelevant to my life.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

5. I feel that I have something worthwhile to say about literature.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

6. I enjoy analyzing literary texts.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

7. I would rather read newspapers, magazines, and bestsellers than classic authors.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

8. I do not believe it is true that literature gives us more insight into ourselves and others.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

9. I have enjoyed my literature courses in the past.  
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

10. If I had the choice, I would never take another literature class.  
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

11. The greatest minds of history have left their thoughts to us through literature.  
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

12. Literature has expanded my world view and appreciation of the past.  
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

13. Literature has helped me to understand myself.  
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

14. I cannot relate to anything written more than 20 years ago.  
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

15. Most literature is written by people who are upset about something.  
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

16. Rarely do I find a character in literature who resembles me, my family or my friends.  
    +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

(Do not write in this column.)
### Part B

In this part of the questionnaire, we would like you to tell us a little about yourself.

**Section 1.** These are questions to tell us something about your experiences in school.

1. What is your rank in the university? (CHECK ONE) 9
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - Continuing Education Program 65
   - Other (please write in: )

2. What grade did you receive in your last French course? (CHECK ONE) 7-8
   - A
   - A-
   - B+
   - B
   - C+
   - C
   - D
   - E
   - Incomplete
   - Audit

3. Did you ever study French in high school? (CHECK ONE) 10
   - Yes
   - No
   - IF YES: How many years? 11-12
   - How many years ago? 13-14

4. Have you ever studied any other foreign languages? (CHECK ONE) 15
   - Yes
   - No
   - IF YES: What languages did you study and for how many years? 16-26
   - CHECK EACH LANGUAGE YOU HAVE STUDIED AND WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF STUDY.
   - Spanish: ______ years
   - German: ______ years
   - Italian: ______ years
   - Latin: ______ years
   - Other: ______ years
   - (WRITE LANGUAGE HERE: )

5. Why did you decide to study French? (CHECK ONE) 27
   - Language study is a requirement for me.
   - I like languages.
   - Languages support my major field.
   - I am planning to travel or work in a French-speaking country.
6. Have you ever read any literature in French? (CHECK ONE) 28
   { } Yes IF YES: What have you read? 29-30
   { } No

7. Have you taken any English or Comparative Literature courses at the college level? (CHECK ONE) 31
   { } Yes IF YES: How many? 32-33
   { } No
   WRITE NUMBER HERE:

8. Why did you decide to take English or Comparative Literature courses? (CHECK ONE) 34
   { } Literature is my major field.
   { } To fill a requirement.
   { } I like literature.
   { } Literature supports my major field.
   { } I had been told about an interesting course.
   { } Not applicable.

9. Are you planning to take any English or Comparative Literature courses? (CHECK ONE) 35
   { } Yes IF YES: Why? (CHECK ONE) 36
   { } No
   ( ) To fill a requirement.
   ( ) I like literature.
   ( ) Literature supports my major field.
   ( ) Literature is my major field.
   ( ) I have heard of some interesting courses.

Section 2. These are questions to tell us about yourself.

1. What is your DATE OF BIRTH? 37-39
   month     day     year

2. What is your sex? (CHECK ONE) 40
   ( ) Male
   ( ) Female

3. My major is ___________________________. (PLEASE WRITE IN) 41-44

4. Is any language other than English spoken in your family? (CHECK ONE) 45
   { } Yes IF YES:
   { } No
   a. What language? 46-57
      WRITE IT HERE:
   b. Who speaks it? (CHECK ALL WHO DO) 58-66
      ( ) yourself
      ( ) your husband/wife
      ( ) your father
      ( ) your mother
      ( ) your grandfather
      ( ) your grandmother
      ( ) other (please write in:____________________)
### Section 3: *Le Malentendu*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Do not write in this column.)

1. I enjoyed reading *Le Malentendu.*
2. I would rather have continued grammar than read *Le Malentendu.*
3. I feel that I have something worthwhile to say about literature.
4. I do not feel that analysis of the text is important.
5. I think that reading *Le Malentendu* was a waste of time.
6. When I have time, I will read another play in French.
7. I saw little relationship between this play and my own life.
8. I feel that I have gained new insights into literature through reading *Le Malentendu*.
9. I like the way we discussed *Le Malentendu* in class.
10. I found the reading of *Le Malentendu* to be a worthwhile part of my overall experience in French this quarter.
11. I will be relieved when I never have to read another work of French literature.
12. Reading *Le Malentendu* did not make me feel any better about studying French.
13. I feel that reading and studying *Le Malentendu* has prepared me to read more literature in French.
14. I feel that I have gained deeper appreciation of literature through reading *Le Malentendu*.
15. *Le Malentendu* was too difficult for me to read.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>63___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. I do not like looking for symbols, irony, and hidden meanings in literature. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

17. I feel that I was given adequate time to express my opinions on Le Malentendu. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

18. I found studying Le Malentendu boring. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

19. I feel that I have gained new insights into myself through working with Le Malentendu. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

20. I felt as though most discussion during class on Le Malentendu was directed to the experts in literature. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

Any comments or suggestions concerning the study and discussion of Le Malentendu are welcomed below:
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