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ABSTRACT

Increased interest in the efficacy of student discourse has prompted theory and research regarding the role and nature of oral and written literary response. This study examined the effects of teacher inservice in transactive strategies on oral and written discourse about the novel in secondary English classrooms.

Six Grade 10 classes participated in the study read To Kill a Mockingbird. Four of the six teachers participated in three experiential inservice sessions to construct transactive strategies for teaching a novel. Subsequently, the six classes read a second novel. Three lessons were videotaped at the beginning, middle and end of each novel study. A literary essay was submitted after each novel.

Treatment classes responded by writing in a response log during the reading of the second novel during class time, delaying discussion until they completed the novel, using the logs as catalysts for further discourse. Control classes read the novel without inservice intervention. Comparisons of the content and quality of the discourse were drawn both in the pre and post treatments and between the control and treatment groups.

Analysis through various observation tools revealed the following results: that students writing response logs spoke more and on a wider range of topics, posed more
questions, engaged in exploratory, conceptual and abstract discourse, and linked their experiences to the novel.

The following conclusions may be drawn from this study:

(1) Teacher inservice in transactive strategies promotes effective classroom implementation

(2) Students responding during their reading encounter textual anomalies that may be resolved in the writing and reshaped and refined in further discourse

(3) Written discourse alters when students record their ongoing responses in a log

(4) Expressive responses in logs do not appear to improve the quality of literary essays

(5) Using the logs for discourse alters and improves the content and quality of oral discourse.

(6) Students engaging in exploratory written and oral discourse shape their own responses and develop in their response-ability

These findings indicate that students reflectively engaging with literature through exploratory oral and written discourse develop in their response-ability.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

This study examined the effects of teacher inservice in transactive strategies for teaching the novel through the oral and written responses of secondary literature students. This chapter provides a sketch of current conditions in literature teaching, identifies some of the problems in relation to current theory and research and introduces the parameters of this study.

CURRENT CONDITIONS IN LITERATURE CLASSROOMS

Literature Teaching

Many secondary English classrooms continue to exemplify the traditional pedagogical model that took root during the early 1940's. English teachers, well-trained in New Criticism, continue to import its formal interpretation techniques into their classrooms, assuming the role of experts and expecting their students to assimilate and imitate the strategies of formal analysis (Gerber, cited in Nelms, 1988, 4,5). The formal approach is deemed academically respectable for all students. Heavy emphasis on text dissection remains firmly entrenched at both the

This pedagogy reflects the New Critical stance. Teachers structure and define the literary events by stipulating the content, interpreting, questioning and assigning essays topics. Students are exposed to the text through teacher explanations, oral and written questions, whole class discussions, and reading outside sources (an accepted literary critic, commercially prepared summaries). A direct approach, teacher-centered and teacher-driven, continues to characterize most literary activity.

**Oral Discourse**

Most teachers spend their time talking, asking questions and explaining. Frequently they set the agenda by announcing the discussion plans, pointing students to particular issues or portions of text, noting significance of particular characteristics or events. Up to 80% of classroom talk is done by teachers (Watson, 1981, Barnes & Todd, 1977; Barnes, 1971; Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Hull, 1985; Kerry, 1981). Often, the talk, directed to students, is punctuated by questions relating to textual content. Through this pattern of discussion, teachers lead the students to a received, canonical interpretation of the text. Generally, in a class of thirty, five or six students
regularly speak during discussion (Watson, 1981). Student talk consists of brief, unelaborated answers to teacher questions.

**Written Discourse**

Most commonly, writing about literature consists of comprehension questions, chapter summaries, vocabulary studies, literary essays and tests (Applebee & Langer, 1981; Cooper & Odell, 1978; Marshall, 1988; Purves, 1981; Thomson, 1987; Watson, 1981). Correctness both in form and content remains central. Students are expected to adhere to the formal guidelines (the traditional five-paragraph essay, for instance).

Most literary writing in the classroom focuses on the finished product and is graded. Comprehension questions, chapter summaries, and quizzes are most often corrected. In essay writing, students try to figure out what the teacher wants and frequently opt for the easiest of teacher prescribed topics (Marshall, 1988, 52). In producing the essay, students are to assume the teacher has not yet read the book. Writing becomes both a demonstration of the "facts" of the story and a measure of the students' critical skills.
Response to Literature

In the New Critical view meaning lies in the text; hence, response consists of correctness regarding details of the text, accepted interpretations, and identification of the literary elements. Since students lack experience in literary criticism, teachers spend considerable effort eliciting the literal story dimensions and lecturing on the more complex elements, thus defining acceptable response (Dixon & Brown, 1984, 1985; Marshall, 1988; Purves, 1981, Purves & Beach, 1972; Squire, 1987; Watson, 1981). Student response comes through reiterating the accepted interpretation and understanding of the literature.

VIEWING CURRENT CONDITIONS THROUGH THEORY AND RESEARCH

The discussion relating theory and research to the current conditions in literature teaching will incorporate four components: pedagogy, oral discourse, written discourse and response to literature.

Literature Teaching

By assuming responsibility for the structure and process of the literature class, teachers become the primary critical audience for student speaking and writing about the literature. Under these conditions, students often find it difficult to become involved. Literature remains something
apart from them - the object of formal analysis, exercises, essays and tests. Applebee (1990, 61) found literature classes to be overly text-centered: the texts of the accepted literary canon and literary critics. Teaching about the text - the background, author, literary devices and structures - produces students who have memorized facts without necessarily becoming able, perceptive readers. Teachers often demand premature literary analysis. Students are seldom encouraged to elaborate their perceptions or to develop personal reactions to the literature; their opinions are generally measured against teacher opinion. In this pedagogical framework (what Barnes terms a transmission model), teachers offer a kind of "tourist" literature where students watch it being done - to them and for them.

Questioning remains a characteristic pedagogical strategy. Watson (1987) found that teachers ask as many as 50,000 questions a year, most of them "closed" (Watson, 1981). Students, on the other hand, may be asking as few as ten questions per year, most of them procedural ("When is this due?"). Teachers use questions to control students' attention (Barnes, 1976); they question them an average of every 11.8 seconds (Hoetker & Ahlbrand, 1969). The problem may not only be the questions themselves, but who is asking the questions and in what context. Learners need opportunity and practice formulating and posing questions if
they are to facilitate and become involved in their learning. When teachers assume responsibility for a disproportionate amount of the questions posed, students learn to rely on their teachers to assume that responsibility. Furthermore, no evidence assures us that teacher questions reflect genuine student questions. Question-asking needs re-assessment in the classroom.

A conflict arises when these pedagogical practices are viewed in light of current theory and research. Dixon (1975), Barnes (1976, 1971), Watson (1981), Freire (1968), Mehan (1978), Britton (1970) and others have urged a more interactive relationship between teaching and learning as well as between readers and texts. When interaction of texts and readers becomes central, pedagogy shifts to accommodate students who play a more responsible and demanding role. Since questions emerge out of some level of knowledge and indicate student knowledge, students need to ask more questions. The content broadens to include a wide range of literature (past and present) that liberates imaginations and exposes students to an array of different worlds and cultures (Probst, 1988).

Pedagogy reflecting active student engagement with the literature requires incorporating transactive strategies in the literature class. Rosenblatt (1938, 1978) forces a
closer look at the "transaction" between reader and text and opens the way for acknowledging and incorporating student response. Essentially, the reader, rather than being a passive decoder, carries on an active transaction with the literary work. The reader contributes a host of individual experiences and knowledge to the reading. These, combined with the circumstances of the reading event, make up the reader's personal, unique response. Rosenblatt describes the transaction between the text and reader, the new experience arising out of the union between a reader and the text, as a "poem."

Pedagogy incorporating transactive strategies would include a number of guiding principles. Students need to begin by reading, experiencing and exploring the literature for themselves, a stage that Nelms (1988) labels "evocation." Free response is a necessary but not sufficient condition for advancing literary understanding; however, students must proceed to further reflection and analysis through a variety of discourse modes (both oral and written, public and private). The dialectic of class discussion (oral discourse) allows for modifying and correcting responses structured from inadequate textual support. Teachers need to find points of contact among student opinions. Their influence should be "the
elaboration of the vital influence inherent in the literature itself" (Rosenblatt, 1938, 74).

Response to Literature

Asking students to explain, to give evidence, to rationally defend a set position with reasoned and defensible arguments, identifies literary study as an objective, scientific endeavour. In this context, the text, as Nelms asserts, becomes an edifice, the reader a "spectator before its splendours" (1988, 1). Literary response becomes an external, predictable, verifiable experience, an imitative act removed from the experience of the reader and reduced to recitation. That suggests a narrow view of response (the reader as spectator) requiring little more than scanning pages and a keen memory. Students often learn a great deal about a literary text without necessarily reading or experiencing it for themselves. "The direct approach," Dixon wrote, "is more likely to kill a personal response than support or develop it" (1975, 58).

If literature remains primarily an act of decoding, if memorized data constitutes response, a break with reality occurs. Readers outside academic settings recognize that literature offers a "lived-through" experience that invites involvement during the reading and subsequent talk. What
kind of talk? Generally talk that reflects personal response: highlights, feelings, textual incidents, notable textual features.

In theory and research if not in practice, a shift has occurred that embraces both the reader and the literary work while focusing on the transaction between the two. The stance readers assume qualifies the textual experience as aesthetic (what happens during the reading) or efferent (what the reader acts upon after the reading, what is "carried away"). Readers respond individually and uniquely to literature. A growing body of research in the reading process suggests that readers must assume an active role in making meaning. As early as 1938 Rosenblatt proposed that "the experience of literature, far from being a passive process of absorption, is a form of intense personal activity" (v). Subsequent research in reading, response, socio- and psycholinguistics (Smith, 1973; Purves and Beach, 1972; Bleich, 1975; Cooper & Odell, 1978; Applebee, 1981; Fish, 1980; Iser, 1978) confirms the influence of the reader's frame of reference, the "behind the eyeball" contributions. All the reader's previous experiences coalesce to shape the reader's comprehensive textual experience.
Oral Discourse

Because they have assumed the role of literary experts, teachers take responsibility for the content and direction of discussion. The language of the literature class commonly focuses on the formal elements of analysis: theme, structure, symbol. Since students are relatively new to literary criticism, teachers "lead" them to the received interpretation through lectures and class discussion punctuated by questioning to check student knowledge (recitation). Words teachers use suggest a definitive, fait accompli notion of interpreting literature. Students must be prepared for teacher questions. Limiting questions to "what is revealed to us about. . .," "what impressions are created by. . .," "what do we all learn from. . ." produces the view that texts do things to readers. The talk becomes impersonal, "points you make in an answer to a question" (Dixon, 1975, 27). Sparse attention is paid to the considered opinions of the students. In this context, student talk makes little difference. Yet without listening to student talk, teachers can gain only a limited understanding of student knowledge about the literature.

Teacher-dominated discussion limits active student involvement in the literature and encourages dependence on teachers. Regardless of who initiates a comment, attention is directed back to teachers; they serve as funnels for
student talk. Teachers exercise what Stubbs (1976) terms "conversational control." A natural consequence appears to be that students tend to assume less responsibility for their own learning. In time, students expect teachers to present, establish and limit the classroom content.

Understandably, if teacher talk predominates, student talk is accorded a minor role. Because generally only five or six students speak regularly in any given classroom, most have little opportunity to express, contribute to or benefit from discussion (Watson, 1981; Barnes, 1976; Cazden, 1986, 1988; Edwards & Westgate, 1987). Hull (1985) quipped: "Who needs the most practice talking in school? Who gets it? Exactly: the children need it, the teacher gets it." Moreover, as students move through the grades, opportunities for talk generally decrease. What happens to these students? Can we assume that they are learning without sufficient time or opportunity to explore their perceptions, questions and partially formed ideas?

Though whole class discussion remains a common teaching strategy, studies on classroom talk have only recently emerged (Stubbs, 1976; Cazden, 1988; Langer, 1986; Lemke, 1982; Halliday, 1989). Most oral discourse research, though disparate, acknowledges the inextricable, reflexive relationship between talk, thought and learning.
(Barnes, 1971, 1976; Cazden, 1988; Wilkinson, 1982; Halliday, 1989; Lemke, 1986). If talking advances learning, students need frequent and varied opportunities.

How can productive classroom talk be structured and enacted? Teachers need to create the contexts in which students engage in the kind of exploratory dialogue (dialectic) with self, the author, peers and teachers that considers the tentative, developing nature of literary response (Crowhurst & Kooy, 1985; Hunt & Vipond, 1985; Kooy, 1988; Marshall, 1987; Newkirk, 1985). Creating opportunities for small group discussions allows more students to speak and individual students to speak more. It provides the time required to explore the literature without fear of evaluation. Small group discussions offers opportunities for students to socially construct their knowledge of the literary text through shaping and modifying their personal responses. Exploratory talk encourages learners to formulate hypotheses (talk marked by, "probably," "might have," "you'd think") and to evaluate them (Barnes, 1976, 29). It also prepares students for productive whole class discussions (Barnes, 1971, 1976; Dixon, 1975; Cazden, 1988; Lemke, 1986; Hull, 1985; Edwards and Mercer, 1987; Edwards & Furlong, 1987).
Written Discourse

In the context of literature as a decoding activity, writing is reduced to regurgitating "correct" facts and interpretations, and in reality, becomes a measure of how well students listened in class. Confronted by potential judgment and an experienced, knowledgeable teacher-audience, students frequently defer to safe, formulaic patterns of response. Teachers commonly suggest that student writing is stilted, artificial and steeped in generalizations (Applebee, Langer & Mullis, 1987; Applebee, et al., 1984; Britton, et al., 1975; Langer & Applebee, 1987; Cooper, 1981; Purves & Ripper, 1968; Purves & Beach, 1972).

That kind of writing ignores the potential of writing in the literature class. Because writing links so inextricably to thought (Vygotsky, 1986; Applebee, Langer & Mullis, 1987; Emig, 1971, 1983; Berthoff, 1981; Britton, 1970, 1975; Bruner, 1966, 1986), opportunities for exploratory writing about literature allows students to uncover, discover, arrange and organize their developing literary perceptions. Writing to respond throughout the reading or the lesson provides students with a working document for talk, reading, listening and further writing. The writing also informs the teacher: what students know, think, question, and need to know. Armed with this
knowledge, teachers can meaningfully enhance and develop student learning.

Unlike talking, writing can be examined, changed, extended, and reshaped. Moreover, writing can occur simultaneously and requires full participation. Students writing their explorations take responsibility for their own thinking and prepare for sharing with others - contributing to and benefiting from other explorations of literature (Rosenblatt 1938, 1978). Writing allows the group to become a learning community where all individuals work to actively construct meaning and participate in developing their understanding of literature.

Few secondary teachers have altered the traditional teaching patterns to accommodate the increased knowledge in discourse and response. Many, highly experienced, resist change; they have witnessed endless trends (as C.S. Lewis aptly coined, "Fashions come and go, but mostly they go"). Change, even if theoretically defensible, may not be accomplished readily. School-based research - teachers working jointly with researchers - offers a vehicle for bridging the gap.
THE PARAMETERS OF THE CURRENT STUDY

In an attempt to link classroom practice with current knowledge, this study focuses on secondary students' oral and written response to two novels. Six teachers proceeded with no intervention during the teaching of the first novel. Four subsequently participated in three inservice sessions in transactive strategies to structure a curriculum for teaching the second novel. All six teachers taught a second novel allowing comparisons in the content and quality of oral and written discourse to be drawn. The effects of expressive, exploratory writing through two novels on the subsequent oral and written discourse will be examined in the context of the following research questions:

1. How does teacher inservice in transactive strategies affect the content of informal and formal writing on the novel?

2. How does teacher inservice in transactive strategies affect the quality of informal and formal writing on the novel?

3. How does teacher inservice in transactive strategies affect the content of oral response to the novel in the secondary literature classroom?

4. How does teacher inservice in transactive strategies affect the quality of oral response to the novel in a secondary literature class?
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research in oral and written discourse in the English classroom has grown in scope and magnitude, particularly in the last ten years. Though Rosenblatt's *Literature as Exploration* was published in 1938, it was not until a number of research studies in psychology, reading and writing emerged that reader response became the object of serious research.

This chapter describes the current conditions, the research and theory and the contribution of this study to the research in the areas of response to literature, oral and written discourse and a transactive curriculum for the secondary English classroom.

RESPONSE TO LITERATURE

Formalist analysis characteristic of New Criticism retains a firm hold in literature classrooms. Literature becomes an autonomous entity, an "objective cultural phenomenon" (Young, 1987), that can be objectively analyzed. Only teacher-experts and literary critics possess the
Neither the students nor the authors of the literary works participate in the literary experience. Pedagogically, this translates into teachers asking students, "Is it in the text?" Expressing the accepted interpretations of the experts becomes the appropriate response to literature for students. Hence, literature becomes a body of information to be transmitted rather than experiences to be reflected upon (Rosenblatt, 1990, 104). Popularized after World War II, New Criticism offered a response to the focus on empirical scientific methods. "This approach," stated Rosenblatt, "suited an intellectual climate of narrow empiricism in which behaviorism dominated psychology and logical positivism reigned in philosophy" (1990, 103). Current theory and research indicates that the patterns of literary discourse in the traditional classroom are ill-founded.

Simultaneous to the introduction of New Criticism theory, questions about the text as simply a "curious object" (Tompkins, 1980) surfaced. Following the work of Richards (1929) and Harding (1937) on the idiosyncratic nature of response to literature, Rosenblatt developed a theory of reader response in her seminal work, *Literature as Exploration* (1938). In it she proposed restoring the reader to the literary experience. Influenced by Dewey's philosophy of aesthetics, she incorporated his concept into
a view of reading literature. The literary work exists in the "transaction" between the reader and the text, both aspects or phases of the total social and cultural context. The text "brings into the reader's consciousness certain concepts, certain sensuous experiences, certain images of things, people, action, scenes" (1938, 30). The reader contributes a host of individual experiences and knowledge to the reading. These, combined with the circumstances of the reading event, constitute the reader's personal response.

Studies building on Rosenblatt's theory of response began in earnest during the 1960's with the work of Squire (1964) and Purves & Rippere (1968) in the United States and Hansson (1964) in Sweden. Soon after, studies in reading emerged indicating that rather than a decoding process, reading was an interaction of the reader's knowledge and expectations of the text and the text itself (Smith, 1973, 1978). Alongside, an interest in the role of the reader developed by Holland (1968) and Bleich (1975) in psychoanalytic theory, Iser (1978) in phenomonology, Rosenblatt (1938, 1978), Fish (1980) and Culler (1977) in literary theory, shifted the focus onto the reader. Hence, research in education, reading and critical theory all turn their attention to the reader.
The umbrella of reader response incorporates a divergent array of theoretical perspectives. Specifically where the reader belongs on the continuum between reader and text remains a subject of debate (see Suleiman & Crossman, 7-45 for a full discussion). Rosenblatt (1990) charges that most pay only "lip-service" to the reader, preferring to focus either exclusively on the reader (psychoanalytic theorists) or on the text (deconstructionists and post-structuralists). Those overemphasizing the text, she asserts, neglect the personal aesthetic response and "find no problem in continuing the teaching practices of the traditionalists and the formalist New Critics" (1990, 106). Formalist theories may be reserved for literary critics.

Tompkins (1980) proposes an interesting and persuasive response to reader response critics. Like the structuralists (Culler, for instance), she rejects interpretation as the purpose for studying literature claiming that:

By making the reaction of the individual readers a legitimate basis for literary interpretation, reader-response critics have extended the power and usefulness of the interpretive model that they inherited from formalism. (211)

The text, she claims, becomes an object rather than an instrument for reshaping human experience. She urges a return to the classic position of literature: that literature be an instrument of change in society. Though I
am inclined to agree, replacing interpretation with action appears insufficient grounds for acting. Perhaps action resulting from interpretation would be more useful. The language of Rushdie's *Satanic Verses*, for instance, initiated action, albeit not likely the kind envisioned by Tompkins. Predisposing readers to transforming their societies through literature remains doubtful given the ethnic and cultural diversity within our societies and the place of literature within it. That does not mean we need to abandon the idea of literature for shaping human experience, however. How to structure that capacity for change within a pedagogical framework offers a challenge worth investigating.

Not prepared to abandon the text as the psychoanalysts do or to examine the text and abandon the reader as the post-structuralists and deconstructionists do, not able to structure a viable pedagogy on claims of the transformations offered by Tompkins, I align this study most closely with Rosenblatt's critical theory. It provides a reasoned and balanced view that incorporates the reader, text and context. Hence, a workable pedagogical theory for reader response as expressed in this study comes out of literary criticism through psychology and educational research and theory.
For the purpose of this study, response to literature embraces both the reader and the text and focuses on the transaction between the two. Literature, unlike other texts, offers a "lived-through" experience. The union of text and reader produces a "poem" created through an "active, self-ordering and self-corrective process" (Rosenblatt, 1978, 11). Each reading is individual; no one can have a literary work read for him or her.

Pedagogically, this requires creating the contexts whereby teachers and students alike can examine the process by which readers arrive at an interpretation. Oral and written discourse provide the explicit medium as research by Thomson, 1987; Protherough, 1983; Watson, 1981; Cooper (1976), Hansson (1973), Purves & Beach (1972), Purves & Rippere (1968), and Squire (1964) attest. But personal literary events are socially formed too (Vygotsky, 1978; Bruner, 1986; Rosenblatt, 1978; Dias, 1987). Rosenblatt proposes that readers "often manifest[s] an urge to talk about it, to clarify and crystallize his sense of the work" (1978, 146). By engaging in oral and written discourse, students can socially (re)construct their understanding of the literature.

Oral and written discourse characterize both the communication system of the classroom and the means of learning (what Barnes terms "reflection"). The first is an
acceptable given—children and teachers speak and write in the classroom (Barnes, 1976, 11; Cazden 1986, 1988; Wells & Wells, 1984). The second suggests a relationship exists between words and thought (Vygotsky, 1962; Bruner, 1966; Barnes, 1973; Wilkinson, 1982).

What we say and write mirrors our thought processes, and enables us to take responsibility for them. Thus children and adults alike are not only receiving knowledge but remaking it for themselves. (Barnes, 1973, 20)

This study incorporates the work of a diversity of researchers on response and attempts to compose a structure from theory to practice through teacher inservice. Work in written (Purves & Beach, 1972; Purves, 1981; Purves & Purves, 1986; Marshall, 1987; Purves & Rippere, 1968) and oral (Watson, 1981; Dias, 1987; Eeds & Wells, 1989) response to literature generally captures the response after the reading. Studies conducted in articulating oral (Squire, 1964; Hansson, 1973; Lytle, 1985) and written (Purves & Rippere, 1968) responses during the reading of literary texts have focused primarily on poetry and short stories and captured the response during one reading event. The work of Crowhurst & Kooy (1986) and Kooy (1988) explored the written responses during the reading of novels to capture some dimensions of developing literary responses. To increase understanding of literary response, particularly its' evolving, developing nature, and explore implications for
pedagogy, the scant research needs to be augmented (Rosenblatt, 1985; Probst, 1988, 1990).

The conventions of classroom discourse help shape student responses to literature. What follows is a discussion of oral and written discourse that currently characterize literature classes, how research and theory informs our knowledge of discourse and the contributions of this study to advancing the knowledge and process of literature teaching in the classroom.

WRITTEN DISCOURSE IN THE CLASSROOM

Student writing has often centred on their reading of literature. The little writing students do (Purves, 1981) often consists of comprehension questions, summary, definitions and quizzes focusing on the factual data from the text and a reiteration of teacher and critic knowledge about the text. The writing demonstrates content knowledge (Applebee, et al., 1986). In the same study, Applebee found that 39% of the classroom writing consisted of fill-in-the-blank and one or two word answer worksheets; only 10% involved extended discourse. Students are seldom encouraged to elaborate on their personal reactions to the literature in writing. Decoding and busy work characterizes most literary writing (Purves, 1981).
Much writing research focuses on the formal literary essay (Applebee, 1981; Emig, 1977; Britton, 1975; Cooper and Odell, 1977; Hillocks, 1986; Marshall, 1987). Student essays articulate what teachers and critics have revealed about the literature (Marshall, 1984). Often, the writing becomes formulaic. Students adopt formalistic language fluently enough to provide false evidence of their understanding (Applebee, Langer and Mullis, 1986), resort to what Rosen (1985) calls "desperate mimicry" or give up altogether (Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Marshall, 1984). The focus is on the students' lack of knowledge in literary criticism and ability to articulate the imposed interpretations not acquired through personal reading experiences. This stops rather than fosters critical thinking because students are invited to listen not to the text, but to the teacher and critic.

Nevertheless, essay writing allows students to gain competence in conventional academic discourse and may promote success in other academic contexts. However, since little writing occurs in the literature classroom and only a small portion of the writing requires extended discourse limited primarily to the literary essay, students receive few opportunities for elaborating on their own concepts and knowledge of the story.
Major changes in the teaching of writing occurred in the 1970's and 1980's: rather than focus exclusively on the "product," many English teachers adopted the "process approach" advanced through the work of Britton et al. (1970, 1975), Emig (1971), Elbow (1973) Graves (1983), and Moffet (1968). The process, based in the personal knowledge of the students, included attention to the stages of writing from prewriting to publishing as well as a promising range of alternative audiences, forms and purposes.

Some research indicates that a similarity exists between the process of response to literature and writing processes (Buckler, 1985; Pearson & Tierney, 1983; Horner, 1983; Britton, 1982; Petroskey, 1982). Though some English teachers have adopted the writing process, few have made the connection to response to literature or the writing of the literary essay as a developing process.

More recently, attention in writing has been shifting toward the earlier, expressive stages of writing. Research by Vygotsky (1978, 1986), Bruner (1986), Bruner et al. (1966), Emig (1971), Berthoff (1981), Moffett (1968), Langer & Applebee (1987), and Graves (1983), indicates that writing offers a dynamic heuristic for discovery and exploration of meaning. Through assembling, organizing, linking to previous information, and incorporating new information,
students can begin to concretely make sense of the world. Unlike speaking, writing can be re-examined, altered, rearranged, or deleted - it can be reshaped. In their seminal study on writing, Langer and Applebee state:

... the act of writing facilitates a logical, linear presentation of ideas, and to the permanence of writing (as opposed to the fleeting nature of talk), permitting reflection upon and review of what has been written. Written language not only makes ideas more widely and easily available, it changes the development and shape of the ideas themselves. [emphasis mine] (1987, 3)

There are reasons for thinking that the chief instrument for developing students intellectually is writing - thinking on paper. Bruner (1986) argued that when reading and writing came into use something "profoundly different" happened to the human mind. Words on the page can be studied, added to, reflected upon, generalised with, and hypothesised from (Berthoff, 1981; Emig, 1983; Langer & Applebee, 1987). Their abstraction and complexity can be far greater than the rote writing generally required in schools (Wilkinson, 1982).

If, as Langer and Applebee (1987) suggest, "writing shapes thinking" the opportunities, purposes and contexts to use writing has implications for effective student learning (Vygotsky, 1986; Bruner, 1966). While most writing in schools suffers from restrictive, evaluative constraints
Research conducted in both composition and reading suggest that both are processes in composing (Britton, 1982; Petrosky, 1982; Pearson & Tierney, 1983). Both require acts of "making meaning" (Berthoff's term). Research suggest a closely aligned relationship between the two (Johnson, 1985; Horner, 1983; Cookston, 1982; Fristrom, 1982), the one informing and reflecting on the other (Rosenblatt, 1985; Buckler, 1984; Pearson & Tierney, 1983; Petrosky, 1982; Britton, 1982). In 1984, Buckler wrote:

Louise Rosenblatt's model for the process of reading literature and James Moffett's concept of the process of writing are both grounded in the perception of the human intellect as an active entity which collects, synthesizes, organizes, assimilates, and reconstructs experience according to predictable, recursive patterns. (22)

Neilsen (1989) uses Peirce's terms of abduction, deduction and induction to describe a thinking process: (1) abduction represents the unconscious hypothesis-forming, (2) deduction, the predictions that follow and (3) the testing of the hypothesis (Neilsen, 1989). As thinking constructs, these provide an undergirding sensibility for learning and response journals (Berthoff, 1981; Britton, 1970; Emig, 1983; Sternglass, 1983; Crowhurst & Kooy, 1986; Olson, 1985; Kooy, 1988). The research incorporates the premise that
language skill is inextricably linked to the development of mind and that thought takes the shape of internal monologue. It captures, as Staton (1988) terms it, the "interactive written conversation." The internal monologue becomes visible and thus subject to re-view and reshaping.

Though most proponents share the central role of written language in learning in journal writing (Britton's "shaping at the point of utterance"), views on the purpose of the writing varies. Often, these logs appear to serve as introspective journeys for the student: digressions, memories and other personal links. Needless to say, such proponents (Atwell, 1987; Staton et al., 1988) use journals expressly as personal "dialogues" between the student and teacher. Fulwiler (1987) and Maher, Lester & Pradl (1983) offer various functions of journals based on explaining processes and observations in disciplines across the curriculum. Generally, students respond in the journal after an experience or reading event. In a study conducted by Crowhurst & Kooy (1986), students generated their responses in reading response logs during the reading of a novel. Journals engage students actively using language.

For the purpose of this study, writing in the reading response logs will be used for learning and transacting with the literature (Crowhurst & Kooy, 1986; Kooy, 1988). The
reading response logs encourages thinking on paper and employing "sense making" strategies for dealing with the novels. They differ from some uses of the journal, however, particularly in how they are used in English classes. First, the writing occurs at regular, student selected intervals during the reading of the novel rather than subsequent to it. This allows students and their teachers to examine the thinking connections, the transactions with the literature, as they develop. The reading log documents the developing process and preliminary, initial content of the response. Students develop their response to the entire novel before submitting the log to their teachers since this allows students to both freely explore their initial responses through inner monologue and prevents imposed teacher expectations on the response. Writing provides students with time to think frequently missing from Initiation-Response-Evaluation patterns prevalent in classrooms (Cazden, 1988) where teachers pose questions, students respond (usually with a word or phrase) and teachers evaluate ("right"). The reading response log will be shared with the teacher and other students subsequent to the reading. Restricting the dialogue in the reading log to the teacher and student ignores the potential for shared response and the reshaping of response in community. Students use the logs to articulate their initial responses (questions, perceptions, hypotheses, analyses) to others.
Hence, the reading response log serves as a preparation for collaborative oral discourse that continues the shaping of the individual response to the novel.

Research in writing the literary essay has been primarily descriptive (Emig, 1971; Applebee, 1981; Cooper & Odell, 1978; Dixon & Brown, 1984). Most studies have urged a movement away from the formalist literary essays into more meaningful, personal written responses to literature. Newkirk (1989) uses the knowledge of the process of composing, the process of response and the connections between thinking and writing and urges a reclamation of the essay on different grounds. In inviting students to write essays, he offers three alternatives: reading narratives (an account of the reader's perception of a poem after numerous readings), reflective papers (working through a student-formulated problem) and parallel narratives (using incidents in the text related to personal experience). Newkirk offers encouraging alternatives for writing that incorporate the current knowledge on writing and the opportunity for students to write extended discourse.

The essay writing in this study remained attempted to incorporate Newkirk's alternatives by encouraging teachers to use the reading response log and the student questions as the basis for the formal writing assignment.
This study incorporates the tenets of reader response, the composing process and the link between thinking and writing through the construct of the reading response log. Since writing offers a way of constructing meaning from the literary text, students in this study shape their preliminary perceptions by engaging in active dialectic during the reading of the text in a reading response log as the initial stage in the evolving process of response to literature.

One purpose of this study is to continue the process of response from the initial personal monologue (written) to public dialogue (oral) with others about the personal responses to the text. Suggestions for linking written and oral discourse about literature have already been postulated.

ORAL DISCOURSE IN THE CLASSROOM

To a very large degree, classroom education is talk. Teachers orchestrate classroom talk as a principal means of transmitting information (Barnes, 1971, 1976; Barnes & Todd, 1977; Cazden, 1988; Jones, 1988; Kerry, 1984). Students demonstrate acquisition of school knowledge through talk (Cazden, 1986; 1988).
While children at primary levels frequently engage in oral activity, the incidence decreases as students move upward. By the time students arrive in secondary schools, their opportunities for talk have been seriously reduced. Moreover, in a study conducted by Kerry (1981), secondary students spent little time using concepts or reasons (ranging from .3% to 9.5%) or dealing with abstracts (0% to .3%). It appears that very little talk is conducted for reasons other than management or seeking information (79).

Most classroom discourse takes place in whole class discussion. What may be called 'whole class discussion' frequently turns out to be little more than recitations where "closed" questions predominate and one or two-word answers suffice (Hoetker and Ahlbrand, 1969; Barnes, 1976; Watson, 1981). In this context, teachers initiate, respond and evaluate the questions (Mehan's I-R-E pattern). Students learn to avoid involvement and respond only when directly called on (Jones, 1988; Kerry, 1981, 1984; Lemke, 1986; Stubbs, 1983; Watson, 1981). Where Watson did find evidence of more "open" kind of questioning, teachers still generally maintained "conversational control" (Stubbs, 1976).
In typical classrooms of thirty students, five to seven regularly contribute to class discussions. The remainder only speak when called upon by the teacher. Consequently, many students do not regularly engage in classroom discussions (Goodlad, 1984; Watson, 1981; Fullan, 1982).

Watson (1981) found that

... what passes for discussion is really question-and-answer of the most restrictive type - what Americans call of a growing body of evidence suggesting 'recitation'. Closed questions predominate, and the teacher is content with one-word or very brief answers. ... such lessons accounted for 60 percent of the total sample (93).

The recitation model still persists in most classrooms.

Teachers frequently have a distorted view of the level of student involvement. Watson (1987) conducted a study examining junior high school pupil involvement in English classes. In follow-up interviews he found that teachers overestimated both the number of students involved and the nature of the classroom discussion. It appears teachers cannot necessarily gauge what happens during the oral discourse episodes accurately.

Since outside of the regular structured talk, students frequently digress and have difficulty maintaining productive discourse, teachers often select whole-class discussion as the major means of transmitting knowledge. Frequently not involved in the discourse, students engage in idle chatter instead (Bullock Report, 1975). Rather than
indicate a student problem, Bullock suggests the problem may be pedagogical since students talk has little value in the accepted classroom structure.

When Jones found that teachers were unable to define the kinds of talk they should be promoting in schools, and hence, by implication, unable to promote it (56), he surveyed a group of secondary students about their attitudes to methods of classroom learning: reading about a topic, listening to teacher explanations, whole class discussion, and writing about the topic (Table 3, 72). He found that students preferred whole class discussion because they felt the teacher controlled for "messing about" (73). The pattern of teacher talk interrupted by questions rated second lowest (15); only answering comprehension questions rated lower (23). The students expressed some reservations about whole class discussion citing boring content, losing concentration and getting restless (73).

Much research attests to the disproportionate amount of teacher talk in the classroom. Flanders (1978) found that as a rule, two thirds of lessons consist of talk and that teachers consume two thirds of the talk, lecturing or eliciting factual information requiring only a word or phrase (Cazden, 1986, 1988; Kerry, 1981; Hoetker & Ahlbrand, 1969; Barnes, 1971). Dividing the remaining talk
time over thirty students would leave each student with twenty seconds of talk per lesson. Wood et al., (1980) found that housekeeping and managerial tasks consumed 44% of teacher talk. Wells and Wells (1984) found that organizational problems, the number of children and curriculum requirements militate against spontaneous talk.

Many teachers would find it difficult to concede that they engaged in what Hull (1985) terms "monologic teaching." This conception conflicts with their frequent demonstrations of encouragement, sympathy, understanding and patience. A conflict arises between the concerns for the students on the one hand and an objectivistic view of the learning environment on the other:

But precisely what seems observable in lessons in different subjects is that certain fundamental taken-for-granted notions of the kind I have called objectivistic - relating to what knowledge is, and learning, and the language we use in school - can press into service a wide range of admirable professional virtues, and that teachers do exhibit at one and the same time a deeply solicitous regard for children and paradoxically, a strange unconcern about what might really be happening in their minds. (Hull, 218).

Certain predictable events occur in classroom lessons, often in the same sequence. Given the pervasiveness of teacher talk, students must correspondingly listen, sometimes for considerable periods of time. The use of the words "right" and "okay" indicate that a teacher wishes to
terminate or begin a new topic or activity, attract and check pupil attention, or indicate a "long turn" by the teacher (Atkinson, 109). When they wish to speak, students need to assume the appropriate protocol: getting the teacher's attention with the appropriate gesture, for instance (Cazden, 1988; Barnes, 1975; Edwards & Westgate 38). Teachers decide what has or has not been learned (Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Cazden, 1986, 1988; Watson, 1981; Stubbs, 1978).

Classroom discourse takes on characteristics not found in other conversations. Unlike in normal conversations, students in classrooms do not typically address each other - unless instructed to do so by the teacher. Who speaks or follows another speaker is generally controlled by the teacher who serves as a funnel through which all the discourse is processed. While teachers may select any speaker in the class, students generally can select only one speaker in the group - the teacher (Edwards & Westgate, 1987; Jones, 1988). Dingwall labels these "orchestrated encounters." With thirty or more students in a class, managing turns becomes so complicated and student frustration at having to wait for a turn so great, that other alternatives have to be found. Dialogue, or "instructional conversation" may be misleading in that it
implies a balanced discourse between equals (Atkinson, 1981).

Question-asking, a characteristic teacher behaviour, has received considerable attention in the research (Edwards and Mercer, 1987; Cazden, 1986, 1988; Jones, 1988; Dillon, 1982; Lemke, 1982; Barnes, 1976). The teacher, posits Barnes,

... asks many questions, and demands answers as of right. 'What other ways are there of measuring it?' she asks, and goes on urgently, 'Come on. More hands up. Have you all gone to sleep?' In spite of this urgency, she seems to know the answers already, for she dismisses several suggestions until one comes which she greets with, 'That's it. Good answer, John.' Her young pupils hardly ask any questions. (1976, 11, 12).

Teachers need the responses students provide as an ongoing force to keep the lessons moving (Cazden, 1986, 441).

Lessons depend on all participants recognizing and acknowledging these procedures and requirements (Atkinson, 1981).

Although teachers ask as many as 50,000 questions per school year, (one and a half million in a professional lifetime according to Kerry, 1981), students may be asking less than ten each (Jones, 1988). Of these, procedural ones ('Do we use both sides of the paper?') may be most frequent (Watson, 1987).
Students, like any new learner confronted with new content or skill need to be able to ask questions. Although this appears logical, classroom conditions and procedures do not generally take this seriously: teacher questions far outnumber student questions. In conducting a study of three students by following them through their school days, Jones (1988) found that teacher questions ranged from 74 to 114; student questions from 3 to 18. Students initiating questions, Hull (1985) found, appear to others as lacking knowledge. He proposes that under such conditions, crucial questions are suppressed.21 The questions teachers ask bear a unique distinction: for the most part, teachers already know the answers (Young, 1987; Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Watson, 1981). Through consistent modelling, students recognize that it is teachers who ask the questions, know the answers and by repeating questions, imply error (Edwards and Mercer). Since the teacher usually knows the right answer already, students learn to focus on the many clues and cues which the teacher provides to narrow the area of search within which that answer may to be found. Students have to accept that what they do manage to say in answer to a teacher's question will almost certainly be evaluated (if only by repetition) and may well be so heavily modified and translated to fit the teacher's frame of reference as to be no longer recognizable as their own contribution at all.
The questions teachers ask ("Initiation") frequently focus on surface features of the content, regardless of the subject area (Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Kerry, 1981; Barnes, 1971; Hoetker & Ahlbrand, 1969). In a Teacher Education Project on effective questioning in five British secondary schools, Kerry found that simple comprehension questions constituted 89.9% to 99.8% of classroom questions leaving little room for questions of application, analysis, synthesis or evaluation. This appears to confirm findings that teachers generally require brief one or two-word answers and rarely prompt students to elaborate (Wells & Wells, 1984; Watson, 1981).

Teachers also use questions to indicate error in response. Repeating the same question suggests the "correct" answer has not been attained. Frequently, "useless" answers are discarded in order to continue the teacher's agenda (Edwards & Westgate, 1987). Moreover, teachers build on their own perceptions and knowledge twice as frequently as that contributed by students (Wells & Wells, 1984).

Rowe (cited in Cazden, 1988, 60) found that teachers wait less than one second for a response and wait less than a second before asking another question. Scarborough found that as teacher questions became longer, student answers
became shorter. Teachers structured the meaning leaving the students to fill in the blanks (cited in Barnes, 1976, 173). When teachers did wait for three or more seconds, particularly after a response that "pronounced changes in student use of language and logic as well as in student and teacher attitude and expectations" occurred.

Only in education does question-asking presume to stimulate discussion and thought (Dillon, 1982; Edwards & Mercer, 1987). In relating questions to other areas (therapy, for instance), Edwards and Mercer found that silence, declarative statements and less direct prompts prove more effective than questions in stimulating talk. Strings of questions generally succeed in short-circuiting dialogue (46).

Another complicating factor may well be the background of teachers themselves. Teachers often adopt the "imitative" method, accepting and duplicating procedures and standards of teacher talk without question. Wells & Wells (1984) suggest that teachers may not feel they are doing their job unless they talk -"telling, questioning or evaluating" (34).

Given increasing pressures for teachers to manage larger classes, demonstrate acceptable student test scores,
submit to public pressures for "competency" and cope with ever-changing social structures, teachers adopt the traditional communication patterns so as to cover the curriculum content (Wells, 1984). Perhaps given the sheer numbers of students teachers meet daily reduces possibilities for productive talk; hence, teachers see teaching as the need to manage crowds and cover content (Jones, 1988).

While Flanders (1978) takes for granted that more talk is necessarily better than less, more in itself may not necessarily lead to enhanced learning. Moreover, oral discourse cannot simply be equated simply with classroom communication since teachers "communicate" acceptable standards of oral behaviours (both hers and the students') without necessarily engaging students in meaningful, learning oral discourse.

Oral discourse in literature classes appears remarkably similar to the discourse in other disciplines (Barnes, 1976; Watson, 1981, 1989; Marshall, 1988; Wilkinson, 1982). Teachers summarize, explain and interpret the literature, often monologically, interject questions to keep the students and the content of the literary discourse on track. Questions, posed by teachers, tend to focus on factual details from the novel. There exists, as in other classes,
a less than whole-hearted belief in the value that students' talk has for their learning (Wells & Wells, 1984, 194). Hence, response to literature consists of responding to a narrow range of questions in a teacher led discussion. Students respond by affirming and restating the knowledge of the literature conveyed by teacher, text and literary critic. Oral discourse plays little part in transforming student knowledge about literature.

THEORY AND RESEARCH ON TALK

Research investigating the language of the classroom began to emerge as the central role of language to learning became more evident. The work of Barnes, Britton and Rosen (Language, the Learner and the School, 1971) served as a springboard for subsequent studies. As the studies increased, so did awareness of the extent of communicative demands made on children and the restrictive range of skills they were called upon to display. Questions emerged regarding the effects of more extensive oral participation and collaborative enterprises by students (with a corresponding decline in teacher dominance) on the discourse patterns of the classroom.

Barnes (1975) proposes an interactive model of teaching and learning. Both Barnes (1975) and Stubbs (1981) contend
that speech enables us to control thought and hence, the nature of what is learned. Classroom talk, states Jones, should lead the student forward in a struggle to understand the world around him (63).

At the same time, the work of Vygotsky provided a perspective on the relationship between talk and learning. Central to his work is the dialogical nature of learning and the "predominance of sense over meaning, sentence over word, context over sentence." This provides the internal sense-making and ordering of the world; establishing order out of chaos.

The dialogical nature of learning provides opportunity for internalizing the concepts and generalizations of formal schooling. Young children participate in a social community (the family) who initiate them by "filling in the blanks" of their abilities both in speech and physical skills; that is, they elaborate on and confirm their early speech efforts and support them in their efforts to stand, walk and negotiate steps, for instance. Practice always takes place in the context of a full performance. Increasingly, as children can assume more of the skills required, caretakers relinquish taking over what the child can now accomplish unaided. Vygotsky termed this stage of leading the child
toward independent use the "zo-ped" or "zone of proximal development," renamed "scaffolding" by Bruner. In the case of speech, this represents the internalized thinking that becomes an important part of the child's own reasoning through practice and support. In this view, oral language becomes a tool for making meaning.

Talk as a process (like the writing process) provides exploratory talk as a vehicle toward understanding (Barnes, 1976). It allows tentativeness, ambiguity, questions, hypotheses, rearranging and restructuring to occur. It allows learning through talk as an ongoing process (learning as opposed to learned) (Barnes, 1976). In a sense, this kind of talk can be compared to the think-aloud protocols used in the composing process by Flower & Hayes (1980) or the reading response log described earlier. The emphasis rests on the process but does not disavow the product: rather, as Barnes suggests, both have a place in education. In the former, students assume responsibility for their own thinking; in the latter, their thinking and understanding as reflected in their talking, becomes subject to external criteria (1976, 113-114).

Common experience, if nothing else, validates that talking through an issue, defending a viewpoint, helps to clarify and understand it. Watson (1981), Barnes (1971,
1976), Barnes & Todd (1977), Dias (1987) among others, has examined small group discussion. Some have examined the content of the talk; others the participation of the students; others, the tasks set (Barnes distinguishes them as 'open' or 'closed'). All would agree that small group discussions offers a natural home for exploratory learning-talk.

"... if we believe Vygotsky's theory of internalization from inter- to intrapsychological processes, then peer interactions assume special importance in school because of the asymmetry of teacher-pupil relationships. Children never give directions to teachers, and rarely ask questions except for procedures and permissions. The only context in which children can reverse interactional roles with the same intellectual content, giving directions as well as following them, and asking questions as well as answering them, is with their peers. (Cazden, 1986, 449)

The role of talk in the classroom becomes fundamentally important insofar as it leads to increased student learning.

Often, when we meet a problem, we want to "talk it over." Rosen calls talk the "irrepressible genre." We seem to need the opportunity not so much to confirm what we already know, but to work towards a reshaping or re-viewing of the problem. Such articulation shapes the knowledge of both the speaker and the listener. This small group talk is free from control by an expert or the need to reach authoritatively defined conclusions (Edwards and Westgate).
The informal, exploratory, expressive nature of learning-talk encourages students to work towards understanding rather than to simply state it (Bruner's conception of "scaffolding"). The nature of the exploratory talk allows the learner to follow "the contours of the mind and journeys beyond to reach out for fresh insights" (Jones, 138). In this sense, talk becomes a tool for discovery.

As a result of a study on classroom questioning, Kerry (1981) suggests a shift in teacher questioning. The pronounced emphasis on managerial, literal level questioning must shift to more cognitively demanding questions that allow students thinking time and opportunity to apply, analyze, synthesize and evaluate the content in order to spur genuine learning. Teachers need to know what ideas and in what stage of development the student has (Hull). Socrates pointed out that teaching may be as much about "speaking to" as "speaking about." Unless learners can speak to their own questions and awareness, no dialogue or genuine conversation can develop (Hull).

If over the last twenty years any dissenting voices to the value of talk for learning have arisen, they have been in an effort to direct attention to the pitfalls of purposeless, undirected talk. In a minority report in
Britain's Department of Education and Science (1975), Froome argued that little evidence exists to indicate that talking and writing improve learning any more than listening and reading. The decline in English standards, he suggested, is often directed at the move toward more oral and less written discourse. Very little research confirms this view. It offers a restrictive, mechanistic conception of language. Not that there is much to fear. The major research reports on the quality and kind of learning in the schools consistently confirm that talk for learning still does not play a key part in the education of students in the schools. Perhaps Piaget's view which undervalues talk as a tool for discovery still influences classroom practice. Yet when teachers prevent constructive student learning—talk in the classroom, the problem lies not only in the deprivation of learning opportunities but in other "learned" effects as well: the shaping of student thinking and behaviours (Barnes, 1976, 16).

Nevertheless, forming small groups does not automatically ensure active, engaged dialogue (Jones, 1988, 63-64 provides an excellent example of an unproductive dialogue). Jones admits that more talk occurs in the classroom but most of it, he contends, is the wrong kind (60).
Some teacher concerns may stem from a collaboration-as-cheating mentality; most learning in schools occurs in isolation. Teachers may then be predisposed against it. Research findings appear to discredit their fears. When teachers examined audio and video transcript recordings of small group talk, they expressed surprise at the quality of student discussion and the emergence of unexpected skills and competencies (Quoted in Watson, 1981, 97).

There are also practical issues involved. Opportunity for talk in small groups moves the focus away from a teacher dominated communication systems. Students need to take responsibility for their own talk. When teachers can relax their need to dominate and direct all the talk within one communication system, the pressures are reduced. Students need to have the structures that allow them pursue meanings collaboratively, acts normally carried out by the teacher (clarifying a confusing point, moving the discussion along, appointing a speaker, trying to make sense of an issue) now becomes the task of the students. Left to their own devices, students consulted the materials and tested their thinking on each other, not the teacher. Not only did they learn to investigate collaboratively but to negotiate socially (Edwards & Westgate, 1987).
Talk changes when students have opportunities for interactive reflection. Some have found small group collaboration leads to more productive whole class discussion - a preparation, as it were. Benefits became evident in research comparing the effects of individual and group work (Barnes, 1976, 113-114). Barnes suggests that the format move from an introduction by the teacher to small group work and back to the whole class discussion. Atwell (1987) has detailed this approach of her own work in the junior high school classroom.

The point and value of small group talk lies not in abandoning structure or refraining from presenting guidelines. Requiring students to actively participate in their own learning, to be accountable for their perceptions and views requires structuring events to make it possible. The parameters set must not constrain their "exploratory talk".

In sum, language becomes the tool both whereby humans participate in their communities and at the same time and "make meaning" by re-interpreting the world to their own ends. Speech, then, becomes not only a means of guiding action but also of interpreting the world.
The building of this study now incorporates the knowledge of oral discourse in the structuring response to literature. The language of the classroom will move from individual written reflections about the novel to engaging in oral discourse of the text in various group structures. This links exploratory reading, writing, speaking and listening in the process of the developing literary response.

TEACHING LITERATURE IN THE SECONDARY CLASSROOM

Research on language/thought connections and readers' responses has implications for the study of literature in the secondary school. Literature teaching aims to produce students who can clearly articulate their responses, understanding and appreciations of literature through oral and written discourse (Torbe, 1981; Dixon, 1975; Watson, 1981, 1987; Barnes, 1976). "The major means by which children in our schools formulate knowledge and relate it to their own purposes and view of the world are speech and writing" (Barnes, 19). Students articulate in oral and written language have a decided advantage in school learning. Unless students apply the full range of language resources in learning, they can only achieve a superficial understanding.
English teachers concern themselves both with literary works and student responses to them. Although widely differing views regarding the teaching of literature exist in secondary schools, teachers generally embrace one of two predominant pedagogical views: transmission or interpretation (Barnes, 1976). Barnes (1976) contends that language as a means for learning frequently falls along a line which at one end is called 'transmission;' at the other, 'interpretation'. A transmission model implies that "knowledge passes up and down the tube unchanged" (Barnes, 1976, 142). The 'transmission' model continues to persist in the classroom (Young, 1987; Watson, 1981; Purves & Beach, 1972; Purves, 1981; Goodlad, 1984, 1987; Fullan, 1982). Needless to say, both imply views of language: purpose, function and relationship to learning.

As students move through the high school grades literature teachers increasingly narrow the focus of study, both in text selection and possible responses (Marshall, 1988, May; Purves, 1981). Not requiring students to actively participate, teachers take "over more and more of the interpretive work during classroom discussion" (Marshall, 1984, 4). Literature classes become "gentle inquisitions" (Eeds & Wells, 1989, 4). At a time when students need to take ownership of their own readings and interpretations, teachers provide scant opportunities to do
so. Through conducting a number of studies on the study of poetry, Travers (1984) found that:

... the majority of pupils in a class will, regardless of their differing personalities, respond according to the preference indicated by the teacher's questioning behaviour and the teacher's way of receiving pupils' responses. In other words, pupils tend to learn what teachers teach. ...
(cited in Dias, 1987, 70)

Increasingly, then, students listen to and accept the interpretations of the teacher/expert. They become passive and submissive.

Teachers are quick to point out that language in the classroom is to be used to investigate, reflect, pose problems and determine solutions. Yet the gap between theory and practice remains (Goodlad, 1984; Cazden, 1986, 1988; Torbe & Medway, 1981; Wood et al., 1980). The seasoned interpretations of teachers and critics, however, cannot magically be transferred to students.

Literature provides a particularly rich field for oral discourse. Because response to literature begins with the individual, resists right/wrong categories, invites speculation and personal engagement with the text, talking about it enriches the experience (Dias, 1987; Watson, 1981; Protherough. 1986; Thomson, 1987). The seasoned interpretations of teachers and critics cannot magically be
transferred to students; they need opportunities for constructing their own (Newkirk, 1985).

Only recently has research on oral discourse in secondary English classes been conducted (Watson, 1980; Barnes, 1976; Hynds, 1989; Lytle, 1985; Thomson, 1987; Dias, 1987). One of the more comprehensive, although not as scientifically rigorous as some, the Bullock report (1975) provided a useful view into British secondary English classes (see Chart, Jones, Lip service, 53). All suggest that talking about literature nurtures understanding and appreciation. Opportunities for reflective oral discourse about the literature alters and shapes the developing understanding of students. It allows them to move out of the "gentle inquisitions" into grand conversations" (Eeds & Wells, 1989, 4)

Small-scale studies by Ryan, et al. (1982), Hammond (1981) and Williams (1982) found that small group discussions in literature promoted comprehension, literary appreciation and interpersonal understanding (reported in Watson, 1981, 155). The informality of small groups, the opportunities for expressive discourse, and the absence of teachers allows a tentativeness generally reserved for conversations. Risks, attempts, reframing, questions and speculation are more likely to occur (Seigel & Carey, 1989,
Dias' work in undirected small group discussions on poetry suggests that the small group time allows students to take responsibility for interpretation upon themselves, tolerate other views, accept ambiguity, develop confidence through practice and respond more personally (1987, 74).

A transactional model for literature teaching proposed by Rosenblatt and others and framing this study requires that students respond personally to the literature. They need opportunities for constructing their own responses and understandings (Newkirk, 1985). Oral and written discourse become "ways of helping pupils think more effectively and will credit them with the ability to make sense of experience for themselves by talking and writing about it" (Barnes, 1976, 15).

To implement a transactional model of teaching literature requires operationalizing the research on response, discourse and language/thought relationships (Protherough, 1983; Thomson, 1987; Watson, 1981; Probst, 1988, 1989, 1990; Corcoran & Evans, 1987; Young, 1987). Teachers, writes Probst, do not lead classes carefully along to foreseen conclusions, sustained by critical authority, about literary works. Instead, they face the difficult but interesting task of acknowledging the uniqueness of each reader and each reading, accepting the differences, and crafting out of that material significant discussion and writing. (1987, 2)
The role of the teacher in the transactional literature classroom is to accommodate the developing responses of the students. Teachers become facilitators in creating the contexts for active, engaged literary dialogue. Discussion of the text through writing and talking provides the real work of the classroom since it encourages students to generate their own questions, explore alternative answers and develop in their literary response-ability.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

A substantial body of research indicates that New Criticism still prevails and response consists of applying formalist interpretations to the literature (Rosenblatt, 1938, 1990; Young, 1987; Eeds & Wells, 1989; Watson, 1987; Marshall, 1984). In that context, teacher talk tends to dominate while student talk and writing frequently becomes an evaluative performance for the teacher (Barnes, 1976; Watson, 1981; Goodlad, 1984, 1987). Research in response points to involving students in the reading process and encouraging "transactions" with the literature and the benefits of engaging students in the experience (Rosenblatt, 1938, 1978; Protherough, 1986; Thomson, 1987; Probst, 1989, 1990). Moreover, evidence exists that both oral and written discourse link to thought (Vygotsky, 1986; Bruner, 1986;
Langer & Applebee, 1987); hence, students need time and opportunity to "rehearse" new knowledge through talking and writing. Links between research and pedagogy in the classroom remain scant.

This study differs from and contributes to current research in various ways. First, integrating response to literature, oral and written discourse and teacher inservice in transactive strategies offers a more comprehensive view of literature teaching and learning previously not available. Second, while most studies examine either oral or written discourse, this study examines both in the context of literature teaching. Third, while most classrooms engage students in oral discourse before writing, this study suggests that students prepare for talk and further writing through reflective written discourse about the literature. Fifth, to examine oral and written response to literature that develops over time, novels rather than short stories or poetry were used. Sixth, this study provides a bridge from theory to practice through engaging teachers in transactive strategies for the classroom in three inservice sessions. Little has been done to date to create the bridging needed for teachers to implement theories and research in response and oral and written discourse in the literature classroom (Rosenblatt, 1990). Seventh, this quasi-experimental design aims to account for
the complexity of the world of the literature classroom through incorporating a range of observation tools that allow numerous views of the oral and written responses to literature both before and after the inservice. Finally, a videotape summary with an accompanying transcript of the study is included to provide a visual account of first novel study, the inservice, the second novel study and interviews with students and the treatment teachers.

What will this study do to advance knowledge about response to literature? Given the current conditions in literature classrooms (see opening of this chapter), the need exists to provide a theory and structure of literature pedagogy for teachers. This study will advance knowledge about the effect of inservice training in transactive strategies on pedagogy, the effect of transactive strategies on the literary discourse, the nature of literary response as expressed in the content and quality of oral and written discourse about the novel. In sum, the study creates a bridge from critical literary theory in reader response to transactive practices in the classroom.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the study will be described in terms of the sampling, design, data collection, procedures, and scoring and analysis.

SELECTION OF THE STUDY SAMPLE

A brief description of the study and a call for teacher volunteers was submitted both to the Surrey school district's "helping teacher" and to each English department of the area secondary schools. Of those who responded, six qualified teachers were selected on the basis of university training in English, teaching experience, current teaching of a Grade 10 English class, commitment to the research project, and scheduling.

One hundred and thirty-nine students and their six teachers in three secondary schools participated in the study. The three schools are located in School District #36 (Surrey), a fast-growing urban area of 213,000 in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. The three schools spanned the middle class range: lower middle class area with high apartment density, stable middle income area of primarily
single family homes, and a higher middle class residential area.

Teacher Subjects

Four females and two males participated; five earned English majors, one an English minor. Of the six, three teach English exclusively; the other three teach at least one other subject. Five teachers had more than four years of university; one is currently completing his fifth year. One teacher heads the English department in her school. All were seasoned teachers with classroom experience ranging from seven to twenty-five years.

Student Subjects

One hundred and thirty-nine students participated in the study. Eighty-eight percent of the students were in the appropriate grade for their age. They ranged in age from 14 years, 9 months to 18 years, 9 months. The average was 15 years, 5 months.

Table 1 (below) presents the distribution of the English marks for the 139 Grade 10 students in the study while they were in Grade 8 and 9.
Table 1
distribution of marks: Grade 8 and 9 English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Teacher dp</th>
<th>Teacher ka</th>
<th>Teacher rs</th>
<th>Teacher rp</th>
<th>Teacher nc</th>
<th>Teacher gk</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=24</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>n=24</td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>n=25</td>
<td>n=139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x=46</td>
<td>x=52</td>
<td>x=48</td>
<td>x=22</td>
<td>x=45</td>
<td>x=50</td>
<td>x=263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = the number of students  x = the number of grades available
dp/ka = control classes rs/rp/nc/gk = treatment classes

Records of the Grade 8 and 9 English marks were available for 96% of the participating Grade 10 students. [For an analysis of the individual class marks, see Appendix A.6] Averaging the marks for the six classes resulted in the following: A, 12.3%; B, 32.4%; C, 38.1%; Pass, 17.4%; F, 1.7%. In one class, 27% of the students received A's in Grade 8 and 9, in two others, 4% received A's; the remaining
two 25%. Combining the A and B range revealed one class with 53.9%, three with 50%, 49.1%, and 43.8%; the remaining two, 37.8% and 22%. In the control classes (dp, ka), 52% of the students received A's and B's while 48.5% of treatment 1 and 33% of treatment 2 students received A's and B's. On the whole, students in the six classes represented a typical range of secondary students in the schools.

DESIGN

This quasi-experimental study was conducted with a control group and two treatment groups.

The six teachers selected one of their Grade 10 English classes each to participate. To get a representative student sample, only heterogeneous classes participated. Grade 10 students were chosen for this study because they represent the mid-point of secondary schooling. Since subjects were at the mid-point of a five-year program, inferences can be drawn toward the higher and lower levels of secondary schooling.

The teachers and their classes were assigned to either a treatment or control group. The three schools had three, two and one teacher participant respectively. To prevent the sharing of information and strategies (treatment diffusion) by having teachers in the same school assigned to
both treatment and control groups, the school with two teachers became the control group. That left two schools, one with three and the other with one teacher respectively, to constitute the treatment groups.

Novels

The three novels in the study - *To Kill a Mockingbird*, *Animal Farm*, and *The Chrysalids* - were selected both from the approved B.C. Ministry list for Grade 10 and the stated preferences of the teachers [Appendix A.4]. Since all six teachers had taught *To Kill a Mockingbird*, it was selected as the first novel for all six classes. For the second novel, two control and two treatment teachers selected *Animal Farm*. Two control and one treatment teacher had previously taught it; one had not. The two remaining treatment teachers taught *The Chrysalids*. One teacher had previously taught it; one had not. Two treatment teachers used another novel to assure that any difference in effect could not be attributed to the novel. Each teacher taught two novels during the research.

Although the novels vary in subject and genre (traditional classic, fable, science fiction), all deal with conceptions of humanness, power struggles, human rights and class distinctions. Traditional narrative style characterizes all three novels.
The research was conducted in three separate strands: the teaching of a novel by the six teachers; inservice training for the four teachers in the treatment group; the teaching of a second novel by all six teachers. During the teaching of each novel, videotaping of three evenly distributed (early, middle, later) class sessions occurred. All six teachers taught *To Kill a Mockingbird* during the first phase. To attribute change to the inservice and avoid any change attributed to one specific novel, two control and two treatment teachers taught *Animal Farm*; the remaining two, *The Chrysalids* during the teaching of the second novel.

**Teacher Inservice**

Four treatment teachers participated in three inservice sessions. The first session introduced the teachers to transactive strategies in literature. Teachers engaged in several poetry and novel strategies requiring active reading, writing, listening and speaking, beginning individually or in small groups and reconvening to compare responses in the group as a whole.

To prepare for the second session, teachers were asked to record their ongoing responses during the reading of Cormier's *I Am the Cheese* in a Reading Response Log. By responding to the entire novel before discussion, teachers
experienced a personal transaction with the text and learned
that when "... the work has been evoked, it can become
the object of reflection and analysis" (Rosenblatt, 1990,
106). This experience formed the content of the two
subsequent inservice sessions: the process and content of
the Reading Response Logs (session two) and the implications
for content and pedagogy in teaching the second novel
(session three). An excerpt from each inservice session is
available on the videotape and accompanying transcript
included in the dissertation.

One control and two treatment teachers were on a
semester system; the remaining three on a term system. All
the classes met for fifty-five minutes. Videotaping
occurred in each class at the beginning, middle and end of
the novel unit.

DATA COLLECTION

Oral and written discourse data was collected.
Teachers submitted information on their educational
backgrounds and teaching experience. They selected two
novels to teach from the prescribed B.C. Ministry Grade 10
English Guide [Appendix A.1]. Oral discourse was gathered
by videotaping three class sessions for each novel and
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analyzing it through various data tools. Student writings about the novel constituted the written discourse data.

Interrater reliability calculations were conducted on each of the observation tools. Generally, two raters compared a sample of discourse for each observation tool. For general observation tools (classroom tasks [Appendix B.5], classroom observation card [Appendix B.1], for instance), one pre and post lesson for each teacher was used. The agreement ratings were derived from calculating a percentage of the number of identical ratings to the number of total ratings. For teacher and student talk (Appendix B.3 and B.4), six videotapes were randomly selected for comparison. Each column was tallied and calculated for both raters; the smaller a percentage of the larger. The eight (four utterances, four question) columns were subsequently averaged to achieve the interrater reliability for each observation tool.

1. **Oral Discourse**

This study incorporated various means of collecting oral discourse data ranging from general impressionistic perceptions to coding and tallying individual teacher and students statements and questions. To track the content and sequence of each class session, the time, event and comments
were recorded on a "Discourse Episode" sheet [Appendix B.8].

Videotaping offered numerous possibilities for collecting the oral discourse data: (a) reviewing the data (b) identifying individual students (c) focusing on specific discussion groups (d) providing a visual sense of student involvement in the lessons (e) comparing lessons, groups, novels. Videotaping eliminated the need for transcribing. Watching students and teachers speaking increased accuracy for data collection.

a. Classroom Observation Card [Appendix B.1]:

In the 1968 Squire and Applebee study of high school English, observers used observation cards to identify and succinctly describe the various elements of the English class. They found that sixty percent of English time was spent on literature and its teaching. More pertinent to the current study, the Observation Card provides a capsule overview of the class and indicates both the level of pupil involvement and pedagogical emphases, making possible a summarization of impressions for later data analysis.

The Observation Card provides an overview of the class: the activities, assignments, link(s) to previous lesson(s), pupil involvement, primary content and pedagogy. Recording
information required briefly listing, describing and ordering involvement (1 through 7), content (a through h) and method (a through 1). A scale of 1 through 5 at the bottom of the page provided an overall indicator of the class as a whole (similar to the general impression for writing). To determine interrater agreement, two raters independently recorded the information and compared each of the categories for six randomly selected classes from the overall group of thirty-six lessons. Interrater agreement was determined by the number of similar categories or ratings selected. Analysis revealed an interrater agreement of 94% for the section on pupil involvement, 100% for the order of emphasis (content), and 84% for the methodology. The average interrater agreement indicated a 93% for this observation tool. The general impression ratings concurred in five of six classes; the remaining class impression varied by one point.

b. Analyzing Transcripts of English Lessons [Appendix B.2]:

Watson (1983) developed this observation schedule (based on the work of Barnes, 1976) to conduct a study of ninety English classes involved in whole-class discussions. In a sub-sample of thirty of the ninety lessons, Watson found that of the 605 questions asked, only 170 qualified as
'open' (suggesting a range of responses or invitations for more scope for thinking); 97 of these occurred in five of the lessons. In the remaining 25 classes, 'open' questions constituted only 16% of the questions.

Watson analyzes secondary English lessons by stating three general questions elaborated into a number of specific items on teacher questioning ("open" or "closed"), reception of pupil responses, and conversational control. Both whole class and small group talk are considered. To more specifically reflect the kind of talk, each statement was augmented with a "degree" component (1 through 5). Raters indicated general levels ranging from "always" (1)/"never" (5) to "inattentive" (1)/"attentive" (5) after a completed viewing of the videotaped lesson. To determine interrater agreement, each teacher and student discourse category rating was calculated. The 1 through 5 ratings received one point per number; that is, each tally corresponded in value to the level indicated. The two raters calculated percentages based on the points possible for the total categories and the points received by each teacher. Comparing the tallies for the teacher talk resulted in a 93.0% agreement. Student talk revealed a 92.7% agreement.
c. **The Department of Education and Science Teacher Education Project:**

The Department of Education and Science in Britain undertook a four-and-a-half year research and development project in Teacher Education. Researchers observed over 1000 lessons and interviewed over 200 teachers making it the largest study of teaching skills ever undertaken in Britain. As part of the project, researchers conducted a sizeable study of mixed-ability teaching (code-named the Shemood Project) to discover the cognitive demands made on students. All periods of teacher talk, teacher questions, student responses and student tasks were noted and coded during a sequence of lessons. The researchers assumed that "almost all manifestations of thinking in classrooms can be divided either into the three oral components (teacher talk, questions and pupil response) or into tasks set by individual teachers" (Kerry, 1984, 164).

The Kerry study involved 36 teachers and 135 pupils in 213 lessons. In summary, Kerry found classroom verbal exchanges consisted of 53.7% managing, 42.2% informing and only 4.1% "stimulating" (requiring higher order thinking). Task-setting occurred frequently; 4.3 times per 80 minute session. In English, 66.6% were lower order tasks, 33.3% higher order (compared to the overall average of 85% and 14.9%). Kerry concluded that most tasks failed to consider
individual abilities, few tasks made sufficient cognitive demands on any students, and considerable time was spent on trivial tasks.

(i) Teacher Talk and Questions [Appendix B.3]:

The teacher talk was coded for level of cognitive demand, ranging from T0 (management) to T3 (abstract ideas, laws, generalizations). Based on the work of Bloom (1956) and Turney (1973, 1975), the teacher questions used seven categories ranging from Q0 (management questions) to Q6 (evaluation questions). Though not explicitly hierarchical, T0 to T1 and Q0 to Q1 indicate lower order discourse; T2 to T3, Q2 to Q3, higher order discourse. To accommodate unclassifiable discourse, a T99 category was added.

For each videotaped lesson, teacher statements and questions were categorized and tallied in the appropriate column (T0-T3; Q0-Q3; T99). Each column was subsequently totalled. To achieve interrater reliability, regular cross-checking occurred. Comparing results for each allocated statement and question revealed an 89.9% interrater agreement.

(ii) Pupil Talk and Questions [Appendix B.4]:

Based on work by Gallagher (DES, 1970), pupil responses and initiations of talk (R0-R3) correspond to the teacher
categories [Appendix B.3]. Each pupil category was divided into response (r) and inquiry (i) to distinguish between statements and questions (R0-R3). Social Contact (C) and Incorrect Responses (RW) were added to the Pupil coding system. For the purposes of this study, each statement and question was coded and tallied for each student for both small group and whole class discussions. Videotapes were used to do the coding. To determine interrater reliability, the students in six of the thirty classes were randomly selected. Comparisons revealed a 96.68% correspondence.

(iii) Classroom Tasks [Appendix B.5]:

In the Kerry study, observers recorded and described 640 tasks set by the 36 participating teachers. Two analysts sifted them into "task types" and assigned appropriate labels, using the teachers' words where possible. The labels for the tasks emerged from the exact nature of the tasks assigned. Hence, it became possible both to create a category system and differentiate between lower (L1 - L12) and higher (H1 - H6) level tasks.

For the purposes of the current research, each task was described briefly on a "Discourse Episodes" sheet [Appendix B.8] and categorized and tallied on the Classroom Tasks sheet. Comparing the tasks for six randomly selected classes revealed a 97.5% correspondence.
d. **Discourse Episodes** [Appendix B.6]:

An informal data collection tool that numbers, specifies the time and topic and briefly describes the various discourse events occurring during each class session. This served as a guide for applying other observation tools, facilitated reviewing either entire lessons or specific segments on the videotapes allowed identifying specific segments for interrater reliability tests.

e. **The Fillion Grid** [Appendix B.7]:

Developed by Fillion (1981) as an informal tool to provide an overview and visual schematic of the focus of literary discussions, the grid categorizes a variety and scope of responses to literary works. Six areas common to literary discussions are placed vertically on a grid (events/plot, characters/relationships, setting/mood/atmosphere, images, ideas/themes, language: style/structure) and four levels of discourse (factual, interpretation, personal association/significance, evaluation) horizontally. Entries on the grid indicate both the content and level of the literary discourse.
Each discourse episode corresponds with the number of the task for the content and cognitive levels on the Fillion Grid. If discourse episode 1 involved writing a quiz on the novel at the simple recall level, that would be designated vertically in the events and characters columns and horizontally at the factual level and assigned to either teacher (T) or pupils (P) as 1-T. More than one level of discourse in a discourse episode required categorizing in the appropriate levels and literary elements. Tallying the agreement for two randomly selected classes resulted in a 91.3% interrater agreement.

f. Observation Schedule [Appendix B.8]:

To provide a measure for evaluating student classroom performance, Purves (1979) developed an observational tool intended to be used over at least three separate classroom observations to determine individual student involvement in the lessons. The prescribed observation schedule provides a view of both the variety and degree of involvement of the students during English classes. The form does not place hierarchical values on any particular activity; nor does it suggest that talking is necessarily better than listening. At least three observations are needed to obtain a sense of each student's behaviour and participation in the class; the current study used six. Videotaping allows reviewing the
session and providing an indication of involvement for individual students.

This systematic evaluation of student involvement in the literature class is based on ten activities such as listening, reading, writing, answering questions, or working in a group. If a student does not appear to participate to an observable degree, no mark is placed on the sheet. If a student participates to a degree, a "minus" (-) is entered in the appropriate box. Students who actively participate in any of the activities, receive a "plus" (+) in that category. Comparing for purposes of interrater reliability required providing a scale for each indicator of involvement: no sign (1), - (2) and + (3). The records of six students in six randomly selected classes were used to determine correspondence. Tallies revealed a 88.3% interrater reliability.

2. Data Collection: Written Discourse

General Response to Literature [Appendix C.1]:

Developed by the National Assessment of Educational Progress Staff for use in the intermediate through postsecondary-adult range, the General Response to Literature instrument (1979) permits a content analysis through classification or description both of the whole
response and individual statements. It was constructed to reveal the personal, literary and cognitive resources that students bring to their literary writing. Developed from analysis of responses of thirteen to seventeen-year-olds, the GRL has validity for assessing changes in emphasis or patterns in the writing due to instruction.

Each essay statement was coded using such categories as EG (egocentric), PR (personal - analytic), X (personal - global), EM (emotional), RT (retelling), IN (inferencing), GN (generalization), AN (analysis - superficial), Y (analysis-elaborated), OW (other works - general), Z (other works - specific), E (evaluation). Tallying the category totals could indicate the focus and the range of responses in the essay.

To maintain accuracy, comparisons were made at regular intervals during the analysis. Twelve essays for each set were randomly selected for comparison. The essays on *To Kill a Mockingbird* revealed a 93.1% interrater agreement; the essays on *The Chrysalids* and *Animal Farm*, 93.2%, also indicating a high degree of interrater agreement.

**General Impression:**

Like the oral discourse, a "general impression" value was given ranging from 1 (unrelated to topic, scattered) to
7 (clear, defensible literary response). To achieve interrater agreement, two readers compared twenty-five randomly selected essays for both novels. A comparison of the identical ratings by the two readers revealed an interrater agreement of 77.1%.

PROCEDURES AND TREATMENTS

Pilot Study

In May, 1989, a pilot study was conducted in one Grade 11 English class in a secondary school in the Surrey School district. The twenty-four students involved received a brief description of the research and a parental and student consent form. The students were heterogeneously mixed and all were registered in the academic English 11 course.

Videotaping occurred during the teaching of three short stories. The teacher proceeded through the short stories as she had traditionally done; no intervention occurred. After the second session, I conducted a brief inservice on "response to literature." To prepare for this session, both the teacher and I responded in writing during the reading of Flannery O'Connor's "Everything That Rises Must Converge." From this experience, we developed three response strategies for teaching "The Late Man." Students submitted brief essays on the short story, "The Late Man."
Major Study

Orientation

Initially, teachers received preliminary information about the research: a brief description of the research; novel preference sheets (for novels approved by the B.C. Ministry for Grade 10); requests for schedules and class lists; consent forms; Teacher Questionnaires and schedules of the videotape sessions. Students received a brief description of the research, videotaping procedures, and a personal and parental consent form.

Each class was observed three times during each of the two novel studies: at the beginning (class 2/3), in the middle (class 5/6) and toward the end (class 9/10), resulting in thirty-six videotaped observations. All three schools had fifty-five minute classes.

For each session, the camera was placed in the front at the side of each classroom to capture the entire class and avoid obvious intrusion. Three disk microphones were placed strategically to collect student discourse as clearly as possible. When students met in small groups, only one microphone was active at a time; the camera frequently rotated to individual groups to record a variety of discussions.
To analyze the oral and written discourse, one research assistant was trained. An experienced, professional educator, he earned his degree in History and completed a fifth year in education in 1987. He has spent fifteen years teaching in secondary schools and four years teaching English in Adult Basic Education.

**Novel Study # 1: Six Classes**

All the classes proceeded without any prescribed instructions or expectations. Teachers were encouraged to proceed as they normally would during a novel study. Discussion with the teachers was limited to procedures and scheduling. I attended all videotaping sessions. Students submitted both a literary essay and a "Degree of Liking" scale on the novel. Student essays were xeroxed before the teachers marked them.

**Inservice Training: Treatment Teachers**

Four teachers from two secondary schools participated in three inservice training sessions: one after-school and two full days. The initial session involved training teachers in several response strategies in poetry and the novel and introduced teachers to reader response theory. In preparation for the next inservice session, each teacher received a copy of Cormier's *I Am the Cheese*; None had read
the novel previously. In preparation for the second
in-service session, they read the novel by keeping an ongoing
written record of their observations, questions,
understandings and impressions in a journal while they read
(using the Reading Response Log Guide (Appendix C.2).

During the second session, teachers discussed the
process of reading and writing - their expectations,
interrupting the readings to write, and findings. Both the
researcher and the camera technician participated along with
the teachers. The two groups exchanged their Reading
Response Logs and subsequently used them to create and
extend dialogue about the novel.

The four teachers discussed the content of both their
Reading Response Logs and small group discussions. They
shared the process and effect of writing their responses and
bringing them to the small and larger discussion groups. To
prepare for the next session, each teacher was asked to
write a Reading Response Log for the first two chapters of
the next teaching novel; The Chrysalids or Animal Farm.

In the third session, teachers discussed the effects of
responding to a familiar piece of literature. They compared
the content of their written reflections in pairs. Using
the experience of their own response writings, the teachers
collaboratively developed strategies for teaching the second novel. All the teachers agreed to refrain from discussing the novel until all students had completed a Reading Response Log of their reading of the novel.

**Novel Study # 2: The Treatment Classes**

The four teachers introduced their students to the novel by reviewing the Reading Response Log Guide, instructing them to read and write during six to eight consecutive class periods. Each day, they posted daily reading requirements on the board to allow the students to complete their reading simultaneously. No discussion about the novel occurred until all students had completed their reading. Teachers read and wrote with their students. To duplicate the order of observations used during the first novel study, the first observation was a silent reading/writing session.

At the end of the reading/writing period, all ninety-one students in the treatment group submitted a Reading Response Log. With the teacher, I read and commented in the margins: questions ("Could you answer this question now?") instructions ("Bring this comment to your discussion group"), shared responses ("I wondered about this, too"), a fresh insight ("I never thought of this before"). Evaluative comments were avoided.
When the students received their Reading Response Logs in the next class, they reread their own responses and the comments. They were instructed to place a check mark next to the questions and confusions that had been resolved in their reading and to place a circle around any unresolved issues.

In small groups, the students exchanged Response Logs, discussed their responses and worked to answer the unresolved issues. Answers, insights and new information could be added. Remaining questions were raised to the whole group. At this point, teachers selected various strategies for addressing the unresolved concerns. Discussion and further writing about the novel ranged from four to six lessons.

Topics for literary essays stemmed from the discussions and writing in two of the treatment classes. Norm provided some initial writing time and assigned the essay for homework. Gail directed the students to prepare for the in-class essay by reviewing their response logs and deciding on a topic that they wished to write about. Roni and Renata assigned the topics in the two remaining treatment classes. Renata's class received the essay assignment after the Christmas holidays. Both assigned the essays as homework allowing little or no class time for writing.
Control Groups

The two control groups studied *Animal Farm* with no intervention. Both teachers introduced the novel in an historical context, providing background details of the Russian Revolution and drawing parallels to historical characters. Students read portions of the text, completed comprehension questions, provided summaries of historical characters, wrote chapter quizzes. Both classes were assigned essays on the text and had time during the lessons to prepare. Both teachers allowed the students two weeks for completion.

SCORING AND ANALYSIS

The oral discourse was collected through the videotaped sessions in each classroom; a total of thirty-six fifty-five minute classes were recorded. Students submitted an essay after each novel study. Of the 139 students, 114 submitted essays based on *To Kill a Mockingbird* (82.01%); 105 for *Animal Farm* or *The Chrysalids* (75.54%).

Training and Scoring: Oral Discourse

Three pilot study videotapes served to train and familiarize the research assistant and I with the observation schedules. During training, each rater provided a score, code, degree or priority; comparisons followed. Discussion of the support of both agreements and
digressions occurred, occasionally prompting revisions and alterations of some (adding a "degree" component to "Analyzing Transcripts in English Classes," for instance). The initial training sessions required three days.

Both observers recorded each "discourse episode" stating the time, content, and adding any relevant anecdotal comments. Recording the discourse episodes allowed reviewing of specific portions of the oral discourse episodes as needed. The research assistant analyzed the videotapes for the general observations and teacher talk; I analyzed student talk, coded the Fillion Grid and completed the observation schedule for each student.

Randomly numbering the videotapes from one to thirty-six avoided identifying experimental and control groups. To maintain consistency and accuracy and avoid "observer's drift," regular cross-checking occurred. Seven videotapes were checked in three ways: first, General Impression, Classroom Observation Card, Classroom Tasks and Analyzing Transcripts of English; second, Teacher Talk; third, Student Talk, Student Profile and the Fillion Grid.

Training and Scoring: Written Discourse

Twelve essays submitted for the short story in the pilot project received a general impression rating from 1
(low) to 5 (high). The research assistant took six randomly selected essays and provided a general impression rating.

The twelve pilot project essays initially underwent a similar procedure using the General Response to Literature tool. Since each statement was coded, comparison involved determining the percentage of identical categories.

DATA PROCESS AND ANALYSIS

The data was transferred to computer coding sheets and entered into the computer for analysis. Details of the results and analyses will be discussed in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The results of the study are discussed in two major sections: oral and written discourse in secondary literature classes. Four sections report the results regarding the content and quality of the written discourse (Questions 1 and 2) and the content and quality of the oral discourse (Questions 3 and 4). To elaborate on and characterize specific results, student and teacher dialogues are used throughout the chapter. These can be also be found in the enclosed video presentation as well as the accompanying viewing guide [Appendix D]. In relating the results, chi-squares are reported only where the contrasts between the treatment and control groups or the pre and post lessons require additional support (to indicate that teachers were very similar in the pre lessons, for instance). Where chi-squares have been omitted, the contrasts are obviously significant or non-significant as indicated. The chapter closes with a general summary of substantive findings.
WRITTEN DISCOURSE IN THE LITERATURE CLASSROOM

I. The Content of the Written Discourse

The content of the writing will be discussed by examining the various writing assignments in the six classes both before and after the inservice. Classroom observations included an anecdotal record of the written assignments on the novel leading to the formal essay [Appendix B.8]. A discussion of the content of the writing assignments during the reading of the novels precedes a discussion of the literary essays.

A. General Writing Assignments

Pre Treatment

In the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird, writing assignments included chapter questions, quizzes, definitions, journal entries, note-taking, script writing, class presentations, posters, and essays.

The content of the writing assignments frequently involved answering comprehension questions on the factual details relating to the characters and events of the novel. During taped interviews, Tammy described these assignments:
Because if you do questions you can read a chapter, you read half a chapter and get let's say you hand in your homework and you can get five questions out of six and not have even read the whole chapter and just go to the next chapter because we usually just do chapter questions.

Most of the writing consisted of finding answers directly in the novel (Shanen: "You just skim over it for the important facts").

Quizzes were a staple in five of the classes. In preparation, students read a section of the novel either at home or during a lesson. Most questions required a word or phrase responses, multiple choice or matching exercise of the factual data. NC read brief sections directly from the novel, ending each quotation with an incomplete thought leaving students to "fill in the blank" (lessons 1 and 3). A quiz during RP's lesson was preceded by these instructions:

What I want you to do now on the back is a really quick quiz to review what you remember about the questions. You can see it says on the left the name of the characters and on the right the characteristics about those people. Please go through and maybe at the end of each name put next to each number the letter on the right which matches. Okay, move through it as quickly as you can. (RP, lesson 2)

At times, the writing extended beyond the factual. During one lesson, students assumed a character's perspective to write journal entries (RP, lesson 1).

RP: Last time I talked to you about the journals you chose a character and you decided to be that
person. I would like you to continue on now as we read the book. Continue on and maybe write down your feelings about something that has happened in the last few chapters we have read. How do you feel about it as that character? Sort of give me an internal monologue of your feelings or thoughts, or maybe even recount what's happening in your life since the last time you wrote or just continue right from where you started. Would it help if we read out some of our excerpts from last day or would you like to just get started?

S1: Just get started.

Students express some hesitancy: "I'm not in the mood" and "I don't understand this" and "You just do it again, on the same page?" Finally, RP offers to read her own entry to clarify the expectations:

RP: Last week we chose, last time we did it we chose a character. Remember that part? OK, then you started to write notes on the thoughts and feelings of that person, just as if you were that person. Say I was Scout. 'Today I went up to the Radley house. Although I am really frightened of the Radley house, I am willing to go up and touch it. In fact, I was dared to.' So you're telling what happened from that person's point of view. OK? So let's start with that and use the book and tell what's happened to you to begin with. It'll be a good ten minutes.

S1: What chapters are we working out of?
RP: Any chapter you like.

During another lesson (RS, lesson 1), students had to find a series of adjectives to describe and categorize the main characters. In all cases, however, teachers framed and shaped the content; that is, students received assignments to assume a character, find the adjective, or select a prescribed essay topic.
When teachers returned written assignments, students glanced at the grade before inserting it into their notebooks. Teachers did not use the written assignments to induce either further written or oral discourse about the novel. They collected the writing assignments without reviewing them, comparing student selections, or sharing them in small groups.

Post Treatment: General Writing Assignments

Control Classes

Writing in the control classes consisted of copying historical data from overheads (KA, lesson 4), matching historical dates and events to events in the novel (DP, lesson 4,5), selecting three of twenty questions to answer and present in small groups (KA, lesson 5), chapter questions (DP, lesson 4,5), choosing three words from each chapter to define (DP), a three chapter quiz (KA, lesson 6) and taking notes from resources on one historical person involved in the Russian Revolution (DP, KA). Students had to find the events in the novel that matched a given set of dates (KA, lesson 4). Teachers focused primarily on using the novel to draw historical parallels. Though teachers assigned a variety of writing activities, no observations of a class reviewing any comprehension questions or definitions
occurred. It appears that most writing assignments were submitted to the teacher for marking.

**Treatment Classes**

The content of the writing altered for the treatment classes. Students and teachers responded to the novels in a Reading Response Log. While they read, they recorded their perceptions, understandings and questions. Teachers did not prescribe content expectations short of providing a response guide [Appendix C.2].

The ongoing writing in the Reading Response Log prompted many questions (over 300 in one log), observations, and links to historical events and current conditions. The content varied for each reader. One teacher commented:

"... one of the things I noticed in reading the journals last night is how different everyone's comments and ideas were. How everybody in the room came into this assignment with different ideas. You noticed different things. Some of you noticed things that I didn't notice and I've read the book five times." (RP, lesson 5).

Students in both treatment groups used the logs to reflect on the content of *Animal Farm* and *The Chrysalids*. About *Animal Farm*, students personally reacted to the characters and events ("I don't like the pigs, they are too greedy. They want to control everything and everybody"),
questioned ("What is a trotter?", "Animals talk?", "How did the word get around that there was to be a meeting in the barn?")
connected to historical events ("Napoleon is like Louis XIV, Hitler and Napoleon Bonaparte all in one," "These pigs remind me of Jim and Tammy Baker," "The harness room could be representing the Kremlin", "He's like Hitler", "They talk like Russians, i.e. "comrades"," "Their farm represents a country in our society, maybe Russia?", "Mollie is the 'Benedict Arnold' of Animal Farm"), reflected on human nature and the human condition ("Animals took advantage of generosity just as man does"). In addition, students predicted, requested definitions, responded emotionally to the characters and events, drew analogies, identified with characters, made connections to earlier information, judged situations, offered advice and evaluated Orwell and the novel.

Students reading The Chrysalids responded in a variety of ways. They asked questions: "Nobody must know - but if they found out, how badly would Sophie be treated?" "Does this place Waknuk have any laws besides laws against the mutants?" Carla's questions "What happened to the Old People?" "Who are they [the Old People]? Who do they represent? Why are they no longer in existence?" led her later to ask:
"How long ago did these people live? They still don't know that the world is round. Or are they far into the future but have to start again because the Old People wrecked it for them?"

One student sounded a warning: "If our society doesn't start to accept others' differences, we could end up having a different 'Tribulation' war." Another compared characters from the two novels: "It seems to me that Uncle Axel may turn out to be a bit like Atticus." Yet another compared characters within the novel: "I noticed that the character of the inspector is in strong contrast to that of Joseph."

Many reacted strongly to Joseph Strom, the restrictive religious laws and treatment of the mutants. A variety of questions, reflections and reactions characterized the reading response logs of both treatment groups.

The remaining writing consisted of written reflections on small group and discussions, listing personal questions to prepare for discussions, answering personal questions, creating lists of unanswered questions in the small group to bring to the discussion (Why didn't the animals rebel?, Why are the pigs so evil?) and generating possible topics for essays. Puzzling issues (the time frame of The Chrysalids, why the animals did not rebel under Napoleon's leadership, for instance) and unresolved questions ("What happened to Aunt Harriet's baby?") formulated in the Reading Response.
Log and subsequent discussions informed the ongoing writing in the reading response logs. In one lesson (GK, class 6) students developed eighteen different topics based on the questions and issues that had arisen during discussions. All four classes used student questions for small group and whole class discussions. Students did not write any comprehension questions, definitions, or quizzes on the novels.

B. The Literary Essay

Pre Treatment

Students wrote literary essays in all six classes. The two control teachers each presented the essay during the observed lessons. DP wrote a paragraph on the board as a way of introducing the five paragraph essay (lesson 2). KA introduced six topics on an overhead and discussed them with students during an observed lesson (lesson 3). The four treatment teachers assigned the essay at the end of the To Kill a Mockingbird unit. Students had opportunity to do some writing during the lesson in Gail (treatment 2) and Norm's (treatment 1) classes. Essays were assigned as homework assignments by Roni (treatment 1) and Renata (treatment 2). Norm initiated the writing of the essay during an observed lesson (lesson 6). Gail briefly reviewed the assigned in-
class essay (lesson 6). No descriptions or explanation of the essay assignment by Roni and Renata were observed.

To determine the content of each essay required examining the topics selected and determining a focus from The General Response to Literature [Appendix C.1] which analyzes the essay statements into twelve possible categories including retelling (RT), personal response (PR, X), generalizations (GN) and comparing the novel to other works (OW, Z). Together, these indicate essay content.

In both the control classes, teachers spent considerable time reviewing the topics eliciting and offering evidence from the novel to validate the claims of the topic. KA (lesson 3) offered six different topics to write about. The first topic asks how the mad dog incident at the end of part one prepares the reader for part two. Another essay topic read:

Everyone in Macomb had their place. Explain the class structure as it is described in the book by both Atticus and Aunt Alexandra. Tom was killed because he was thought to have crossed the boundaries. Could a similar story be set in Canada today? Who would be the major player?

He articulated the content expected in the essay during the review of the essays:

KA: So the first topic, this is something you can write on, and it says, "How does the author use
"the mad dog?" Do you remember this part of the story? OK. Could you write, could you write two or three, two hundred words on that? Do you remember the whole, the story about the mad dog? Brandi, can you tell me about the mad dog, chapter ten or eleven?

S1: Um, well this dog was running - I didn't understand that part actually very much because I didn't think it fit in very well...

KA: So, the dog is diseased. At one point before that they, they refer to Macomb's disease. Do you remember what the town's disease is? They use the word disease in a special way.

S2: Racism

KA: Racism. OK. So you can see Jason how this incident with the dog prepares us for the second part of the book and stands for, symbolizes, can you see that?

S1: No, I'm not sure...

KA: No you have to, it's a difficult thing to see. OK. I appreciate that these questions are all interpretive. but what I'm trying to say is that they, they ask you to see beyond the literal, the first level of meaning. And maybe, maybe there shouldn't be any questions like that, maybe there should just be questions that ask you to tell what happened, you know, explain. (lesson 3)

Content of the literary essays connects to the topics students select. Teachers assigned a total of thirty-one different writing topics for the six classes, an average of five per class. Topics suggested by teachers ranged from one for the whole class (RS) to ten (GK). When options were given, most students tended to select two more frequently than others. Only in the class that had ten options did a fairly even distribution occur. Typical assignments included prejudice (the only assignment for one lesson), the symbol of the mockingbird, Atticus as a father, and
comparing the movie version to the novel. Of the thirty-nine suggested topics, three extended beyond the novel: writing an epilogue, comparing current views of the mentally handicapped to those of the 1930's, and the criminal justice system in the south.

In about half the lessons, students had time to work together in small groups or pairs to find the content or do some peer editing.

Each essay was analyzed to determine the predominant focus using the GRL [Appendix C.1] by categorizing each essay sentence. The category containing the highest number of sentences suggests the predominant focus of the essay. If an equal number of categories emerged, both served as the focus. Since some essays received a double rating, adding the numbers in the columns may exceed the number of essays submitted (see Table 2 below). As Table 2 reveals, retelling (RT) proved the most predominant response for the greatest number of students in four classes (DP, NC, GK, RP), analysis (Y) for one (KA) and personal response to the content (PR) for the other (RS). Retelling proved the most predominant focus in the To Kill a Mockingbird essays.
Table 2

The Predominant Focus of Student Essays Determined by Categories and Values Assigned in the G. R. L.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/Treat. 1/2 Teacher</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>No. of Essays</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Retelling (RT)</th>
<th>Analysis (Superficial)</th>
<th>Personal Analysis (PA)</th>
<th>Generalization (GM)</th>
<th>Spec. Ref. to Other Novels (2)</th>
<th>Analysis (Y)</th>
<th>Inferencing (IN)</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Assigned Categories</th>
<th>Average Category Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control KA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 WC</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GK</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post Treatment: The Literary Essay

Control Classes

Table 2 below reveals that the control class essays differed in emphasis from the first set. Essays in DP's class shifted from twenty of the twenty-two essays being predominantly Retelling (RT) to a wider distribution with ten of the nineteen essays in the Personal-Analytic category. KA's essays remained in the analysis (Y) category with nineteen of the twenty-seven essays in the pre writing and nineteen of the twenty-three in the post.

Though each class submitted a set of essays, various approaches and contents characterized them. KA's class selected three of the twenty topics offered, prepared answers in small groups and presented their findings orally. They wrote on topics examining Orwell's selection of animals, Benjamin's role in the revolution, how Napoleon gained power, examples of satire in the novel, how the masses must be governed, Boxer's role, and how the pigs controlled the other animals. Because the small groups could select any three questions, many students chose the same questions to answer. During oral presentation, nine students reported on a comparison of Snowball and Napoleon to historic characters.
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DP's class could select one of eight topics. Students submitted individual essays. Topics included developing a radio program about the revolution, bringing about political change, governing the masses, power corrupts, leaders of the revolution, using animals to represent historical characters, a sequel to the novel, and propaganda.

Most essays recapitulated the revolution and the historical context of the novel. Some students in DP's class wrote interviews ("Today we have the one and only George Orwell and he's going to tell us about Animal Farm II" Bryan, DP), and radio programs (". . .Good evening and welcome to Channel 1's special report" Misty, DP).

Treatment Classes

Retelling (RT) occurred less dominantly in one treatment class in each treatment group (NC, GK). Essays for RS remained primarily in the personal-analytic category (PR) while essays for RP moved from a range of categories to all the essays in the analysis (Y) category.

Two treatment classes (NC, GK) offered possible essay topics from the content of their response writing and discussions. Topics included alternate endings, comparison of Animal Farm to history, why Animal Farm is not a good
book, discussing the rule changes, how Napoleon gained power and the role of Squealer. The students collaborated in collecting topics both as a class and in small groups. One treatment class (RP) studying Animal Farm wrote on the same topic (comparing the leadership styles of Napoleon and Snowball). The other class could select from seven topics with eight of the twenty-four students writing a character sketch of Napoleon.

One treatment class (RS) reading The Chrysalids wrote on prejudice, fanaticism, the repeating of history, the younger versus the older generation. The second treatment class (GK) reading The Chrysalids wrote an in-class essay selecting a personal topic relating to something that interested or puzzled them in the novel. Twenty-three students submitted essays on eighteen different topics such as an evaluation of the novel, who is Uncle Axel?, the world of The Chrysalids, the powers of the children, the role of Petra, prejudice and closed-minded people, confusions in the novel, why Anne commits suicide and unfinished business in The Chrysalids, among others.

With the exception of the in-class essays (GK, treatment 2), most teachers in both control and treatment classes limited topic choices. As in the first essay
writing, students tended to select two topics more than the others. Some shifts in content occurred for one control, two treatment 1 and one treatment 2 classes. Less retelling (RT) characterized the second essays.

II. Quality of the Written Discourse

The link between content and quality exists in written as well as oral discourse. A discussion of the ongoing written assignments and the literary essays on the novel follows.

A. General Writing Assignments

Pre Treatment

As Table 3 below reveals, the six classes participated primarily in lower order writing tasks [Appendix B.5]: chapter questions, quizzes, matching exercises, definitions, and paragraphs on novel characters. In the control classes, 90%, 100% and 71% of the writing assignments were classified as lower order for the control, treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups respectively. The number of writing assignments assigned during the three pre lessons ranged from two to seven indicating that on the average, students wrote once or twice during a lesson.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/Treat. 1/ Treat. 2</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Lower Order Tasks</th>
<th>Higher Order Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>L11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2 40 1 20 1 20 4 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3 43 1 14 3 43 7 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2 67 1 33 3 100 3 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3 50 1 17 2 33 6 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1 17 5 83 6 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 MC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2 100 2 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2 50 1 25 3 75 1 25 1 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1 33 1 33 2 66 1 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two student groups wrote journal entries (assume a character's perspective and the effects of categorizing people). Both RS and RP defined the expected content and length. Unless required (oral presentation or marking, for instance) students did not share the contents of their writing with anyone other than the teacher. RP (lesson 2) asked students to read their journal entries to the others; no one volunteered. GK assigned chapter questions to small groups (lesson 1). When one student group had reported their answers to the whole class, GK, running out of time, answered the remaining questions asking students to mark their own. Another class (DP, lesson 1) marked their comprehension questions in small groups while the teacher circulated, recording the marks in her day book. On the whole, writing provided a record of the students' comprehension of the factual data of *To Kill a Mockingbird* through a variety of writing assignments. Generally, students worked individually and teachers collected and marked the papers.

A review of the assignments for all six classes revealed little time allocated to writing during the observed lessons. Teachers appeared to assign most of the writing for homework. In the six classes, thirty-four
writing assignments occurred during the eighteen lessons. Twenty-eight consisted of copying (L4), comprehension questions (L10), reinforcing (L11) and looking up information (L12), all categorized as lower order tasks [Appendix B.5]. Most of the remaining tasks involved journal writing.

Post Treatment: General Writing Assignments

Control Classes

In the control classes, writing tasks [Appendix B.5] focused on the lower levels - copying information from the board (L4), chapter questions, review sheets, definitions (L10), information from outside resources on the Russian Revolution (L12). KA required more writing during the teaching of this novel. Most of it consisted of copying notes from the overhead and looking up information on the Russian Revolution (L11, L12). Both teachers had drawn explicit parallels in their lectures on the Russian Revolution; hence, most of this task could be categorized as simple comprehension (L10). Students were assigned to investigate the characters and draw parallels to the novel as preparation for class presentations as a final assignment on Animal Farm. As in the oral discourse, recitation of the factual data characterized the writing.
Treatment Classes

Writing in the four treatment classes consisted of students and teachers recording their perceptions of Animal Farm and The Chrysalids while they read. Students received a "response guide" that consisted primarily of "prompts" to be used if needed [Appendix C.2] but no information about the novels. Hence, students implemented problem-solving (H2), analysis (H3) and application (H3) to articulate their reading in the response logs. Students read and wrote about the novel for six to eight lessons.

The written responses averaged about seven pages and ranged from one page (one student) to sixteen pages. Because teachers did not introduce or discuss the novel during the reading, students constructed their own understandings in the response log. Much of the content prescribed by the control teachers (information in the novel, historical parallels, definitions, questions, characterizations) emerged without teacher intervention in the response logs.

The response logs revealed a range of responses, some strongly personal ("I dislike David's father with a passion"); others more detached and probing ("I think what David said, 'I would rather have a sword hanging over me..."
than burning inside me,' show his maturity").
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If the

used for analyzing the oral

discourse had been applied to the response logs, the writing
would cluster in the interpretation, analysis/ application,
personal association and evaluation categories and touch on
a significant portion of the literary elements.

Students

reflected more on the concepts of the novel through
questions, hypotheses, speculations and personal responses
to the novel as the following examples illustrate:
I predict that the animals will somehow overthrow Mr.
Jones, be happy for a while and then somebody will try
to take over and their lives will be no better.
All animals are equal but some animals are more equal
than others.
Why have an election with only one
candidate?
The farm represents a country in our
society (Maybe Russia?).
The flag they raise
resembles the Russian flag in a way.
The Republic
of the Animals could be the U.S.S.R.
which is made up
The harness room could be
of Republics.
representing the Kremlin.
I was truly astonished
that the van [to pick up Boxer] was from the glue
factory. Oh, what cruel pigs1
Napoleon seems
like a king. Snowball was much smarter. Squealer
sounds like a politician. Hapoleon is like Louis XIV,
Hitler and Napoleon Bonaparte all in one.
The
line
"They were truly their own masters and
that the work they did was for their own benefit" This
statement is not true because all the work was done for
If the animals didn't want to be
Napoleon.
controlled, then why were they letting the pigs tell
Power is going to Napoleon's
them what to do?
head. The animals are realizing what Napoleon's
doing
he's becoming "human."
I wish they would
have rebelled against the pigs. The pigs were so
caught up in becoming more human, that they only began
The pigs became so much
to care about themselves.
like man that it was impossible for anyone to tell the
pigs from the men so the pigs actually defeated the
purpose of trying to be as unlike man as much as
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possible. . . How can someone end a story like this? What a bad ending. (Animal Farm)

Sophie has six toes. Today people would treat her with a slight awkwardness. But in the book she's seen almost as a monster, someone horrible and that is why David is confused. . . I'd like to know more about the deviations and why people think that they are evil. . . There is a code of silence. One that applies to knowledge - knowledge of the past. Anyone who tries to bring about or talk about the past was silenced in one way or the other. . . Everything around the people starts to change. Sophie has an extra toe, David is telepathic with his friends, a neighbour's cat has no tail and horses start to grow to twice their size. This is not normal so I know things are starting to change around this town. I hope I can figure it out later in the book. . . This time he [Joseph Storm] thinks that just because a horse is big it is the work of the devil. I am starting to think that he is ignorant. . . All he [Joseph Storm] says is that deviations should be killed and to pray. This guy is worse than Jim Baker. . . This book so far is similar to the first book we read in that prejudice is in it. . . This story must have something to do with special powers, E.S.P., etc. because of the way David was trying to read Sophie's mother's thoughts. They seemed to be able to semi-communicate without speaking. . . I hope David and his friends don't get caught with their psychic powers because I'm really beginning to like them. . . Is this a future or different world altogether or what continent? Who are the Old People that so many references are made to? . . . Only an atomic or nuclear fallout could result in the large areas known as the black coasts on the radioactive ruins that glow in the dark. So is tribulation only nuclear war with the survivors' denial of it? . . . Nobody in this story shows any feelings. The mother didn't even try to comfort her sister, Aunt Harriet. . . I think the author has a degree of morbidity in him. . . At last the story is starting to get good. . . It's the kind of action I like. . . This book is becoming like a soap opera. . . The story book characters that Petra's scared of are just like people's fear of going to Junior High. . . Sophie's back! I'm so glad she's alive. . . One thing that I like about David is that he's neutral, the pivot point.
The ending of this book is the stupidest ending I've read in a long, long time. . . . If our society doesn't start to accept others' differences, we could end up having a different "Tribulation" war. . . . There seems to be a hidden message in the story. Could the people in Labrador be an exaggerated example of our society today? . . . I also enjoyed the book because of the psychic powers that the kids had. My overall opinion of this book is very good.

(The Chrysalids)

Teachers in the treatment classes returned the student logs. Students reread the logs with interest and readily shared them with other students. Tammy commented that at times she would reread portions of her log and say, "Wow! I wrote that?" (NC). Sharing the logs publicly exposed students to numerous other responses. Cory reflected that when he read other logs, he "could tell what others were thinking" (NC). In each of the four lessons, students took an active interest in both their own and other students' responses to the novel.

Some students expressed their perceptions of the novel through the writing in taped interviews:

Tammy: . . . you can understand the story more.
Cory: I found it almost made you have to learn the story more because you're always reading over your notes . . . . just by writing all the notes and reading all the notes, I had a really good grasp of what the story was about and the characters.
On the whole, students wrote more, used the writing for further oral and written discourse and shared the writing with other students. Students used the writing to respond reflectively on the novel individually and communally.

Figure 1 illustrates that both the control and treatment groups focused primarily on the lower order tasks during the teaching of *To Kill a Mockingbird*. While the control classes engaged exclusively in lower order writing tasks, both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes engaged exclusively in higher order writing tasks for teaching of the second novel.
Figure 1
A Comparison of Frequencies of Lower and Higher Order Written Tasks Averaged per Group
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Post

L10 Simple Comprehension
L11 Reinforcing
L12 Looking Up Information
H1 Imaginative
H2 Problem Solving
H3 Application
H4 Analysis
B. The Literary Essay

Teachers used a variety of approaches to writing essays. For *To Kill a Mockingbird* essays, one control class (DP) wrote essays with a partner. The other (KA) wrote an in-class essay. All four treatment classes submitted individual essays. For the teaching of the second novel, both control classes worked in small groups to develop an essay for oral presentation. Treatment 1 classes submitted individual essays, treatment 2, one individual (RS) one in-class individual (GK). In total, 104 of the 139 students participating in the study submitted essays for *To Kill a Mockingbird* (75%) and 99 students of the 139 submitted essays for the second novels (71%).

The framework for determining the quality of the essay is linked to its content (Question three), purpose, audience, and teacher expectations for the writing. Like the quality of oral discourse, the writing cannot be qualitatively evaluated outside the context of teacher expectations. Since teachers generally provide titles, format, audience and requirements, students work within that context.
To determine the quality of the essays, two measures were applied: a general impression ranging from 7 (high) to 1 (low) and the General Response to Literature [Appendix C.1]. An impressionistic rating of each essay required reading and assigning a rating to the essay between 1 (high) and 7 (low). Consideration was given to the topic and the student's explanation or defense.

Pre Treatment: The Literary Essay

The two control teachers assigned the literary essay toward the end of their reading of To Kill a Mockingbird. Both took class time to discuss the assignment. One (DP) reviewed the structure of the five-paragraph essay on the board. Asking students to "pretend I don't know anything," she asked them to review "what's wrong" with the paragraph." At one point she stated, "Do you like that?" The class answered "No!" in chorus. Students had difficulty offering alternatives. Finally, DP did most of the work ending with, "I like that. You guys did a good job!" Students began writing topic sentences with a partner to get started on their essay avoiding the paragraph on the board because "That's fine but that's mine - you can't use that!" They had additional time to share their writing with a partner and to revise it before submitting it to their teacher.
KA listed a number of topics on the overhead and reviewed the appropriate information required for each one introducing the essay as follows: (lesson 3):

I started last night to think of how to come up with some assignment, a writing assignment that you could understand and that you could deal with and I had some trouble thinking about this story in a way that I could be sure that you would understand. So what I did was I came up with six, six topics and these are things we can talk about and then they will become, we can change them, and we can add others and then whatever we end up with will become your assignment for next period. Do you understand what I'm saying? OK. (lesson 5)

Based on this discussion, students wrote an in-class essay during the next lesson.

No observations occurred during the assigning of essays for the four treatment classes though all the classes submitted essays. Table 4 below contains the ratings assigned to the essays for the teaching of both novels. The scale ranges from 1 (low) to 7 (high).
### Table 4

General Impression Ratings for all Student Essays for Both Pre and Post Novels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/Treat. 1</th>
<th>Treatment 2</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total Ratings</th>
<th>No. of Essays</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 CK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An examination of the general impression of the essays (Table 4) revealed that no essays received a 7 (high) rating in either the control or treatment groups. A majority of the essays fell in the middle range (4 and 5); 56% for the control classes, 68% for treatment 1 classes and 63% for treatment 2 classes.

A second way to determine quality of the writing required applying the General Response to Literature [Appendix C.1] to each essay (Table 2). Each sentence was categorized for such qualities as retelling (RT), analyzing (AN, Y), inferencing (IN), evaluating (EV) and comparing (OW, Z) and a tally of each category conducted. Each category received a value related to the general nature of the writing assignment. Since the essays generally required literary analysis, the hierarchy reflects the teacher expectations for effective essays:

- Egocentric (EG) - 1
- Retelling - 2
- Analysis - Superficial - 3
- Emotional (EM) - 4
- Other Works - specific (Z) - 6
- Generalization (GN) - 6
- Analysis - elaborated (Y) - 7
- Evaluation - 2
- Personal - Global (X) - 3
- Personal - analytic (PR) - 4
- Other Works - general (OW) - 5
- Inferencing (IN) - 7

By applying the categories of the General Response to Literature to each sentence in the essays, two dimensions of
the writing could be uncovered. First, the focus of the essay could be determined by locating one or more categories with the largest number of sentences. In four of the six classes (DP, RP, NC, GK), the largest number of students focused on retelling (RT). The remaining two classes (KA, RS) focused primarily on analysis (Y) and personal-analytic (PR) respectively.

Second, by totalling the value of each sentence and dividing by the number of sentences, a numerical value on a scale from one through seven could be determined. An averaged score of six or seven represents the higher scale categories; a score below four a focus on the lower scale categories. In the control classes essays averaged 4.6, in treatment 1 classes, 4.0 and treatment 2, 3.9.

In their essays, students often used formal, stilted and formulaic language:

In the story "To Kill a Mocking Bird", there are examples of the United States justice system in action. The criminal justice system in the U.S. may be considered from at least three perspectives.

First, it can be considered a normative system, that is, a body of legal rules expressing social values. (Anita, GK)
Retelling the events of *To Kill a Mockingbird* proved to be the most frequent strategy for writing in four of the six classes:

One fine Saturday, Jem and Scout went out, hoping to shoot a small animal with their air rifles. They were walking down the street when they saw a dog acting strangely. They ran home and told Calpurnia. Then she alerted all the people on the street to stay inside.

(Akira and Dan, DP)

Circular language and repetition occurred in many essays:

Courage is something that is greatly needed in the world today, as it was needed in the 1930's. There's many definitions for the word courage. Some of the them are (mental or moral strength to venture persevere and without stand danger, fear or difficulty.) No one can really explain it, it's a very confusing word. But to survive you need it. (Trisha, GK)

Some students continued the *To Kill a Mockingbird* saga:

Charles Baker Harris (Dill) became a successful writer who wrote six best seller mystery novels from which he earned a lot of money. This did not surprise anybody that knew him when he was younger because he had such a good imagination then. (Kyla, RP)

Most of the students wrote essays that retold the events of *To Kill a Mockingbird*. Rating the essays revealed that a majority of the essays ranked in the middle.

**Post Treatment: The Literary Essay**

**Control Classes**

In the control classes, student essays reflected the topics discussed during the lessons for *Animal Farm*:
historical parallels, change, communism, power corrupts, leaders of the revolution and a radio program announcing the takeover in DP's class. KA's students collaborated on writing and presented their topics to the class: the selection of animals for the allegory, the role of Benjamin, how Napoleon gained his domination, examples of satire, the ability of the masses to self-govern.

A shift toward higher ratings occurred in one control class (DP). Six of the sixteen essays (38%) received a rating of 6 out of 7 (Table 4). In the general impression ratings, class essays for DP rose from 4.5 to 4.9; KA's essays went from 3.6 to 3.4.

A shift in emphasis in the essays (Table 2) occurred for both control classes. Ten of the nineteen essays in DP's focused on personal-analytic (PR) while nineteen of the twenty-seven essays in KA's class focused on analysis (Y). Writing remained relatively similar to previous essays:

Benjamin was the oldest animal on Manor Farm and he was set in his ways. He was the donkey and he had seen revolutions come and go and he figured this one would be no different. He knew that in the beginning it started out with good intentions but he knew that it would end the same as always. (Brandi, Kelly, KA).
When students moved into more imaginative writing (interviews, radio programs, sequels in DP's class, the writing became less predictable:

"Well, here comes the ambulance carrying Napoleon and the pigs to the back of Animal Farm to be buried. Here come all the other animals in parade. It seems that they are happy! But why should they be happy, they don't have anyone to guide them now? Let’s talk to the only remaining pig who is Squealer. Squealer, my name is Red Raccoon and I'm from Animal News. How come you are the only pig left alive? Why weren't you killed with the rest of the pigs?" (Chris, DP)

Calculating the number of essays times the value of the category and averaging by the total number of assigned categories revealed that control class essays averaged 4.6 out of 7 for the essays and 5.0 for the second essays.

**Treatment Classes**

As Table 4 indicates, the general impressions for the essays in treatment 1 classes improved on the average from 4.4 out of 7 to 5.1, an improvement of .7. No change occurred for treatment 2 class essays (4.9).

Table 2 indicates the ratings assigned to each essay statement to determine the general focus of the essays. In treatment 1 essays, analysis (Y) and retelling (RT) proved predominant. Personal-analytic (PR) and analysis (Y) proved predominant for treatment 2 class essays. Multiplying each
predominant category times the assigned value revealed that treatment 1 classes went from 4.0 for To Kill a Mockingbird essays to 5.9 out of 7 for Animal Farm essays. More essays incorporated higher levels of analysis. Essays for The Chrysalids (treatment 2) shifted from 3.9 to 4.7 indicating some movement toward more analytic writing.

Most essay topics in both the control and treatment classes reflected the traditional literary essay: prejudice, fanaticism, character sketches and comparing characters, historical characters in the Russian Revolution, for instance. As tasks [Appendix B.5], these would likely constitute the lower order assignments (L10, L11); some would be categorized as higher order assignments (the H levels). All the essays on Animal Farm in RP's class compared Napoleon and Snowball:

In the novel "Animal Farm" George Orwell creates two strong characters, who, using their own talents compete for leadership of the farm. Snowball and Napoleon have some similarities but quite a bit more differences. (Jessica, RP)

The second class reading Animal Farm selected more topics. The writing, as the general ratings indicate (Table 4) improved:

One of the major questions in this novel is: How did Napoleon gain his power? The first thing that led to Napoleon's power over the animals is the death of Old Major. Being the former leader, Napoleon took advantage of Old Major's death. This death gave
Napoleon an opportunity to take over the farm. While the other animals were mourning old Major's death, Napoleon stepped in to give them a path to follow. (Trevor, NC)


Nine students discussed areas that continued to puzzle them in the novel. One wrote:

The part that frustrated me the most in this book was the last part, especially the last chapter. When the aircraft was hovering over the ground, was it a helicopter or some kind of flying saucer? And the silky, white webs that were flying out of the aircraft, were they some kind of human-made spider webs or some kind of chemical that scientists made up in Sealand? What happened to David's parents? Did they die or are they still alive? (Shawn, GK)

Students determining topics of interest for their essays appeared to create better essays (NC, treatment 1; GK, Treatment 2).
As Figure 2 depicts, some discrepancy exists between the general impression ratings (Table 4) and the average value assigned to each statement in the essays (Table 2). The greatest discrepancy occurred in the essays of KA's class (3.6 and 3.4 in Table 2; 5.7 and 5.5 in Table 4) and the second essays in RP's class (5.1 in Table 4 and 7.0 in Table 2 for the second essay). The General Response to Literature ratings indicates some improvement for all three groups, most notably for treatment 1 (from 4.0 to 6.0). The control and treatment 1 groups showed some improvement in the general impressions ratings (4.0 to 4.4, 4.4 to 5.2, respectively). In treatment 2 classes, one set of essays went from 5.0 to 4.6; the other from 4.7 to 5.2. Averaging the two class sets of essays indicates little change.
Figure 2
A Comparison of Averaged Ratings Assigned to Essays Using the General Response to Literature and General Impression Ratings in Each Group

Pre

Control | Treat 1 | Treat 2
---------|---------|---------
GRL: 4 | GI: 3 | GRL: 4 | GI: 3 | GRL: 5 | GI: 4

Post

Control | Treat 1 | Treat 2
---------|---------|---------
GRL: 5 | GI: 4 | GRL: 5 | GI: 4 | GRL: 6 | GI: 5

GRL: General Response to Literature 1-3: Low 4-5: Average 6-7: High
GI: General Impressions
In summary, writing assignments in the control classes during the reading of *Animal Farm* consisted primarily of comprehension questions, definitions, and copying historical data. In both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes, students wrote more, asked more questions, constructed their own understanding in the reading response logs and used them to compare their perceptions with other students and continue writing. The logs became working documents. No discernible difference in the quality of the essays emerged in the control and treatment groups.

**ORAL DISCOURSE IN THE LITERATURE CLASSROOM**

I. The Content of the Oral Discourse

To determine the content of the classroom discourse, a number of observational tools were applied to student and teacher discourse; some general, others more specific. Although student discourse remains central to this study, it cannot be examined independent of teacher discourse since teachers generally shape and direct classroom discourse (Cazden, 1986, 1988; Barnes, 1971, 1976, 1981; Edwards and Westgate, 1987; Goodlad, 1984). Moreover, accurately relating and reflecting the content of student discourse proves difficult in the context of teacher-directed prompts.
and questions. Hence, the content of both student and teacher discourse will be examined through numerous observation tools. To clarify the discussion, student and teacher discourse will be cited.

To capture an overview of each class, records of discourse episodes [Appendix B.8] including the time, topic, activity and germane anecdotes for each lesson were maintained. To further classify and identify the content of the oral discourse, five other observation tools were applied: (1) literary discourse tasks [Appendix B.5], (2) elements of literary response [Appendix B.6], (3) teacher talk [Appendix B.3] and student talk [Appendix B.4]. The content of the discourse will be discussed through each of the observation tools in the order listed above. Since a number of observation tools are applied, some overlap occurs. Efforts will be made to confine each discussion to the information revealed by each of the observation tools. After discussing the individual observation tools, similar categories found across the various tools will be compared.

A. Literary Discourse Tasks

From the tasks listed, several indicate the content of the oral discourse: simple comprehension (L10), reinforcing
(L11), problem-solving/ deducing (H2), application (H3), analysis (H4), synthesis (H5), and evaluation (H6). In Table 5 below, the numbers in the columns represent the total number of tasks assigned in the category for the three pre and three post lessons observed. The percentage column indicates the total percentage of the tasks in relation to all oral tasks assigned for that class in the three pre and three post lessons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/ Treat.</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Lower Order Tasks</th>
<th>Higher Order Tasks</th>
<th>Total Higher Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple Comprehension</td>
<td>Reinforcing</td>
<td>Total L10/L11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>6 (40)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>8 (67)</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (38)</td>
<td>4 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5 (42)</td>
<td>6 (50)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>7 (33)</td>
<td>9 (43)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6 (55)</td>
<td>5 (46)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre Treatment: Literary Discourse Tasks

As Table 5 reveals, the number of oral tasks encountered for both treatment and control classes during a lesson ranged from one to nine. Simple comprehension (L10) and reinforcing (L11) constituted the largest number of assigned tasks. Averaging the percentages allotted to these two categories resulted in 86% for the control teachers, 82% for treatment 1 and 88% for Treatment 2 teachers. The difference between the control and treatment groups in assigning lower order tasks was not significant, chi-square = 0.58, p. < .05. The difference between the control and treatment groups in assigning higher order tasks was not significant, chi-square = 2.38, p. < .05.

All six teachers reviewed the contents a chapter at a time. Typical comments were: "I think you were reading chapter 7 and 8. Something happened in Chapter 7 that's sort of intriguing, the story line. Look in your books, OK?" (DP, lesson 2) and "OK, who do we meet in the first four chapters?" (RP, Lesson 1). This generally introduced an extended oral discussion on the text.
Frequently, teachers summarized the events of the book for the students, intermittently interrupting the summary with questions: "We met Walter. Like father like son, isn't he? They're a very proud family and they don't want to take charity. Who is the town scold?" (RP, lesson 1). The focus of these discussions remained at the literal, lower order levels. For all six classes, lower order discourse tasks characterized the lessons.

Students engaged in few higher order oral tasks (Table 5). Most consisted of brief interludes with teachers governing the content. RP asked students to assume the perspective of one character in To Kill a Mockingbird in a journal entry. When students resisted reading theirs aloud, she read her entry and moved directly into the traditional summarizing and questioning strategy. The diversion into the journal lasted about two minutes (RP, lesson 2). On another occasion, students had been asked to collect magazine articles on racism for class discussion. When only one student responded, RP listens briefly to the student, explained the article she brought and moved to another activity. This episode lasted about two minutes (lesson 1). Most other higher order oral activities focused on extensions of the novel by the teacher: a personal experience in racism in Rhodesia (NC, lesson 2), a reference
to John Dewey (KA, lesson 1). Teachers spent little time on higher order oral tasks during the lessons.

Post Treatment: Literary Discourse Tasks

Control Classes

In the two control classes, discourse content consisted of reciting (L10) and reinforcing (L11) the textual events (77.5%). Both teachers reviewed the historical background of *Animal Farm*. KA used a summary and question strategy:

KA: That's the name of the song, "Beasts of England." So the Beast of England song is equivalent to *The Communist Manifesto* and *The Communist Manifesto* talks about communism. What did "Beasts of England" talk about? (lesson 4)

DP listed the historical characters on the board and explained direct parallels to the fictional characters of the novel. In asking the students what they wanted to know about the historical characters, she posed and answered her own questions and told the students what they wanted to know. KA provided an historical overview of the Russian Revolution (dates a summaries of the events) and a list of *Animal Farm* characters to match to the historical characters as the basis for the lesson lecture:

KA: What is the equivalent in the book, chapter one, to Karl Marx's plan of *The Communist Manifesto*? What's the equivalent?
S2: Um, it's very like . . . .
KA: No, no, we're only talking Chapter one remember?
S2: The pig's idea. He tells everyone his idea and everyone takes over for him.
KA: Yah, who is that pig? What is his name?
S2: Majors.
KA: Majors, yah. Old Majors. Now I think George Orwell was sort of smart because he took the name Majors. He could have had any name he wanted but he has the pig called Majors. So Majors and Marx are the same, as far as Orwell is concerned.
S3: Majors and Karl Marx?
KA: Major the pig and Karl Marx, OK? We said that Karl Marx wrote The Communist Manifesto and what did Majors do? What did all the animals, can you find a spot in Chapter one that sort of does what The Communist Manifesto did? Look through Chapter one, we'll find it stands out.

A review of the chapters and the historical parallels characterized the oral discourse tasks.

**Treatment Classes**

A marked shift occurs for the oral discourse tasks in the four treatment classes (Table 5). Students engaged in no lower order tasks in treatment 1 classes; 6% in treatment 2 classes. Conversely, higher order tasks increased. Both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes focused primarily on higher order tasks of problem-solving (H2), application (H3) and analysis (H4), 93.5% for both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes. RP's class (treatment 1) engaged in two evaluation tasks (H6).
The oral tasks for both treatment groups required students to use the content of their reading response logs to discuss the content of the novel. They asked each other questions, speculated, applied their reading to life situations, analyzed events and motives and evaluated the text as a whole as the following dialogues illustrate:

S1: Yah, where's this supposed to be? This world or something?
S2: Just a settlement. It's in
S1: Well, it says Labrador so probably in Canada.
MK: Did it say Labrador?
S3: Yah. It says near Labrador.

(GK, The Chrysalids, lesson 5)

S1: That's what communism's all about. They had one leader like when they elected him as president. There's only one candidate.
S2: What's the use of having an election, really?
S3: Even though they found out they didn't like it [communism].
S1: To make people think they had a choice. Yah, they didn't think they'd have a choice because they'd die.

(RP, Animal Farm, lesson 5)

Teachers structured the small group and whole class discussions based on the content of the reading response logs. Higher order oral discourse characterized student discussions of the novels.

No marked change occurred in the teaching of the two novels for the control teachers. As Figure 3 below confirms, oral discourse tasks remained primarily at the lower order. Higher order tasks characterized the discourse
for treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups. No lower order oral
tasks were assigned in treatment 1 classes; one for
treatment 2 classes. The difference between the control and
treatment groups was significant, chi-square = 27.28, \( p < .05 \) for the lower order tasks and 20.28 for the higher order
tasks.
Figure 3
A Comparison of Frequencies of Lower and Higher Order Oral Tasks Averaged per Group
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B. The Elements of Literary Discourse

The Fillion Grid [Appendix B.6] indicates the discourse content through six literary elements: (1) events/plot, (2) characters/relationships, (3) setting/mood/atmosphere, (4) images, (5) ideas/themes, and (6) language/style/structure. In Table 6 below, the numbers in the columns represent the total number of student and teacher references the percentages of the total references to the literary elements during the three pre and post observed lessons.
Table 6
The Combined Oral References of Teachers and Students to the Literary Elements in the Novel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/ Treat. 1/ Treat. 2 Teacher</th>
<th>Pre/ Post</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total No. of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plot/ Events</td>
<td>Characters/ Relationships</td>
<td>Setting/ Mood/ Atmosphere</td>
<td>Images</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>Language, Style and Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control KA</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GK</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre Treatment: Elements of Literary Discourse

A heavy emphasis on plot (1) and characters (2) dominated the discussions on To Kill a Mockingbird. Adding the percentages in the plot (1) and character (2) categories and averaging for the two classes in each group revealed 82% in the control classes, 81% in the treatment 1 classes and 90% in the treatment 2 classes. Of the 180 oral references, 143 referred to plot (1) and character (2); thirty-seven, the remaining elements.

Teachers tended to review the content for the students by drawing attention to particular incidents or characters and interjecting questions related primarily to plot and characters (Table 5).

KA: So, you read Chapter 9. Now, you remember, Scout goes to school and she meets Cecil Jacobs. Cecil Jacobs calls Scout a name. What happened? What did Cecil Jacobs call Scout? He called her a word that might offend most of you. He called her a ________. Her father was a ________.

S1: Nigger lover.
KA: Nigger lover, OK? And she really didn't know why she didn't like that expression. Why did Cecil Jacobs do this? Any idea? What's about to happen in Part 2 of the book? And why is this idea introduced right now? I can't see anybody. Yes?

S2: Because Scout's dad is defending one in a court case.
The teachers included oral reviews of the novel content in sixteen of the eighteen observed lessons (discourse episodes).

Post Treatment: Elements of Literary Discourse

Control Classes

In the two control classes, teachers focused the novel discourse primarily on the plot, characters of Animal Farm (64% of the discourse). The setting category (3) not prominent in earlier discussion, emerged in both classes since teachers spent considerable time on the historical context of the Russian Revolution as they reviewed the content of the novel as the following dialogue reveals:

DP: What two animals are struggling for power on the farm?
Chorus: Snowball and Napoleon
DP: Yeah, and which one loses?
Chorus: Snowball
DP: Snowball loses. So who would Snowball be equivalent to then?
Chorus: Trotsky.
DP: Trotsky, yeah. So those kind of obvious equivalents are spelled out on the sheet for you. (KA, lesson 5)

Treatment Classes

A broader range of the literary elements characterized all the treatment classes. Averaging the percentages for the first two categories revealed that treatment 1 classes
incorporated 23.5% of plot (1) and events (2) categories in the novel discourse; treatment 2 classes, 20%, a shift from 40% and 44.8% respectively. As Table 6 reveals, one class in both treatment groups 1 and 2, (RP and RS) engaged in discourse in all six elements. The other two classes, NC (treatment 1) engaged in four of the six, GK (treatment 2) in five. All classes shifted to include more literary elements in the discourse of Animal Farm and The Chrysalids.

Students in the treatment groups discussed a range of topics elicited from the novel, the reading response logs, and their own life experiences. The content broadened to include images (4), ideas and themes (5) and language (6) elements. A more representative range of topics emerged.

S1: We talk about all these Old People but, and they said they're the true ones but everybody thinks that who are in their society. All the people think that.
S2: They're talking about us, though.
S2: Are they? Are we the Old People?
S3: Yah. (GK, lesson 5)

S1: Read the first sentence: "When I was quite small I would sometimes dream of a city - which was quite strange because it began even before I knew what a city was."
S2: What is it supposed to be like? They talk about the Old People. I wonder if there's a, like it happened
S1: Like in France, or something.
S3: It does seem like in the future or something.
S2: Nuclear Holocaust (GK, lesson 5)
On the average, as Figure 4 below illustrates, students in the control classes increased talk about the setting (3) in their novel discourse (from 18% to 33%), though the shift occurred primarily for one teacher (DP). One oral reference involved ideas (5). No references were made to images (4) or language (6) of the novel.

Students in both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes broadened the literary elements included in their discourse about both Animal Farm and The Chrysalids. Figure 4 indicates a reduced emphasis on the plot (1) and characters (2) to include more literary elements in their discourse when compared to the reading of the first novel for both treatment groups.
Figure 4
A Comparison of Frequencies of Oral References to Literary Elements Averaged per Lesson in Each Group
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C. **Student and Teacher Oral Discourse**

The Student Talk and Questions data collection tool [Appendix B.4](#) includes three categories indicating the content of oral discourse in the classroom: data (T1, R1), concept (T2, R2) and abstract (T3, R3). Data talk about the novel suggests simple recall of the factual data in the text. Concept talk implies understanding, application and analysis of ideas, themes, and moods of the novel. Abstract talk suggests synthesizing and evaluating the novel as a whole in relation to other novels and the world in general. A summary of the student and teacher talk in each of the three categories has been recorded by providing a total for the three lessons, the average per lesson and a percentage of the total talk in each category.

**Pre Treatment: Student and Teacher Oral Discourse**

Table 7 below reveals that most of the novel discourse centered on recall and simple comprehension (Data) in all six classes. Averaging percentages for the two classes in each group resulted in 86% data talk for the control classes, 73% for treatment 1 classes and 80% for treatment 2 classes. Of the 1,401 total utterances per lesson in the six classes, 1,088 were at the data level, 313 at the concept and abstract levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/Treat. 1/ Treat. 2 Teacher</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>T1/Q1 R1/I1</th>
<th>T2/Q2 R2/I2</th>
<th>T3/Q3 R3/I3</th>
<th>Per Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recall/Simple Comprehension (DATA)</td>
<td>Application/Analysis (CONCEPt)</td>
<td>Synthesis/Evaluation (ABSTRACT)</td>
<td>Total Utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ave. No. of Utterances Per Lesson</td>
<td>Ave. No. of Utterances Per Lesson</td>
<td>Ave. No. of Utterances Per Lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Pre 276 95</td>
<td>15 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 133 85</td>
<td>23 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>Pre 206 76</td>
<td>64 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 173 81</td>
<td>42 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Pre 223 62</td>
<td>136 37</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 133 85</td>
<td>247 74</td>
<td>45 13</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Pre 190 84</td>
<td>37 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 136 74</td>
<td>169 54</td>
<td>99 32</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Pre 123 70</td>
<td>53 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 75 29</td>
<td>163 63</td>
<td>19 8</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2</td>
<td>GK</td>
<td>Pre 70 90</td>
<td>8 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 20 12</td>
<td>134 83</td>
<td>8 3</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the talk consisted of reviewing the chapters assigned for the lesson:

DP: What did you notice about what we read last day? What's one thing that's happened so far? I think you were reading Chapter 7 and 8. So what happened in Chapter 7 that's sort of intriguing? The story line. Look in your books, OK?

S1: (Unintelligible)

DP: OK. What are they trying to do?

S2: They're trying to know who is Boo Radley.

DP: They already know who he is but what do they want to know more about?


DP: What does he do all day? Remember, how long has Boo been grounded?

Chorus: 37 years, 35 years.

DP: Yah. And we talked about what it's like to be grounded, right? For a weekend, let alone your whole life. He's now in his thirty's and he's still grounded. Still grounded. Who in the community has seen him? (pause) Well?

Chorus: Miss Maudie.

DP: Miss Maudie. Good for Christine. She remembered.

Between 15% and 20% of the talk moved out of the data levels into the concepts of the novel represented in the following lesson excerpt:

RS: One of the things I want you to notice in this novel is the fact that we have a society, a town, which seems to be quite negative. And then when we look at the people, slowly but surely we see that the people are really. . . .

S1: positive

RS: Well, not all of them positive, but really a rich array with many different types with all these things in there. And these people are all going through during the novel - they're going to rub against each other.

S2: Friendship (RS, lesson 1)
No talk included the abstract elements of *To Kill a Mockingbird* during the observed lessons.

**Post Treatment: Student and Teacher Oral Discourse**

**Control Classes**

An average c. 83% of the discourse for the two control classes remained at the recall and simple comprehension levels.

Both teachers summarized the contents and asked students about the content of the chapters as they read them. Teachers relayed the historical context of *Animal Farm* to students as they were completing the reading of the novel:

KA: You have read, or just about read, this story and before I, I would guess that none of you know much about the Russian Revolution. That's my guess. Am I correct?
Chorus: Yah.
KA: Is there anyone here who remembers anything about it? So what I need to do, Chris, what I need to do, is that I needed to somehow give you information and the nicest way to give you information is to turn on a video and have a bunch of professionals read about it, show you something, express it well and read it back. Or have a very nice short article in easy terms that you read in fifteen minutes and have, leave it at that. I've been looking for two weeks and I can't find anything like that so what you've got is me. And the only good I can do is explain to you what I know about the Russian Revolution and then have you see how it ties into the book. (KA, lesson 4)

Teachers guided students through the content always assuring the historical links had been clearly made:
KA: So anyways, Moses the Raven, take a guess, what could Moses represent from what you know about the story? He's a bird, a big black bird. (lesson 5)

DP: Who do you think in the novel represents the czar of Russia? Who represents the ruler running the farm? (lesson 5)

KA: What is the equivalent in the book, chapter one, to Karl Marx's plan of the Communist Manifesto? What's the equivalent? (lesson 6)

**Treatment Classes**

A shift away from a predominance of recall and simple comprehension talk (data) occurred for both the groups reading *Animal Farm* and *The Chrysalids*. Averaging the percentages in Table 7 for the data categories reveals that treatment 1 classes reading *Animal Farm* moved from 73% of the talk at simple comprehension to 14%; treatment 2 classes reading *The Chrysalids*, from 80% to 19% of the talk. Conversely, talk in the concept and abstract categories increased for both groups. Averaging the percentages resulted in 64% (treatment 1) and 73% (treatment 2) of the talk about concepts and 23% (treatment 1) and 6% (treatment 2) abstract talk. The content of the talk focused more on the conceptual and abstract elements of the novels for both treatment groups.

In the two treatment groups, teachers provided no background or contextual information of the novels.
Individually, students reflected on the content in reading response logs before discussing the novels. A range of topics emerged during the talk about both the novels. Classes reading Animal Farm (treatment 1) discussed a wide array of topics and issues related to the novel. In a one-page transcript of a small group discussion (RP, lesson 5) students considered inequality on the farm ("I noticed that they were breaking the commandments, too."), personal links ("But have you noticed like in life? How people do that? They're like, they're hypocritical?"), communism ("That's what communism's all about. They had one leader like when they elected him as president. There's only one candidate."), politics ("This is like, I put it in here, it's about politics because it's like leaders. The pigs are the leaders but they're leading the blind and dumb because they [the farm animals] don't think for themselves. They just go, you know"), the structure of the novel ("I think it sort of answered itself from the beginning. It circled over and over"). Toward the end of the segment, they evaluated Orwell's use of animals:

S1: The humans understand animals. That's stupid. That's really dumb.
S2: And when they sang that "Beasts of England" song than all the humans could understand them.
S3: How could they hear them? They couldn't hear him before.
S1: Yah, really.
S2: And some of the adults were stupid. They couldn't, they can't write or anything.
Similarly, the classes reading *The Chrysalids* discussed a variety of related topics: deviations, the time frame, the fate of the characters, thought shapes, location, laws, the fringes, the true people, nuclear holocaust and its consequences, the Old People, living within dogmatic constraints, and accepting and not accepting differences.

The following bits of dialogue illustrate the range:

GK: What you guys are talking about are the Waknuk people. It's about the seventeenth century type of behaviour. Is that what you're saying?

S1: Yah.

GK: Could that mean that it actually took place in that time?

S1: Well, it seems like that.

GK: It seems like that. They're acting like the seventeenth century people but could it be in the future where they . . .

S1: It could be. (GK, lesson 5)

S2: You know what happened. There could be a nuclear holocaust. (GK, lesson 5)

S1: Well, the deviations they represent fear, right because they sent them away, right?

S2: Sort of, the badlands, the badlands represent . .

S1: The badlands represent what happened after the war. They were caused by the war, right?

S2: What war?

S1: There was a nuclear war then.

Questions drafted in small groups for the whole class discussion during the final observation revealed additional topics discussed. Both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes used the student questions to guide whole class discussion.

RP's class of twelve students submitted 100 questions on *Animal Farm*. Questions touched on a variety of issues: (1)
Why did the Pigs become so corrupt? (2) What would happen to the human race if animals took over? (3) Why are the Pigs so evil? (4) How did the dogs get so important without anyone noticing? (5) Why did the author use animals to represent the characters in the book? (6) In your opinion, what happened after the end of the story? Students in the other treatment 1 class discussed why only seven commandments had been written and why they took the skull out of Major before they buried him.

Students reading The Chrysalids discussed the meaning of chrysalids ("Like a cocoon. . . . So David's group were also like psycho people or whatever and everybody else is sort of dying off and there's a new race being born"), the location of Waknuk, and the source of the definition of true humanity:

S1: They say that they got what the true human was out of the Bible. Was that the old Bible, or. . . . What I wanted to know was, was it our Bible or one that was already made?

Both the control classes and treatment groups focused primarily on the data for the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird. Whereas the control classes focused on the data and the historical context 83% of the time, treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes focused on data less than 13% and
21% of the time, respectively. As Figure 5 illustrates, student talk shifted primarily into concepts in both treatment groups, though some data and abstract discourse occurred. Differences appeared in the pre and post for the treatment groups while little difference in the talk occurred for the control classes.

In sum, accounting for similar categories in Table 5 (oral tasks), Table 6 (literary elements) and Table 7 (Teacher and Student talk in three categories) revealed that during the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird, teachers tended to focus on the detailed content of the novel, particularly the plot and characters. Content review occurred after each reading assignment. During the second novel, control classes remained predominantly within those categories. A shift in content toward higher order tasks, inclusion of a broader array of literary elements and a high incidence of conceptual and abstract discourse about the novels occurred in the Treatment classes.
Figure 5
A Comparison of Frequencies of Teacher and Student Utterances per Lesson in Each Group
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II. The Quality of the Oral Discourse

A relationship exists between the content and quality of literary discourse; the various levels indicate both the content (what is discussed) and quality of the discourse (how well is it discussed). To describe the quality of discourse, observation tools ranged from a general evaluation of each lesson to individual student and teacher utterances.

Discussion will include: (1) General Impression of the Class, (2) Classroom Observation Card [Appendix B.1], (3) Analyzing Transcripts of English [Appendix B.2], (4) Literary Discourse Tasks [Appendix B.5], (5) Elements of Literary Discourse [Appendix B.6], (6) Teacher Oral Discourse [Appendix B.3], and (7) Student Oral Discourse [Appendix B.4]. Discussion will move through each of the observation tools, moving from the whole class to small groups and individual students and teachers.

In the following discussion of the observation tools, the first five represent a general overview of various components of the lesson. The individual student profiles [Appendix B.7] and Teacher and Student Talk [Appendices B.3, B.4] examine the oral discourse in more detail. By weaving a series of observation tools to derive an overall
impression prevents depending on one subjective measure as a full indicator of quality and layers impressions to arrive at a quality rating. As in the discussion on the content of the oral discourse, tables and examples of the student and teacher discourse will be incorporated where applicable to the discussion.

A. General Impressions of the Lessons

Criteria for determining the general impression rating of the lesson represents a composite of the remaining observation tools. Although the rating depended on an overall impression, a general sense of the learning environment, considerations included the combined elements of student engagement, activities and talk. Though not limited exclusively to oral discourse, impressions are formed primarily through oral exchanges in the classroom. Table 8 below presents an overview of the general impressions of the lesson. One represents the lowest rating, seven the highest.
### Table 8

**General Impression Ratings (1-7) for Each Observed Lesson, Averages for Each Group and Teacher**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/ Treatment 1/ Treatment 2 Teacher</th>
<th>Control, Treatment 1: To Kill a Mockingbird</th>
<th>Control, Treatment 1: Animal Farm</th>
<th>Novels 1/ Novel 2</th>
<th>Change in Rating</th>
<th>Percentage of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating: 1 (Low) to 7 (High)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>Average for 3 Lessons</td>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Df</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control K1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rating Per Class</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 MC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rating Per Class</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rating Per Class</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre Treatment: General Impressions of the Lessons

In the teaching of *To Kill a Mockingbird*, both control and treatment lessons received a rating of between 1 and 3 out of a possible 7. The control classes averaged 2.0 for the three lessons observed; treatment 1, 2.2, treatment 2, 2.5. All classes averaged in the bottom half of the seven point scale.

Post Treatment: General Impressions of the Lessons

**Control Classes**

In the control classes the ratings fell from 2.0 to 1.4, a drop of .6 for the teaching of *Animal Farm*.

**Treatment Classes**

As Table 6 reveals, ratings improved for both the treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes. Treatment 1 moved from an average of 2.2 for the pre treatment to 6.0 out of 7. Treatment 2 classes moved from 2.5 to 5.8. Comparing the control and treatment classes reveals a 4.6 rating difference between treatment 1 and control classes, a 4.4 difference with the treatment 2 classes.
Figure 6
A Comparison of General Impression Ratings of the Lessons for Each Group

Pre

![Bar chart showing comparison of ratings for Control, Treat 1, and Treat 2 pre-intervention.]

Post

![Bar chart showing comparison of ratings for Control, Treat 1, and Treat 2 post-intervention.]

1-3: Low
4-5: Average
6-7: High
B. General Student Involvement in the Lessons

To assess the general student involvement during the lessons, one element on the Classroom Observation Card [Appendix B.1] was used. Student involvement was rated from 1 (low) to 7 (high). Table 9 below provides both the ratings assigned to each class during each lessons and the average ratings for each class over the three pre and post treatment lessons and the average for the control, treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/Treat. 1/ Treat. 2 Teacher</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Average for 3 Lessons</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Average for 3 Lessons</th>
<th>Change in Rating</th>
<th>Percentage of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control KA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Rating Per Class</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td><strong>+3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>+43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td><strong>+4.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>+63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Rating Per Class</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>+3.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>+53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td><strong>+2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>+33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td><strong>+3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>+43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Rating Per Class</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>+2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>+38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre Treatment: Student Involvement in the Lessons

For the To Kill a Mockingbird discussions, the average student involvement in the control classes averaged a 2.3 rating out of a possible 7. Treatment 1 classes averaged 2.5, treatment 2, 3.5. Using the 1 to 7 scale, students appeared relatively uninvolved in the lessons across the six classes.

Post Treatment: Student Involvement in the Lessons

Control Classes

In the teaching of the second novel as Table 9 reveals, the two control classes averaged a 1.8 out of 7 rating for student involvement in the lessons, a drop of .5. One class remained the same (DP, 2.3), the other dropped one point. In percentages, this constitutes an average of a 7% drop for the two classes.

Treatment Classes

Ratings for both the treatment 1 and Treatment two classes improved. Calculating the differences between the pre and post lessons revealed an improvement in the post lessons for all classes ranging from 2.3 (RS) to 4.4 points (NC). In percentages, improvement in the ratings for the
treatment classes averaged 53% for treatment 1 classes and 38% for treatment 2 classes.

Comparing the control and treatment groups in Figure 7 below reveals that student involvement in the teaching of the first novel rated between 2.4 and 3.4. Differences occurred between the pre and post for the treatment groups and between the control and treatment groups for the second novel. The control group shifted to 1.9, treatment 1 and treatment 2 to 6.0 and 6.1.
Figure 7
A Comparison of Student Involvement in the Lesson
Ratings for Each Group

Pre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treat 1</th>
<th>Treat 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treat 1</th>
<th>Treat 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Oral Exchanges During the Lessons

Watson's system for analyzing transcripts of English lessons [Appendix B.2] provides a more specific observation of oral exchanges during the lessons. It describes the teacher's questioning, pupil responses, teacher reception of pupil responses and conversational control. Each of the questions is followed by a scale from 1 indicating little or no involvement to 5 indicating considerable involvement.

Table 10 below tallies the ratings assigned to each question for all class discourse over three pre and post lessons. Calculations were made on the basis of the total number of ratings for each rating for each teacher during the three pre and post lessons to determine an average rating for each teacher. The score was obtained by multiplying the number of ratings times the rating: 22 (1) = 22; 3 (3) = 9. The total score was divided by the total number of incidents in each rating category to find the average rating (a score of 55 divided by 37 categories = 1.5 average rating).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/Treat. 1/Teacher</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Rating 1 (Low)</th>
<th>Total Score (No. x Rating)</th>
<th>Total 2's</th>
<th>Total 3's</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total 4's</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total 5's</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No. of Score Categories</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control DP Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control DP Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control KA Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control KA Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP Post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GK Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GK Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pre Treatment: Oral Exchanges During the Lessons**

During the teaching of *To Kill a Mockingbird*, the six teachers functioned primarily at the lower levels indicating such things as "closed" questioning (1a, 1b, 1c), brief, unelaborated student responses (2), evaluations (right/wrong) of student responses (3a, 3b) and considerable conversational control exerted by the teacher (4a, 4b). The ratings for the three lessons averaged between 1.1 and 2.7 out of 5. The control classes averaged 1.5. Treatment 1 classes also averaged 1.5; treatment 2, 2.0.

**Post Treatment: Oral Exchanges During the Lessons**

**Control Classes**

Ratings for the control groups remained relatively stable for both classes: 1.5 for both the pre and post lessons.

**Treatment Classes**

A change occurred in the treatment classes. A shift toward more open questioning, elaborations and student initiated dialogue occurred for both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes. Three of the class ratings went from 1.1 (NC), 1.3 (GK) and 1.8 (RP) to 3.6, 3.2 and 4.4 out of five respectively. Ratings for the fourth class (RS) moved
from 2.7 to 3.8. Calculating the percentages revealed a 51% increase in treatment 1 and 30% increase for treatment 2 classes.

Figure 8 compares the oral questioning and response ratings for the control and treatment groups. As is evident in the graph, a similarity existed for the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird. Differences emerged for the teaching of Animal Farm and The Chrysalids. Ratings remained similar for the control classes (primarily 1's and 2's) and shifted to three, four and five for the two treatment groups.
Figure 8
A Comparison of the Number of Oral Questioning and Response Ratings Assigned for Each Group
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Total Number of Ratings
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D. Oral Discourse Tasks During the Lessons

The Literary Discourse Tasks observation tool [Appendix B.5] categorizes twelve lower and six higher order tasks. Of these, two lower order tasks indicate oral discourse (L10, simple comprehension; L11, reinforcing). Five of the six higher order tasks could involve oral discourse (H2 through H6). Table 11 below indicates the total number of oral discourse tasks for the first (pre) and second (post) novels. The number of tasks in each category is expressed as a percentage based on the total number of tasks assigned. The total lower and higher order tasks are calculated to compare the percentages allotted to each.
Table 11
The Number and Percentage Assigned to Each Lower (L) and Higher (H) Order Tasks During the Observed Pre and Post Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control/Treat. 1/2 Teacher</th>
<th>L10</th>
<th>L11</th>
<th>H2</th>
<th>H3</th>
<th>H4</th>
<th>H5</th>
<th>H6</th>
<th>Percentage of Higher Order Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literal Comprehension</td>
<td>Reinforcing</td>
<td>Percentage of Lower Order Tasks</td>
<td>Problem-Solving Deduction</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
<td>Total Tasks $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9 60</td>
<td>6 40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>8 67</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4 36</td>
<td>4 36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5 45</td>
<td>3 27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2 18</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>9 38</td>
<td>8 33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0 26</td>
<td>4 21</td>
<td>6 32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5 45</td>
<td>6 55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0 33</td>
<td>5 33</td>
<td>5 33</td>
<td>5 33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>7 33</td>
<td>9 43</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>3 14</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>7 32</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GX</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5 42</td>
<td>6 50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 33</td>
<td>4 33</td>
<td>3 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre Treatment: Oral Discourse Tasks

Simple Comprehension (L10) and Reinforcing (L11), both lower order tasks, predominated in both the control and treatment groups (Table 11). The lower order tasks constituted an average of 81% of the control classes. Treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes averaged 81% and 84%. The difference between the control and treatment groups for the lower order tasks was not significant, chi-square = .5698, p. < .05. The averages in all the groups ranged from 71% to 100% of lower order tasks and 0% to 29% for the higher order tasks. The difference between the control and treatment groups for higher order tasks was not significant, chi-square = 1.6259, p. < .05.

Though teachers offered a variety of oral activities, most remained at the lower order levels. Teachers set the tasks: reporting on answers to comprehension questions (GK, lesson 1; RP, lesson 2) oral review of the content of the chapters (all teachers), reviewing the answers to assigned questions in small groups (DP, lesson 1; KA, lesson 2). GK (lesson 1) assigned small groups of students to collaborate on a set of comprehension questions from the novel. When time ran short, she read the answers from the teacher guide to the class. Students sometimes used class time (DP,
lesson 3) to correct comprehension questions in small groups:

S1: OK. what did you get for 5 a? It's supposed to be out of 2, right?
(mumbled response)
S1: OK, that's more like it. OK, Scout's response, uh, her anger is coming out because they're trying to raise her being . . .
S2: unbiased.
S1: If it has anything to with, uh
S3: discrimination
S1: OK, OK, it's a 2.

Tasks categorized as higher order were often veiled lower order tasks requiring specific, factual data from the novel. RS (lesson 2) asked students to identify a group characters that could be described by the same three adjectives. Each group reported to the whole class. One group classified Nathan Radley, Miss Maudie and Calpurnia in one group stating that they were all "protective of what's precious to them." RS asked for specific examples to validate the claims. After the first group reported, she used the responses to question the groups further on the content of the novel. When RP attempted to relate the racial incidents in To Kill a Mockingbird to current news situations (lesson 1), one student (of twelve) responded. After Erica offered her magazine clipping, RP summarized the articles she had found. No specific link to the novel was made. No other students contributed to the discourse. Both
GK (lesson 2) and NC (lesson 3) asked students to prepare oral presentations on portions of the novel. Students prepared short scenes and read from texts during the presentation. No attempts to link the presentations in the context of the whole novel occurred.

On the whole, students generally performed the tasks individually; occasionally they collaborated in small groups. Teachers set, directed and monitored the tasks with little student initiation or response.

Post Treatment: Oral Discourse Tasks

Control Classes

Table 11 reveals little change occurred for the two control classes. Control students and teachers limited discussions primarily to the factual and historical components of *Animal Farm*. Control classes completed seventeen lower order and six higher order tasks during the six lessons. Averaging the percentages resulted in 74% lower order tasks, 26% higher order tasks, an increase of 7% in higher order tasks. The historical background to the novel, though seemingly at the higher levels of task, was presented as factual content; parallels and links were often drawn by the two teachers. The content, so specifically
presented, required little application (H3) on the part of students.

**Treatment Classes**

Students in the treatment groups during the second novel selected the higher order tasks particularly in small group discussions. As Table 11 reveals, treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes engaged in 0% and 7% lower order tasks respectively, shifting to primarily higher order tasks. Comparing tasks assigned during the reading of the first and second novels revealed a shift from an average of fourteen lower order and four higher order to no lower order and seventeen higher order tasks for treatment 1 classes. Treatment 2 shifted from an average of fifteen lower order and three higher order to one lower order and sixteen higher order tasks. As Table 11 reveals, students and teachers in the two treatment groups engaged in more higher order tasks. The difference between the control and treatment groups in the lower order tasks was significant, chi-square = 27.2769, p. < .05. The difference between control and treatment groups in higher order tasks also proved significantly different, chi-square = 20.334, p. < .05.
E. Oral Discourse of the Literary Elements

The Fillion Grid [Appendix B.6] divides each of the six literary elements into four levels: (a) factual, (b) interpretive, (c) personal association/significance and (d) evaluation. The grid provides a visual overview of the content and levels of student and teacher oral discourse. Though the elements (vertical) are not hierarchical in value, they represent a range of possible discourse about the literary elements of the novel. The levels of the elements (horizontal) indicate a movement from factual to evaluation. Table 12 below replicates the basic structure of the Fillion Grid and offers the total number of discourse episodes for the two classes in each group in the various elements at the four different levels in the cells provided.
Table 12
Total Number of Discourse Episodes in Literary Elements at Four Levels of Discourse for the Observed Pre and Post Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literary Elements</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Total Number of Discourse Episodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Events/Plots</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Characters/Relationships</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Setting/Mood/Atmosphere</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Images</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Ideas/Themes</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: Style and Structure</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9 compares the assigned lower and higher order oral tasks. In the teaching of the first novel, a majority of the tasks consisted of literal comprehension (L10) and reinforcing (L11) for the control and treatment groups. For the second novel, a shift occurred. While literal comprehension talk remained similar, reinforcing talk decreased and some evidence of problem-solving (H2) and application (H3) emerged. For both treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups, talk moved almost entirely away from the lower orders into problem-solving, application and analysis (H4). Some evaluation talk (H6) occurred in the treatment 2 group.
Figure 9
A Comparison of Frequencies of the Oral Lower and Higher Order Tasks per Group

Pre

Post

Percentage of Total Tasks

Control  Treat 1  Treat 2

L10  Simple Comprehension  H2  Problem-Solving
L11  Reinforcing  H3  Application
      H4  Analysis
      H5  Synthesis
      H6  Evaluation
Pre Treatment: Oral Discourse of the Literary Elements

As Table 12 indicates, the control, treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups had almost an equal amount of oral references for the four levels of discourse (48, 50 and 51, respectively). The control group had more references at the factual level than the two treatment groups (41 compared to 27 and 31). In the four levels, nevertheless, at least half the talk for the three groups focused on the factual data in the novel.

The factual (a) discourse focused predominantly on plot (1) and characters (2) for all three groups. In the three groups, 83% of the factual talk in the control classes, 78% in treatment 1 and 77% of treatment 2 was in the plot (1) and characters (2) categories. The difference between the control and treatment groups was not significant, chi-square = 3.519, p. < .05.

Teachers in all three groups appeared to be primarily concerned that students had read the assigned chapters and used class time for oral review:

RP: What about the town scold? Do you remember her? She's always criticizing all the little kids, and check your books, please, to see if you can find it. Also, there's a young man there who has lice in his hair.
Chorus: Burris.
RP: I knew you would remember his name. And what about the young man whose family is too proud to take any money from the teacher?
Chorus: Cunningham's
RP: What's his name?
Chorus: Walter
RP: Walter. Like father, like son, isn't he? They're a very proud family and they don't want to take charity. Who is the town scold?
S1: Miss Caroline.
RP: Miss Caroline is the teacher and I guess you could say she was the town scold. She's a little confused when she first comes to the area. She didn't relate to the characters.
S2: We also met the Ewells.
RP: We met the Ewells. Burris has lice in his hair. A critter in his hair.
S3: a cootie
RP: That's right. Thank you very much Dawn. Miss S. Her name starts with S. (lesson 1)

Less talk occurred at the other levels or elements. A decrease in episodes occurs both in the vertical reading of Table 12 in elements 3 through 6 and in the horizontal reading, b through d. For the control classes, no discourse episodes occurred at the personal association (c) and evaluation (d) levels. Discourse of the novel remained primarily at the factual levels within the elements of events and plot (1) and characters and relationships (2).

Post Treatment: Oral Discourse of the Literary Elements

Control Classes

A fairly even distribution of talk emerged in the first three elements in Table 12 at the factual level (thirteen, fourteen and nineteen respectively). Like the discourse on
To Kill a Mockingbird, most remained at the factual level (84.2%) with some at the interpretive levels (15.8%). More talk occurred in the setting category (46.3%). Aside from some references to ideas and themes (3, 3.5%), the remaining talk continued in the plot (1) and characters (2) categories. The difference between the control classes in the pre and post was not significant, chi-square = .6065, p. < .05.

Both control teachers presented the historical context of the novel as a parallel body of information. Little distinction between the content of the novel and the historical content occurred. Both teachers used a direct, factual approach to the novel ("And the only good I can do is explain to you what I know about the Russian Revolution and then have you see how it ties into the book," KA, lesson 5).

**Treatment Classes**

As Table 12 indicates, both treatment 1 and treatment 2 talk shifted. Oral references increased from fifty to 160 for treatment 1 and from fifty-one to 159 for treatment 2. Most of the talk (71.9% and 80.5%) occurred at the interpretive (b) and evaluation (d) levels. The greatest shift transpired from the factual (12.5% and 6.3%) to the
interpretive (45.6% and 50.9%). This represents a move from 54% and 60.8% in the factual and 32% and 17.6% in the interpretive during the teaching of *To Kill a Mockingbird*.

The range of both the literary elements and levels discussed broadened and increased. For both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes, discourse included the six literary elements at the interpretive (b) and evaluation (d) levels. More talk (61.3% and 62.9%) occurred in the setting (3), images (4), themes (5) and language (6). Though, like the control classes, a shift toward more talk in the other elements developed, treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups demonstrated a more even distribution in the elements. The ratio of talk in the first two and last four elements is converse for the control and treatment groups.

Figure 10 demonstrates the shift in the discourse in the six literary elements at four levels of discourse (four pre and post graphs). Most of the discourse in the control group remained at the factual level. The literary discourse focused primarily on the plot and characters for the first novel, adding discourse about the setting for the second novel. Treatment 1 and 2 classes moved away from factual talk into the remaining three levels.
Figure 10
A Comparison of the Frequencies of the Literary Elements in Three Levels of Discourse in Each Group

A. Factual
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Post

1. Plot/Events
2. Characters/Relationships
3. Setting/Mood/Atmosphere
4. Images
5. Ideas/Themes
6. Language: Style, Structure
B. Interpretive
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Percentage of Total References to Literary Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treat 1</th>
<th>Treat 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post

Percentage of Total References to Literary Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treat 1</th>
<th>Treat 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Plot/Events
2. Characters/Relationships
3. Setting/Mood/Atmosphere
4. Images
5. Ideas/Themes
6. Language: Style, Structure
C. Personal Significance

Pre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Total References to Literary Elements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Total References to Literary Elements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Plot/Events
2. Characters/Relationships
3. Setting/Mood/Atmosphere
4. Images
5. Ideas/Themes
6. Language: Style, Structure
D. Evaluation
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Percentage of Total References to Literary Elements

<table>
<thead>
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<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treat 1</th>
<th>Treat 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post

Percentage of Total References to Literary Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treat 1</th>
<th>Treat 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Plot/Events  4. Images
2. Characters/Relationships  5. Ideas/Themes
Examining Tables 8 through 12 reveals an overall consistency. General impressions of the lessons and student involvement both reveal low ratings for all classes during the teaching of *To Kill a Mockingbird* (1.3 to 3.0 and 1.3 to 4.0 out of 7). In both observation tools, the ratings drop .5 and .6 for the control classes and rise 3.7 for treatment 1, 2.7 for treatment 2 classes. This supports the data obtained for Oral Exchanges (Table 10) where the majority of ratings for the first novel average between 1.1 and 2.7 (out of 5), remain there for the control classes (1.6, 1.5) and rise to 4.4 and 3.6 for treatment 1 and 3.8 and 3.2 for treatment 2 classes. Consistency prevails in Table 10 and Table 11 with the predominance of lower order tasks and factual talk about the novel. While little change occurred in the control classes, a shift toward higher order tasks (from 15% and 16% to 100% and 94%) occurred for both treatment 1 and 2 classes. A similar shift occurred in a broader representation of literary elements and higher levels of discourse particularly in the movement from factual to interpretive discourse (Table 12).

In sum, the foregoing discussion reveals that teacher and student discourse for the teaching of *To Kill a Mockingbird* focused primarily on the factual levels of
discourse about the novel. As the same tables reveal, a consistent shift toward higher levels of discourse occurred for all four of the treatment classes.

F. **Student and Teacher Discourse During the Lessons**

Where the earlier discussion examined the general scope of the literary discourse, this discussion focuses on the specific number of utterances in the various discourse levels: data (T1/R1), concept (T2/R2) and abstract (T3/R3) teacher and students talk (Table 12) and questions (Table 13; Q1/I1, Q2/I2, Q3/I3) about the novels. Discussion will include the number of utterances, the level of the utterances and indications of change between the discourse about the novels in the control and treatment classes.

1. **Literary Discourse**

Table 13 below reveals the scope of student and teacher oral discourse about the novels. The numbers in the columns indicate the average number of utterances per lesson from the three pre and three post observations in each of the discourse levels.
# Table 13

The Number and Percentages of Student and Teacher Utterances About the Novel Per Observed Lesson in Three Levels of Discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Teacher</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Recall, Simple Compreh. (DATA)</th>
<th>Application Analysis (CONCEPT)</th>
<th>Synthesis/Evaluation (ABSTRACT)</th>
<th>Total Teacher Utterances</th>
<th>Total Student Utterances</th>
<th>Total Utterances Per Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control KA</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GE</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre Treatment: Literary Discourse

As Table 13 indicates, teachers and students talked about the novel primarily at the factual (T1/R1) levels. Utterances in the control classes and treatment 1 classes were similar in number (398 and 434, respectively). Teachers spoke less (182 utterances) in treatment 2 classes. Averaging the two classes of each group indicates that 85.9% of the teacher talk in the control classes, 74.7% of treatment 1 and 82.4% of treatment 2 classes was in the data category. The three groups proved similar in the amount of concept talk: 14.1%, 23.7% and 17.6% respectively. Virtually no talk occurred in the abstract category.

Students in the control and two treatment groups spoke a similar amount during the lessons (163, 158 and 172 utterances). No significant difference existed between the control and treatment groups. The chi-square = .6125, p. < .05. Talk consistently focused on the data. Control and treatment 2 students spoke at the data levels 85.9% and 83.1% of the time, treatment 1 students, 56.3%. Concept talk constituted the remaining talk since no student talk occurred at the abstract levels.
"Recitation" (data talk) characterized the discourse about To Kill a Mockingbird:

KA: OK, there's a court case coming up. How much do you know about the court case. You know it involves a black man. Do you know his name?  
Chorus: Tom Robinson  
KA: Tom Robinson. You know that Scout's father has been appointed to defend him, but do you know what he's been accused of? Yes.  
S1: Well, he's accused Mr. Robinson of raping Selene.  
KA: OK. So rape's the word. (lesson 2)

To confirm that students had read the required chapters, teachers in both control and treatment groups directed the content through summarizing, reviewing, and questioning:

NC: Jem says he's going to go downtown. She [Scout] says to him, "I'm coming with you otherwise if I don't go with you, you'll have to come through me. You'll have to fight me." And of course, Jem doesn't want to disturb Calpurnia, so off they go to town. But of course, Dill has to come, too, so they whistle at Dill's window and uh, along comes Dill. Now they go downtown and the reason why Atticus had taken that long extension cord and travel light. Do you know what a travel light is? One of those lights you just hand anywhere. . . . took a travel light with him. What was the reason he had for that long extension cord and travel light? (NC, lesson 2)

In the concept category, averages indicated 10%, 27% and 20% for the three groups respectively. RS attempted to get students to apply the knowledge of the characters through categorization:
RS: One of the things I want you to notice in this novel is the fact that we have a society, a town, which seems to be quite negative. And when we look at the people, slowly but surely we see that the people are really . . . .

S1: positive
RS: Well, not all of them positive, but really a rich array with many different types with all these things in there. And these people are going through during the novel, they're going to rub against each other.

S2: Friendship.
RS: Yes. And the thing that I especially in the incident with Walter, where you always have the backdrop of the town and what the people generally are like, with regions in there, and so, for homework, I want each of you besides reading Chapter 3, you have to read Chapter 3, I want you to reread the incident with Walter and I want you to tell me specifically about Scout's role as far as other people are concerned.

Although the talk reflects application and analysis (T2/R2), the students responded factually (Data, R1). They appear to guess what RS expects and respond accordingly. They respond in one word utterances; RS accepts but does not incorporate the responses in her explanation of the relationships in the novel. Teachers characteristically structured and directed the talk.

Virtually no discourse occurred in the abstract category (1% for treatment 1 classes, no utterances for the remaining groups). Typically, teachers incorporated the higher levels of discourse (T2, T3) by selecting and describing a personal or related example (RP, NC, KA). NC recounted a personal story about living with class
structures and prejudice as a youngster in what was called Rhodesia (lesson 2). Though the talk falls into a higher category (T2) and serves to clarify the concept of prejudice in this case, students were not required to link the discourse to the novel. During one observation, a student elaborated on the Donald Marshall case demonstrating the concept of prejudice (KA, lesson 2). In similar situations, teachers (RP, lesson 1, sharing a magazine article; RS, lesson 3, categorizing people) listened to related examples by students and quickly shifted back to the content of the chapters under discussion ("OK, let's get going." RS, lesson 3). Teachers did not appear to expect or encourage appreciable student input during whole class discussions. Few initiations or elaborations by students occurred.

During one lesson, RP had asked students to bring news articles related to three of the novel themes. While the opportunity to share their findings arose, no direct links to the novel were made either by the teacher or the students:

RP: I asked you to start collecting magazine and news articles that deal with similar themes in the novel. What are the three themes?
Students: Justice, prejudice and growing up.
RP: I showed you something that I found in a magazine (holds it up) about prejudice. Did any of you manage to find a couple of things in the past few days in your research? We just have time to look at a couple today, but... Let's start right...
here (points to Erica). You just hold up something so people can get an impression of some of the things you found.

Erica: (Holds up two pictures). This one is about civil rights and this one's about someone being killed in South Africa.

RP: Did anyone else find anything you wanted to show right now or did you want to wait till next period to . . . OK, let's begin with the main part of our lesson now. (lesson 1)

As Table 13 reveals, teachers spoke more than their students. Dividing the student utterances by the combined number of utterances in each group revealed the following percentage of student talk in relation to teacher talk: control, 29%; treatment 1, 26%; treatment 2, 43%. On the average, teachers spoke two to three times more than the combined utterances of their students.

Small group discussions occurred in ten of the first eighteen To Kill a Mockingbird lessons. Although students spoke more and more students spoke in small groups, they worked to fulfil the requirements stipulated by the teacher: answering questions (GK, lesson 1), identifying quotes (RP, lesson 1), creating categories for characters (RS, lesson 2), discussing and marking comprehension questions (DP, lesson 1). Most frequently, these small group assignments focused on factual details about the characters and events. GK, for instance, gave each group a set of comprehension
questions. Because she ran out of time, she proceeded to read the answers from the teacher's edition (lesson 1). In another instance, though students sat in groups, they completed the assignment individually; very little assignment-related talk occurred (RP, lesson 2).

In the talk during the first novel study, students contributed not only less talk than their teachers, but like them, did so primarily at the data level. The difference between the control and treatment groups was not significant, chi-square = 1.33 for data talk, p. < .05, and 1.36 for concept talk, p. < .05.

Post Treatment: Literary Discourse

Control Classes

In the control classes, teacher talk decreased from an average of 281 statements to 186 statements per lesson. Again, most of the talk (83%) remained in the data (T1) category. Student talk remained relatively stable moving from 29% of the total class utterances to 36% per lesson.

Both teachers provided background information about communism and the Russian Revolution using the information to draw historical parallels to the events of Animal Farm. During one lesson (DP, lesson 4), the teacher asked the
students what they wanted to know ("Obviously, what’s one person we’re going to want to know more about?"). Receiving little response, she answered her own questions and told the students "what they want[ed] to know." After calling for volunteers to research one of the historical characters listed on the board, she moved to other dimensions of the historical context:

DP: We’ve got 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, people but there’s always going to be one or two people in this room who don’t, say, "Well, I don’t mind hearing about people but I’m really not too sure. I’d rather know about something else." So what might be interesting to know about besides the people?

S1: The revolution

DP: Well, the revolution. The revolution, yah (writes on board). Now the revolution didn’t happen in one day or one week. It happened over a long period of time so therefore, we need to know a little bit about the roots. That’s one thing (writes on board). We said that Karl Marx wrote his Communist Manifesto in England. It wasn’t near Russia, so he couldn’t have started it. Where did it come from? Everybody sort of knows?

S2: This is an essay? (lesson 5)

Most of the students utterances remained in the Data (R1) category (DP, 94% and KA, 86%). Averaging the two resulted in 90% of student talk in the Data category for the control classes.
Treatment Classes

Oral discourse increased for the students and decreased for the teachers in the treatment classes. In the treatment classes as Table 13 reveals, talk moved from 158 and 172 utterances to 308 and 357 utterances for treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups. Calculating percentages revealed that student talk in treatment 1 classes increased from 25% to 47% of the total talk and from 43% to 85% of the total talk for treatment 2 classes. Teacher talk decreased from 74% to 63% for treatment 1 to 62% to 15% for treatment 2 groups. These figures represent a shift in classroom talk in both treatment groups.

In the treatment classes as evident in Table 13, student and teacher talk shifted from data (R1) to concept (R2) talk. On the average, data talk constituted 13.7% and 19.3% of the student and teacher talk, a decrease of 51.8% and 63.5%, respectively. Concept (R2) talk constituted 42% of the total treatment 1 talk and 66% of the total treatment 2 talk. The bulk of the discourse for both treatment groups focused on concept (T2) and abstract (T3) talk.

For discussions of To Kill a Mockingbird, teachers lead students through each chapter as they read. For Animal Farm and The Chrysalids, no discussion occurred until all
students had completed the reading of the novels. Since students prepared for discussions without teacher intervention, they used their writing to inform their discussions and ask their questions first in small groups and later in whole class discussions. Their perceptions and observations of the novels impelled both small group and whole class discussions. While during the reading of *To Kill a Mockingbird* students often responded in one word or phrase utterances, students in the experimental classes tended to speak more, elaborate more and question other students instead of the teacher when they were uncertain:

S1: That's how they contacted them but why was she so valuable to them?
S2: Because they'd never seen such talent in such a young girl.
S2: So they can do tests on her and stuff. She's valuable to their kind. She can have kids that have just as much ability as her so they can double and multiply and quadrupalize! (RS, lesson 5)

Discussion of *Animal Farm* (treatment 1) incorporated a variety of topics. In lesson 5 (RS) students discussed the content of the story (Leslie: "I noticed that they were breaking the commandments, too"), politics (Dawn: "It's about politics because it's like leaders. The pigs are the leaders but they're blind and dumb because they don't think for themselves. They just go, you know."), communism
(Sabina: "That's what communism's all about . . . . There's only one candidate"), personal experiences (Dawn: "But have you noticed how, like in life people do that? They're hypocritical?"), repression and Hitler (Leslie: "That's how it was with Hitler. If they weren't soldiers for his army, then they'd kill them."), and an evaluation of the allegory (Kyla: "They'd have had a riot then. Killed off Napoleon. It would have been a better story.").

Students and teachers reading The Chrysalids (treatment 2) spoke more frequently at the factual level than those discussing Animal Farm (treatment 1), 14% compared to 21% of the total Data (T1, R1) discourse. The time frame of the novel, for instance, proved problematic to a number of groups:

S1: I think it took place in the future.
MK: Now, how do you know that's the case?
S2: Early.
MK: OK. You talk about that first because that may help you.
S1: You think it took place in the future, too?
S2: In the early future.
S1: Early future? . . . .
S3: I got the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century.
S4: Yah, that's what it said.
S2: I sort of set it in the '20's and '30's.

In the small group discussions, students elaborated on their responses, asked questions and sometimes negotiated on
a perception or understanding. During the taped interviews, a student explained:

S1: When you worked in groups, you can tell what people are thinking. I may not agree with it but it's still a valid opinion. In some of it, I mean, it's something I missed and look, you see how they saw it and it's something else you can put down.

Students moved from recitation of the facts (data) in discussing *To Kill a Mockingbird* toward exploring *The Chrysalids* in a more tentative, exploratory manner (concept, abstract):

S1: I wonder what it's supposed to be like? They talk about the Old People. I wonder if there's a, like it happened . . . .
S2: In France or something.
S3: It does seem like in the future.
S1: You know what happened. There could be a nuclear holocaust. (GK, lesson 5)

By gathering the remaining questions after small group discussions, students cast the whole class discussions. Teachers generally used the questions to guide the whole class discussions (Lesson 6, treatment 1 and treatment 2) as the following dialogue illustrates:

RS: Alright, then, one by one. Let's see if the other groups could come up with those answers. The chrysalids.
S1: What is the question?
RS: The questions is, "What are the chrysalids?"
S1: I had my hand up.
S2: I get to talk.
S1: I think they're the people who have ESP, they're that little group.
RS: Yes, put up your hand.
S1: How do you know the answer?
S2: I think the author's trying to say chrysalids means chrysalids, like, uh, what am I trying to say?
S3: Like a cocoon?
S2: Yah, like a cocoon. And um, ... . So David's group were also like psycho people or whatever and everybody else is sort of dying off and there's a new race being born.

RP's class considered 100 questions on Animal Farm submitted by small groups (RP, lesson 6). Some questions from each group were:

1. How did the pigs learn to translate English?
2. Why did the animals confess to Napoleon if they knew they were going to be killed?
3. Why did Mollie leave the farm?
4. Why are the pigs so evil?
5. Why did the animals have such bad memories?
6. In the end of the book, who cheated in the card game?
7. What was the role of the cat?
8. Why were Jones' men scared of the animals if they had guns?
9. Who gave old Major all his knowledge?
10. Why would Boxer believe Napoleon, but not Squealer?

NC's class submitted a question from each small group to discuss (lesson 6).

On the whole, teachers spoke less during the teaching of Animal Farm than during the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird. Students in the control classes spoke less than their treatment counterparts. Averaging the student utterances revealed that student discourse constituted 29%
of the pre and 36% of the post talk. Little talk consisted of the concepts and abstracts in the novel (17%).

In both treatment groups, students spoke more from pre to post and teachers spoke less. Students in these classes initiated more discussion and particularly considered concepts and abstracts (59% for treatment 1 and 79% for treatment 2) in addition to the data of the novels in their talk.

Both teacher and student talk in the control and treatment groups, as Figure 11 indicates, focused on the data in To Kill a Mockingbird. Moreover, while teacher talk dominated for the first novel, the converse occurred during the second novel: student talk in the two treatment groups dominated. Some evidence of abstract talk emerged. Though little changed for the control group during the teaching of the second novel, treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups shifted into concept talk.
Figure 11
A Comparison of Frequencies of Teacher and Student Oral Utterances in Three Levels of Discourse in Each Group
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2. Teacher and Student Questions

How many questions, who asks them and what kind of questions are asked indicates the quality of discourse about the novel. Table 14 below demonstrates the number of questions asked by students and their teachers for both novels. The numbers reveal the average number of teacher and student questions per lesson for the three lessons. Percentages based on the total number of questions are provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Pre/Post</th>
<th>Recall, Simple Compreh. (DATA)</th>
<th>Application Analysis (CONCEPT)</th>
<th>Synthesis/Evaluation (ABSTRACT)</th>
<th>Total Teacher Questions</th>
<th>Total Student Questions</th>
<th>Total Questions Per Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control DP</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control KA</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 RP</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 1 NC</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 RS</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat. 2 GK</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre Treatment: Teacher and Student Questions

Table 14 below reveals that teachers posed many questions during the course of the lessons. Control teachers asked an average of 71 questions per lesson, treatment 1 classes, 85, and treatment 2 classes, 45.

Discussion frequently consisted of teacher talk about the novel punctuated by one or more "closed" questions (Watson's term for questions requiring one correct answer). Teacher questions outnumbered student questions. Control, treatment 1 and treatment 2 teachers asked 94.5%, 89.4% and 73% of the questions, respectively. Factual questions (Q1) predominated for all six teachers ranging from 29 to 86 (lesson 1), 22 to 77 (lesson 2), and 8 to 127 (lesson 3). Calculating the percentages revealed that control teachers asked 85.1% of the questions in the data (Q1) category. Treatment 1 teachers posed an average of 72.3% and treatment 2 teachers an average of 78.7% of questions in the data category.

At times, teachers asked numerous questions and did not stop to elaborate or ask students to do so. When students responded to a question, teachers would frequently repeat the response:
OK, who do we meet in the first four chapters?

Scout. Scout. Scout. Scout.


Dill. Dill. Dill. Dill.

Atticus. Atticus. Atticus. Atticus.


Miss Caroline. Miss Caroline. Miss Caroline. Miss Caroline.

Sometimes questions would be repeated two or three times

[KA, lesson 2]. When students failed to respond immediately
to a teacher question, teachers often added another
question, sometimes incorporating the answers into the next
question or providing clues to the correct answer:

KA: Do you know what's different about the way Scout's
father is going to deal with this case? Well, I'll give you a hint. Do you know? Can you tell me? What's the difference about his way than some other person who's been appointed? Most people involved in the case would just walk in and mouth the part.

S1: He's going to try and win even though he can't.

KA: Do you understand that? That's the part that comes out over and over in the play, that even when you know you can't win, you still try. (lesson 2)

"Fill-in-the-blank" questions sometimes prompted chorus
responses; on over thirty five occasions in one lessons (DP, lesson 1). Students generally responded with a word or
phrase and rarely initiated or elaborated their responses. Most teacher questions fell into the data (Q1) category.

Students in the control, treatment 1 and treatment 2 groups posed fewer questions than the six teachers: eight, eighteen and twenty-four, respectively. Calculating the percentage of student questions resulted 5.7% for the control group, 10.6% for in treatment 1 and 27% for treatment 2 (see Table 13). Like their teachers, student questions tended to be at the data (I1) level. They often responded to teacher questions with a single word or phrase, sometimes in chorus. When students answered a question, teachers often repeated and elaborated on their brief responses (GK, lesson 1) sometimes altering them to meet their own specifications (KA, lesson 2):

DP: What did you notice about what we read last day? What's one thing that happened so far? I think you were reading Chapter 7 and 8, so what happened in Chapter 7 that's sort of intriguing, the story line? Look in your books, OK? OK, what are they trying to do?
S: They're trying to know who is Boo Radley.
D: They already know who he is but what do they want to know more about?
S: What's inside the Radley house.
DP: What does he do all day? Remember how long has Boo been grounded?
Chorus: 37 years, 35 years.
DP: Yah. And we talked about what it's like to be grounded, right? For a weekend let alone your whole life. He's now in his 30's and he's still grounded. Still grounded. Who in the community has seen him? (pause) Well?
Chorus: Miss Maudie.
Often, teachers evaluated the response: "That's exactly what I'm looking for" (KA, lesson 1). A preoccupation with comprehension questions at the literal level (T1, I1) clearly emerged in all six classes.

Questions about concepts and abstract issues emerged less frequently. When teachers asked questions relating to concepts (prejudice, for instance), they often framed the question so that it required a correct answer. During lesson 3, students reviewed an article on prejudice (concept) and were questioned orally on the specific content (data). Again, no connections were made to the novel. On another occasion (RS, lesson 2) students placed the novel characters in categories. After the class reviewed the categories orally, the teacher asked, "Now, the questions I want to ask about is this: should you put people in categories?" Though the obvious answer is no, the students had clearly been assigned to do just that. The review became a recitation of the accumulated facts about the novel.

On the whole, teachers spoke more and asked more questions than their students. While teachers often
elaborated on points about the novel, students' oral responses tended to be limited to a single sentence or, in the case of responding to questions, often a word or phrase. Talk centered primarily on the literal events and characters of the novel. Whole class discussions reviewing the novel proved the mainstay of the lessons.

Post Treatment: Teacher and Student Questions

Control Classes

As Table 14 reveals, teachers asked fewer questions than during the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird in both control classes (an average of 25 per lesson compared to 71). As in the previous novel study, questions at the factual levels (Q1, I1) predominated. Both teachers asked questions and sometimes provided the answers as well. At times they asked a series of questions without stopping to have students answer:

KA: Moses the raven represents organized religion in Russia, also called USSR. Do you know why it's called the USSR? Do you know why? Well, have you ever looked at Russian writing? Does it look like English writing?
Chorus: No
KA: No, because they have a different alphabet and so they don't, they don't, they're abbreviations are different. So in the story Moses represents the church. (lesson 5)
The ratio of student and teacher questions did not alter for the control classes. Students questions constituted 6% of the questions on the first novel, 13% of the second novel. Numerically, students asked an average of four questions per class for both novels. Hence, the percentage change is related to the reduced number of teacher questions. Concept (Q2/I2) and abstract (Q3, I3) questions constituted 14% of the total teacher questions and 7% of the student questions.

**Treatment Classes**

Teacher questions, as Table 14 indicates, shifted both in number and kind. They asked fewer questions. Teachers in treatment 1 classes reduced the percentage of questions asked from 92% to 63% of the total questions asked per lesson; treatment 2 classes from 81% to 29%. Teachers also asked fewer data questions and more concept questions. Of the total questions asked by teachers, 90% were in the concept and abstract categories for treatment 1 classes; 83% in the treatment 2 classes. This represents a shift in questioning from the first novel where the data questions constituted 75% and 80% of the questions asked by teachers for treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes respectively.
Student questions increased from 9% to 38% for treatment 1 classes and from 20% to 73% for treatment 2 classes. In general, students in both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes asked more questions about the novels, teachers fewer (see Table 14). While control students did not increase the numbers of questions they asked (an average of 4 per lesson for both novels), treatment 1 student questions increased from 9 to 27 per lesson and treatment 2 student questions from 12 to 36 per lesson. Both treatment classes asked three times as many questions for the teaching of the second novel.

While students in both treatment groups asked most questions at the data (I1) levels, the focus shifted for the second novels. Most of the questions were asked at the concept (I2) levels (see Table 14). Calculating the average number of student questions for the teaching of *To Kill a Mockingbird* resulted in 4 data (I1) and 6 concept (I2) and 11 data and 2 concept for treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes per lesson respectively. During the teaching of *Animal Farm* (treatment 1), students asked an average of seven data, nineteen concept and four abstract questions per lesson. Students reading *The Chrysalids* asked an average of seven data, twenty-seven concept and two abstract questions per lesson. Students asked more concept and abstract
questions and less data questions during the reading of the second novel.

The treatment 1 classes reading Animal Farm response logs used the questions other students had asked for their small group discussions: "Yes, that's the same question I asked - well, similar you know, about the animals starting to act like humans" (RP, John, lesson 5). In the same class, Erica read: "Good question: 'I wonder why they describe Boxer as eighteen hands high'?" Other students asked why Mrs. Jones escaped out the back door, why the people don't treat the animals all equally, and if the book was about communism. A discussion followed each question. Unlike the first novel, students addressed their questions to each other rather than the teacher. In NC's class, Rebecca asked: "How come the pigs are the smartest? . . . . I mean they always use rats for scientific experiments so why shouldn't the rats be smarter?" In reading another student's response log, Derek remarked: "You asked a good question: 'How did they fire a gun'?" Another student asked for clarification: "What do you mean they threw too many angles into the book?"

In discussing The Chrysalids (treatment 2), students spent more time coming to terms with the novel, attempting
to understand when and where the events took place, for instance:

S1: Where's this supposed to be? This world or something?
S2: Just a settlement. It's in
S1: Well, it says Labrador, so probably in Canada.
MK: Did it say Labrador?
S3: Yah. It said near Labrador.
S1: It said near Labrador.

Few questions were directed to the teacher; students asked other students (RS, lesson 5):

1: Mr. Strorm's Rosalind'd Dad, right?
2: No, Mr. Morton is.
1: Mr. Strorm?
3: David's Father. David's father. Everyone was killed when the helicopter landed and they were dropping that plastic stuff on them.
4: Except for Mike, though.
3: Except for Mike, yes.
1: What about David? David died, too?
3: David's saved. Petra's saved.
2: Rosalind's saved. They're all saved.
1: And Mike.

In sum, as Figure 12 reveals, teacher questions predominated and related primarily to simple comprehension of the novel (Q1) during the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird. During the teaching of the second novel, teachers in the control classes asked fewer questions (from seventy-one to twenty-five per lesson) but continued to ask primarily recall and simple comprehension questions. For both novels, students asked few questions (four per lesson).
In the two treatment groups, teacher questions decreased (from eighty-five to fifty in treatment 1; forty-five to fourteen in treatment 2) while student questions per lesson increased (from nine to thirty per lesson in treatment 1; twelve to thirty-five in treatment 2). Both teachers and students asked more questions in the concept and abstract categories.
Figure 12
A Comparison of Frequencies of Student and Teacher Questions in Three Levels of Discourse per Group
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Comparing the general observation tools (Tables 5 - Table 11) with the more specific student and teacher talk (Table 13 and Table 14) revealed that teacher talk and questions predominated for all six classes in the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird. Talk focused on the simple recall and comprehension of the characters and events of the novel. For the second novels, the ratios of student and teacher talk and questions remained relatively stable. Talk remained at the simple comprehension levels. Student talk and questions increased and shifted toward more the conceptual and abstract dimensions of the novels for both treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes.

V. Summary of the Findings:
In closing, the questions posed at the end of chapter 1 that frame the study are repeated in order to provide a summary of the substantive findings of the study. To avoid undue repetition, discussion will be limited to a summary of the impact resulting from the teacher inservice.

1. How does teacher inservice in transactive strategies affect the content of the informal and formal writing based on the novel.

The writing content shifted from a focus on literal comprehension of the novel to an open, expressive response
in the reading response log. Students covered a broad range of topics, questions, problems and hypotheses. Little evidence of summaries of the factual data emerged. Personal response to events, characters, concepts and questions emerged liberally. Hence, writing varied widely, moving from literal comprehension as evidence of having read the novel (pre) to a repository of thinking about the novel in the reading response logs (post).

In two of the four treatment classes, the literary essays demonstrated little difference as a result of the inservice. The remaining essays exhibited a wider range of knowledge about the novel in the writing.

2. How does teacher inservice in transactive strategies affect the quality of the informal and formal writing based on a novel.

Several factors contribute to determining the quality. Students wrote more, included more literary elements at levels beyond the factual (data) and used the writing produced during and after the lessons to continue discourse about the novel. Students produced writing that incorporated higher levels of thinking. The writing suggested a tentativeness and rehearsal (rather than recitation) of the novel. Individually and communally, they used the response log to engage in problem-solving,
analyzing and constructing their understanding of the novel. Due to the diversity in the writing, layering the written responses through small group and whole class discussions using the writing offered a comprehensive view of the novel.

The quality of the literary essays did not significantly alter when combining the four treatment classes, though in two of the treatment classes, considerable improvement in the writing occurred. Writing appeared more informed and fluid. In the remaining two classes, less so.

3. How does teacher inservice in transactive strategies affect the content of oral discourse about the novel in the secondary literature classroom?

Students spoke more, asked more questions, relied on the reading response logs to impel the discourse and less on their teachers to structure the discourse events. Conversely, teachers spoke less and asked fewer questions. Students posed questions to each other in their small groups. They encountered not only the factual data but moved beyond to the setting, mood and atmosphere, images, ideas and themes and the language of the novel to cover a wide range of literary content.
4. How does teacher inservice in transactive strategies affect the quality of oral discourse about a novel in a secondary literature class?

A consistent shift toward higher levels of discourse characterized the oral discourse in the treatment classes. Students not only spoke more, elaborated more, and asked more questions, but also incorporated a wider range of literary elements in their oral discourse. Teacher spoke less. Both students and teachers moved from a preoccupation with factual data (recitation) about the novel to less defined, prescriptive (rehearsal) talk about the conceptual and abstract elements of the novel, moving freely and reflexively among them. Consequently, student involvement and engagement with the literature increased for the treatment classes.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This study structured numerous elements in the context of response to literature through written and oral discourse. The role of critical thinking and learning, social construction of knowledge and the implications for literature curricula are embedded in the study of the discourse. The study investigated six secondary English classes reading a novel both before and after intervention (teacher inservice). What follows first is an attempt to assemble and organize the structure into a narrative account of the general findings in the context of related research. A discussion of the limitations of the study, implications for oral and written discourse about literature and recommendations for future research in this area concludes the chapter.

The following discussion on the oral and written literary discourse of students and teachers arises out of the context of the effects of teacher inservice in transactive strategies on oral and written discourse in literature. What made the change in the content and quality of the literary discourse possible? Several speculations exist. Certainly the fact that teachers personally engaged
in the transactive strategies provided a bridge to pedagogy. Also, teachers encountered the literature in a supportive community. As a community of learners, they received both the time and opportunity not generally allotted to groups of teachers to construct classroom pedagogy.

THE CONTENT AND QUALITY OF THE WRITTEN DISCOURSE

The discussion on written discourse introduces the content and quality of the general writing assignments before discussing the content and quality of the literary essays.

I. General Writing Assignments

A. Content of the General Writing Assignments

Writing assignments consisted primarily of prepared comprehension questions, quizzes and factual data reports. Hence, the content focused on details relating the events and characters in the novel. Students used the questions to recite information from the text. They often "put it [answers to the questions] in the words of the book" (Tammy, NC). Since the teacher already possesses the information, the answers are not intended to inform the teacher-reader. The answers provide a detailed of the plot or characters but no attempts to place the detailed answers within the larger framework of the novel or the world occurred. Hence, the study of the novel becomes a collection of
details to be remembered and memorized for the tests. Studying novels is identified with grazing for details ("When we were doing the Mockingbird questions, you just skim over it for the important facts," Shanen, NC). Written accounts of the content are collected, evaluated and summarily dismissed. Hence, students' writing about the novels become a collection of compartmentalized, disconnected details.

When teachers stress little more than a plot summary or other textual details, they can expect nothing more of their students. Children learn what teachers teach: that names, places, and plot are what's important. Because students often give little, teachers assume that they have nothing more to bring. Consequently, they relate increasingly more of the content to the students. A distanced, reporter stance (Rosenblatt's efferent) toward the work - objective and stark - characterizes much novel study (Langer & Applebee, 1987; ).

Implicit in this model [is] an orientation that treated the purpose guiding the reading or writing activity as essentially irrelevant. That is, the activities themselves and the work that resulted from having engaged in those activities received the focus, while the functional aspects of the activities were largely ignored" (Langer and Applebee, 1987, 138).

For the reading of the second novel, students in the treatment classes recorded their ongoing responses in a
reading response log. Written responses to Animal Farm (Treatment 1) and The Chrysalids (Treatment 2) revealed a wide range of distinct and unpredictable content and questions. Because students received only an open-ended guide [Appendix C.2], individual response to the content was possible. They used the logs to connect personally with the novel (Hubbard, 1985; Peyton, 1988; Staton, et al., 1988; Shuy, 1988; Hackman, 1987). The difference between answering comprehension questions after the assigned portions and responding during the reading of the novel may be best understood in a comparison offered by Neilsen:

When we say to students "Read this to find the three reasons why Rachel left home even though her mother was dying," we tend to prescribe the anomaly and its intellectual resolution in advance. On the other hand, when we say "As you read this account of Rachel leaving home, jot down any questions and feelings it raises," we allow each reader to encounter and resolve his own anomalies. (1989, 17)

Students shared their logs with other students. Reading other logs exposed them to a variety of other responses and enabled them to review the content(s) as preparation for oral discussion of the novel.

B. Quality of the Written Assignments
Comprehension questions and quizzes characterized most of the writing students were asked to do for To Kill a Mockingbird and for Animal Farm in the control classes. Few assignments required more than reciting information from the

Students wrote sparingly and appeared to invest little effort into the writing. Tammy commented:

Because if you do questions, you can read a chapter, you can read half a chapter and get - let's say you hand in your homework, and you can even get five questions out of six and not have even read the whole chapter and just go to the next chapter because we usually do chapter questions. (NC)

Teachers offer specific expectations of the writing, limiting content and specifying length, topic and due date. Writing, removed from student experience, becomes performance based, intended to satisfy the teacher. Having only the alternative of right or wrong, students resist. Recent research indicates that students have "difficulty generating sudden "snapshot" insights about a text" (Marshall, 1987). Even when students mark the writing assignments of their peers, the content is expected to be similar to their own (or the teacher and text). The more similar, the higher the mark. Completed writing assignments were collected, evaluated and disregarded.
The ramifications of these writing assignments in literature are particularly sobering. Rosenblatt proposes that readers need to assume a stance to the work. An efferent stance suggests a functional text. The reader "carries away" something or intends to act upon the reading (an experiment, for instance). For reading literature, she suggests, readers assume an aesthetic stance where "the reader's attention is centred directly on what he is living through during his relationship with that particular text" (1938, 25). The focus is on what happens during the reading. The reader carries on an active transaction with the text. Considerable research supports acknowledging and incorporating the students' response (Petrosky, 1977; Purves & Rippere, 1968; Squire, 1964; Dixon, 1969; Hansson, 1973). No one can read a literary text for another person. Teacher questions and quizzes eliciting factual information from the text ignore both the nature and potential of the literary experience. One student commented:

I find that if, because of your response journal, you don't just learn the facts. You learn the inside feelings and emotions better than you do the facts. Before with questions, you just have to write down the facts and not what feeling the story gives you. When you do the response journal, you feel the story. (Tammy, NC)

The primary writing form in the treatment classes after the inservice was the reading response log. In part, this stems from encouraging and developing the students'
experience of the text during the reading. Tammy explains the different writing tasks:

And also, like the way you have to do it when you analyze a story because of the way your response journal is. You have to analyze it through, all the way through, not just the characters, not just the action, all of it.

It asks students what happened to them as they read a text, not just what they found after they had finished. Students used the logs to generate hypotheses, infer new insights, express difficulty in understanding, define analogies, draw comparisons to other texts, and discover meaningful problems. Moreover, the writing could be viewed and re-viewed.

When teachers collected the logs, they responded to the content. Langer and Applebee noted that "Writing was most effectively used to enhance student learning when the teacher's criteria for judging that learning changed from the accuracy of the students' recitations to the adequacy of their thinking" (1987, 137). This study confirms that finding. Moreover, different kinds of writing lead students to focus on different kinds of information, to think about that information in different way and in turn to take quantitatively and qualitatively different kinds of knowledge away from the writing experience. Writing in the reading response log encouraged students to actively engage
with the literature, to shape their thinking in the act of writing.

Teachers noted the quality of student writing. Renata stated that when she read previous student journals, she commented, "Yah, right, OK" while she read. Reading the reading response logs she'd say, "Oh, wow! I can't believe this!" Students interviewed expressed the benefits to engaging with the novel through writing:

I found it almost made you learn the story more because you're always reading over your notes. . . . Just by writing all the notes and reading all the notes, I had a really good grasp of what the story was about and the characters" (Cory, NC).

Students in Norm's class commented that the second journal proved easier. For the first journal they had to remind themselves to stop and write as they read. For the second journal, stopping came more naturally (see transcript of student interviews).

The benefits of the reading response log include opportunities for thinking and learning (Berthoff, 1981; Emig, 1983; Britton, 1977; Crowhurst & Kooy, 1985; Martin, 1975; Moffett, 1983; Odell, 1981; Olson, 1985; Staton, 1988). Moreover, since extensive oral contributions by individual students is limited in the classroom, writing becomes a primary and necessary vehicle for organizing ideas and for conceptual learning (Langer and Applebee, 1987,
The logs served as vehicles for re-viewing the novel with others. Spor (1987, cited in Farrel & Squire, 1990, 198) found that writing response groups [as opposed to oral response groups] had significantly higher comprehension of the stories as indicated by the posttest scores."

Students had no preparation for responding in a log and teachers had little time to prepare and implement this transactive strategy for response. Yet each student in the four treatment classes submitted a reading response log. Students used their logs particularly at the onset of oral discussion. It appears that teachers need limited inservice to bring about some change in the oral and written discourse of students.

II. The Content and Quality of the Literary Essays

A. The Content of the Essays

The finding that the essays tended to contain predictable content and incorporated considerable retelling of the narrative confirms other research. Teachers assign the topics, frame the content expectations, prescribe the form and stipulate the length (Britton, et al., 1977; Emig, 1971; Applebee, 1981, 1984). Students select the easiest topics. They choose the path of least resistance (Marshall, 1988, 52). Shanen expressed her response to
essay assignments: "It was like, how can I get all these words in?" Not too surprisingly, the content of student essays reveal teacher expectations. Since most of the writing assignments consisted of a recitation of informational data from the novel, essays tended to defend a position (as opposed to support a position) and retelling the narrative (Langer & Applebee, 1987).

On the whole, essays written after the second novel in both control and treatment classes did not demonstrate distinctly different or more content. Both the control classes and one class from each of the treatment groups (Renata, Roni) provided the writing topics and established the criteria as they had done for To Kill a Mockingbird. Little change could be expected in the treatment classes since the essay assignment proved similar to other essay assignments. The reading response log appears to have been put aside, its usefulness ended at the onset of the formal essay project. Little evidence of its use could be detected in the essays. It appears that both students and their teachers reverted back to established patterns for literary essays.

Some change occurred in the writing of two of the treatment classes (Norm, Gail). Both these classes established essay topics out of their personal reading and
writing and it appears some personal investment in the topic may have had some effect on the content of the writing.

Table 12 (Chapter 4) reveals a change away from retelling (RT) in both the classes. Having the information to assemble the essay emerged as vital to students in Norm's class. Cory stated:

It's a lot easier to look back at the story when you have those notes [the reading response log] if you're doing an essay for it. . . . because you know exactly at what point something happens so you can explain it in your essay.

Gail's students wrote in-class essays with each person selecting a topic to write about out of their reading response logs. Reading the essays revealed that students avoided repeating the content. They demonstrated a familiarity with the content most likely due to using the reading response logs during the writing. One example of the range was evident in the writings of nine students who wrote about puzzling areas of the novel. Though some similar questions arose, no repetition occurred. Since others wrote about what interested them or what part of the novel proved to be their favourite, the established pattern may have been at least rearranged. Hence, students supported rather than defended their topic (Langer and Applebee, 1987).
B. The Quality of the Essays

Essays on To Kill a Mockingbird often possessed an artificiality, something Harste aptly coined "textoid." Diane's demonstration of the five paragraph essay (lesson 2) indicates the formulaic quality that encourages students to employ stilted, predictable language. The problem becomes, as Cory stated, "There's no feeling to it. There's no, 'This is what I'm saying'." The content lay embedded in formulaic, formalized "essay" language (Langer & Applebee, 1984; 1987; Suhor, 1984; Langer, 1984; Emig, 1971). Tammy summed up her previous efforts at writing literary essays: ". . . . you'd talk about nothing, round and round about nothing."

Like others, Newkirk (1989) suggests that the literary essay offers a restricted form of writing that teachers unquestioningly accept as a result of being trained in Payne's The Lively Art of Writing and Warriner's English Grammar and Composition. Teachers teach the traditional five-paragraph essay because they "rationalize that once students learn it, they can vary it; they need to produce something rigid so they can later produce something real" (Newkirk, 1989, 1). The problem arises, as with the teaching of grammar in extrapolated form, the connections simply do not appear. Hence, teachers feel the need to
review the formula of the five paragraph essay regularly during each school year.

On the whole, the essays for the second novel did not improve for either the control or the treatment groups. For the treatment classes, I suspect that a break occurred between the reading response log writing and the essay. First, while teachers responded in a reading response log and used it to discuss a novel during the inservice, no inservice work focused on the essay except to suggest that students find a topic out of their own log and questions to produce the essay. Somehow, the link between the expressive and formal writing deteriorated. It could be that teachers were unable to make the connections themselves and in assigning the essays, returned to their previous patterns - as did the students. Roni required all students to respond to *Animal Farm* using the same topic. Students expressed resistance (seven of the twelve students submitted them). It appears that Roni drifted back to the traditional assignments as time wore on during the discussions and writing on *Animal Farm*. Renata expressed dismay at the content of her class essays and speculated that perhaps waiting over the Christmas break prevented students from producing more insightful essays, certainly essays that revealed the insights of the reading response logs. In all
cases the teacher, though thoroughly informed, was the audience.

The routine formula of the traditional five paragraph essay may actually be counter-productive. It pre-empts the need for students to organize, assemble and sort the literature for themselves. Like teachers who tell the students everything necessary for understanding the novel, the essay starts with the answers, not the questions. Hence, essays become forums for listing character traits, similarities and differences, or defining themes, symbols, a provocative quote or incidents in the novel.

The essays in Norm and Gail's classes may have been exceptions because students elected the essay topics and may have invested more into the writing. Certainly research confirms that finding (Newkirk, 1989; Langer & Applebee, 1987; Applebee, 1981; Britton, 1977). The essays reflecting on the questions remaining about the novel in Gail's class revealed content that avoided the repetition and generalization of the previous essays and came closer to authentic voice than previous efforts. For both these classes, audience was restricted to the teachers. The writing may have improved more significantly had students presented their papers in small groups where other students could re-view the writing as a vehicle for re-vision.
Newkirk (1989) presents a convincing case for reclaiming the essay. He urges teachers to use essays to make personal connections with ideas rather than reformulating teacher ideas. In a sense, this offers a forward looking re-viewing of the novel instead of a backward reciting or perhaps, de-viewing of the novel (Marshall, 1987, noted the difference in personal/analytic and formal/analytic essays). Some glimmers of the first emerged in some of the essays in the treatment classes.

Teachers need to consider a variety of forms of written response to literature. In all cases, if students are to engage in authentic discourse, they will need the instruction and structure to engage with the literature in that idea-linking form (Graup, 1985, cited in Farrel & Squire, 1990, 188). The reading response logs, the impressionistic repositories of response, and the ongoing oral discourse need to be incorporated into more formal writings.

THE CONTENT AND QUALITY OF THE ORAL DISCOURSE

The Content of the Oral Discourse

The content of the oral discourse during the teaching of *To Kill a Mockingbird* tended to be structured and conducted by the teachers. Most of the content was literal,
factual data from the novel. This is consistent with a large number of other studies done both in secondary literature classes (Barnes, 1971; Barnes and Todd, 1977; Thomson, 1987; Webb, 1985; Watson, 1980, 1981, 1989; Eeds & Wells, 1989; Marshall, 1988) and other content area secondary classrooms (Cazden, 1986, 1989; Lemke, 1986; Stubbs, 1983; Kerry, 1981, 1984; Jones, 1988). Barnes (1971) terms this the "transmission" model of teaching that implies that knowledge (the content of the literature) resides in the teacher and the text. Smith (1983b) contends that teachers defining and limiting the content of the discourse leads to "soft core ignorance." In one taped interview, one student reflected about the content in the To Kill a Mockingbird discussions: "Who cares about the name of the dog? We wanted to talk about prejudice!" (NC, lesson 5).

During the teaching of Animal Farm and The Chrysalids the discourse shifted from predominantly factual and literal into more analysis and application discourse in both treatment groups. Teachers reshaped their pedagogy in the inservice sessions to accommodate and require students individually to work through the content (the reading response logs) before orally discussing the novel. Since they had time to reflect on the reading in the response logs, students incorporated a broad range of content,
bringing their perceptions and questions and comparing their responses. Work done in literature classrooms confirms that when students assume responsibility for the literary discourse, a shift in content occurs (Barnes, 1971, 1977; Thomson, 1987; Webb, 1985; Watson, 1981, 1989).

How could these teachers create the contexts for this to happen? First, they personally experienced the transactive strategies and collaborated with colleagues to shape the transactive pedagogy for the second novel. Neilsen writes:

Unless teachers have opportunities to exercise greater control over their professional lives and to work collaboratively with colleagues, it's highly unlikely that they will have the insight or conviction necessary to create conditions that help to empower their students (1989, 11).

Little research has attempted to trace the effects of inservice on actual classroom practice and even less on inservice training that involves teachers in both the content and process of their personal learning and responding styles as the basis for classroom pedagogy.

A second general finding involved the range of literary elements evident in the discourse content. During the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird the discourse focused primarily on the plot and events (1) and the characters and their relationships (2) [Table 3]. This reflects the first
finding in that literal and factual discourse on the novel averts issues of atmosphere (3), images (4), ideas and themes (5) and language (6). "Conversational control" (Watson) by the teacher tends to straitjacket student thinking.

The other side of the general finding occurred in the treatment classes for the teaching of the second novel. Students and teachers shifted into a wider range of elements in the discourse [Appendix B.6]. The absence of the teacher as central to the discourse placed the content and the asking of questions into student hands. As in the small group work done by Barnes (1987, Chapter 4; Dias, 1987), students demonstrated considerable competence in determining the content of their discourse and selected a wider array of literary elements in the course of their oral exchanges.

The Quality of the Oral Discourse

The first general finding indicates that impressionistic ratings of the lesson and student involvement ranked lower for the first novel than for the treatment groups in the second novel. Due to the teacher and text-centred nature of the lessons, students became passive recipients of the literary knowledge. Substantial research confirms this finding (Barnes, 1971, 1987; Watson, 1981, 1987; Goodlad, 1984; Hull, 1985; Stubbs, 1983;
Thomson, 1987). The constraints of typical classroom discussions led Kyla (Roni) to comment: "I don't like saying what I think out in class because I'm embarrassed and I'll think that someone else will think, 'Oh, you're stupid'."

Kyla is not alone. Moreover, few teachers accurately assess the number of students involved in whole class discussion (Watson, 1981, 90). What is called discussion often consists of a teacher monologue interrupted by literal questioning. Twenty years after Dartmouth (1966) Dixon's warning that teachers refuse to believe the inefficacy of the direct approach to literature teaching and that "the teacher who weighs in with talk or lecture is more likely to kill a personal response than to support or develop it (1969, 58) still rings true. After the third inservice, Norm reflected: ". . . . they [the students] have to wait for us. We don't teach them to learn for themselves, that's the trouble."

The second half of the general finding indicates that the ratings rose for both the lessons in general and student involvement for all four treatment classes. Teachers asked students to do what had traditionally been done for them: formulating and constructing a response. Opportunity to compare and share responses led to increased active engagement with the literature (Tables 5 and 6). Students responded to what Rosen termed "the irrepressible genre."

A change in the structure and level of the tasks constituted another general finding. Literal comprehension (L10) and reinforcing (L11) characterized a majority of the oral tasks in the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird (Table 8). Teachers set and directed the tasks. They implemented a mechanistic (Neilsen, 1989) view of literature teaching: summarizing and reviewing with intermittent questioning (Goodlad, 1984; Cazden, 1988; Barnes, 1971; Kerry, 1981, 1984; Watson, 1980).

In the To Kill a Mockingbird sessions, the higher order tasks and talk were virtually exclusively framed and created by the teachers. Is that really a higher order task/thinking? Though it may prompt some more thought, it can be as rote as factual levels of talk (The Russian Revolution exercise with Diane reduces itself to "finding the right answers"). There's a problem with calling something "higher order" by virtue of it not fitting into the "lower order" [Classroom Tasks]. If teachers design and orchestrate it,
no matter how imaginative or clever, it cannot be considered "higher order" in the same way that students who initiate the problem-solving, imaginative assignment would. There must be a difference, but the observation tool fails to acknowledge that difference. Hence, though it may look the same in a Table, in reality a fundamentally important difference takes place that must be acknowledged.

The other side of the generalization is an increase in oral tasks [Appendix B.5] at higher levels. In small groups, students communally encountered the text using particularly their problem-solving (H2), application (H3), analyzing (H4) skills (Table 8). Students initiated the higher order tasks. Having completed his analysis, the research assistant noted: "In the first sessions, teachers limited talk to the low-level, literal discussions while in the second sessions, students immediately moved into the higher order categories, working to solve, explain and order the novels through dialogue."

Teachers created the contexts for students to engage in the literary discourse with teachers as fellow readers and responders. Inservice instruction in articulating personal response to literature as well as the transactive process enabled teachers to alter the traditional structures in place in their classrooms (Webb, 1980).
Another general finding indicated that students and their teachers engaged primarily in factual discourse during the teacher of To Kill a Mockingbird. Teachers structured and managed the literary discourse; students followed. It appeared that teachers did not expect or believe students could respond personally, interpretively or evaluatively [Appendix B.6] to the literature. When students failed to respond to a question, they broadened the questions or provided clues ("I'll give you a hint"), lowering their expectations when students wanted more: "Who cares what the name of the dog is! We wanted to talk about prejudice!" Smith might have termed this 'insult to intelligence' (1986).

The treatment groups incorporated more literary elements at higher levels than the control students for the second novel. Using the expressive writing in the reading response logs for the discussions may have prompted the range. A noticeable shift toward 'a language for interpretation' (Watson) characterized discourse in the treatment classes. Movement among the levels and elements occurred reflexively rather than hierarchically. Left to respond to the text outside the framed context of teacher discourse, students opened themselves to interpreting, hypothesizing, evaluating and linking the literature to their own personal lives (Rubin, 1990; Probst, 1989, 1990;
A fourth general finding indicates that during the teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird, teachers generally talked more than the combined discourse of their students. Like the students in this study, Watson noted after observing a Grade 7 class discuss a film "that scarcely any pupil contributed more than five words" (1987, 96). Students participate in what Rubin (1990) calls "the culture of silence."

Fifth, students engaged in what Barnes terms, exploratory talk: "groping towards a meaning" (Barnes, 1976). Exploratory talk often has a reflexive nature - moving among the elements and categories, yet working to resolve issues and questions (as evidenced in the taped transcripts of discussion about The Chrysalids). Students worked together to transform the meaning of the novel. "The dialectic of class discussion offers a means of modifying or correcting interpretations for which there is inadequate support" (Farrel, 1990, x). Dias (1987), Barnes (1977), Watson & Young (1986), all confirm this finding in their research.
A sixth general finding indicates that teachers asked an inordinate number of questions, most of them factual, about *To Kill a Mockingbird*. Students tended to respond in phrases and single words rarely elaborating or developing their answers. "The students," Barnes says, "can only reply to the teacher's initiatives, and their replies are designed neither to inform the teacher nor to restructure their own thoughts but only to show they are taking part in the lesson" (1990, 43). Teachers pose questions to which they already know the answer. Students know they know; few risk being wrong.

In the treatment classes during the reading of the second novel, questioning shifted not only toward interpretation but also toward student initiated questioning. In the small groups, students asked for clarification from other students. Not constrained by teacher expectations, students asked a broad range of questions. Their questions differed from those asked for the previous novel by their teachers. They, not their teachers, wanted to know the answers.

It appears when teachers pose a majority of the questions, several things happen. First, if teachers ask the questions, how will students develop the skill? Students need consistent rehearsal opportunities to develop
their questioning skills. Articulation moves the question to an explicit, conscious level. In conventional circumstances, learners ask questions. When teachers ask most of the questions, they remove the right and responsibility from students if they ask the questions. Second, questioning encourages critical inquiry and in a broader sense, critical literacy, a goal for our students. Third, how can teachers or textbook writers assume they know the questions students have? Given that teachers (and texts) ask the questions and often even answer them, students naturally develop a dependence on sources (the teachers and texts who own and distribute the knowledge) outside of themselves. It appears more logical since teachers know the text and understand it, that their "textbook" needs to be the students and their questions.

Needless to say, when students collaboratively reflected on the novel in small groups, student talk dominated. Outside the constraints of teacher talk and expectations, students explored their divergent responses to the literature based on their own responses to the novel. Discussion groups in the treatment classes resulted in active learning dialogue (a finding confirmed by Barnes & Todd, 1977, 1981; Eeds & Wells, 1989; Dias, 1987). Barnes & Todd (1977) found when teachers listened to taped recordings of the small group discussions in their
classrooms, they "were surprised because the quality of the children's discussion typically far exceeded the calibre of their contributions in class; and they were pleased to hear the children manifesting unexpected skills and competencies" (ix). Similar responses emerged from the four treatment classes.

Coordinating the general findings establishes that oral discourse quality improved for both the post treatment groups. Student response discourse, constrained by teacher limits (questioning, literal comprehension), offers little indication of student sense-making and response strategies to the literature. Little opportunity for meaningful dialogue diminishes possibilities for reflective, exploratory talk. Opportunity to develop understanding and response requires ongoing discourse (Barnes, 1971; Barnes & Todd, 1977, 1981)).

Assigning a value (quality) to discourse cannot be limited to any one component. To attempt to consider one type of literary discourse superior to another requires valuing such things as higher levels of discourse, more student and less teacher discourse, purposeful, structured discourse, authentic discourse and discourse that shapes thinking. No one indicator serves adequately. Hence, the following perception of quality discourse frames the
discussion: (1) that cultivating authentic response to literature requires beginning with a personal response that reshapes itself through ongoing discourse, (2) that talk is learning and unless students receive consistent and ongoing opportunities to engage in dialogue with other students, they will not know what they or others know or think. They will languish in developing personal response-ability, (3) that a higher level of discourse cannot serve as an end in itself as though interpretive talk has value outside of the context of transforming the literary event (Rubin, 1990, 10), and that talk shapes meaning, (4) that student and teacher discourse be characterized by a balanced range of literary elements and levels of discourse.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Teachers needed inservice training in literary essay writing. If teachers could have experienced selecting, writing, determining purpose, audience and format and shared a formal essay with the others, they may have altered the context for the formal writing assignments in their own classrooms.

2. Though inservice training was limited to three sessions, teachers and students were expected to make immediate adjustments in classroom pedagogy. A longer
period of time for ongoing inservice with classroom application may have provided a stronger impact for continued change.

3. Teachers initially expected students to use the reading response logs, but most neglected to continue actively using the content or continue written reflections as discussions on the novel proceeded. Inservice training may have provided the needed tools to capitalize fully on the written student responses.

4. Students generally remained in the discussion group formed when the reading response logs were distributed back to the students. Had small groups rotated, students could have shared their impressions/perceptions of the novel with others in the class.

5. The evaluation tools of the essays did not adequately reveal the nature of the writing. The GRL [Appendix C.1] categorized statements but allowed no provision for repetition, for instance, or elaboration of a point. Essays were evaluated on the basis of individual statements, not how those statements connected or failed to connect to one another. Alternate evaluation and analysis may have provided a clearer picture of the essays. Measures noting the
number of drafts produced by the students, attitudes toward essay writing, indications of the processes applied by the students may have produced valuable criteria for evaluating the essays.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY FOR LITERATURE CLASSROOMS

**Written Discourse**

1. Writing ongoing responses in a reading log allows students to construct their own knowledge, pose their own questions, identify their own textual anomalies and to think analytically, essential life skills. [Chapter 4, General Writing Assignments (post, treatment); Videotape/ Transcript, student interviews, 56-63]

2. Articulating a response to literature through writing urges the response to the surface so that it can be viewed and re-viewed by both students and their teachers. It exposes both the process of reading and the content of the response. [Chapter 4, General Writing Assignments (post, treatment)]

3. Written responses require active engagement on the part of the students ("... there's no way you could
write anything down if you're not concentrating" Tammy, NC).

4. Responding in writing shapes thinking about the literature. "Written language not only makes ideas more widely and easily available, it changes the development and shape of the ideas themselves" (Langer and Applebee, 1987, 3). Writing becomes the vehicle for transforming thought.

5. Writing responses to literature allows a "work in progress" document that traces the development of the literary response not available through traditional questioning. This encourages students to assume what Dewey called "an attitude of suspended conclusion" and acknowledges the tentative "rehearsal" quality of the developing response.

6. Written responses can be shared with others so that the response moves from internal to external dialogue. Comparing responses exposes students (and their teachers) to other questions, perceptions, and ways of looking at the literature. The shaping of response alters through authentic dialectic encounters with
other responses. [Chapter 4, Teacher and Student Questions (Post Treatment); Chapter 5, Quality of the Written Assignments; Transcript and video, 21-25, treatment 1 and treatment 2 classes; student interviews, 37,38]

7. Written accounts of response can be re-viewed and re-written. Students can interpret and reinterpret what they are learning. It allows the "travelling time" that Barnes suggests. [Videotape/ Transcript: Reflecting on Doing the Reading Response Logs, 35-36]

8. Responding in writing insists on personal responsibility and accountability to others in the class. Each written response allows students to inform other responses and be informed by other responses. [Videotape/ Transcript: Sharing Your Written and Oral Responses with Others, 37; Chapter 4, Teacher and Student Questions (Post Treatment); Chapter 5, Quality of the Written Assignments]

9. These texts become the working text for the teacher. Knowledgeable about the literature and her own response, she can structure the lessons around the student responses, perceptions and questions. [Videotape/ Transcript, 20-21]
10. Written responses demonstrate to students that they have something of their own to say. When they re-view and share their responses, they understand the purpose and what is accomplished through the writing (a radical departure from the traditional questions and quizzes). [Chapter 4, Elements of Literary Discourse; Videotape/ Transcript, Teacher and Student Interviews, 30-40]

Oral Discourse

1. Students need more opportunity to explore literature through oral discourse, to talk their way through to understanding (Vygotsky's social construction of knowledge and communicative activity).

2. Talk should reflect the tentative, rehearsal nature of a developing response. It should be forward-looking (increased understanding) not backward looking (answers to teacher questions, fait accompli). Evidence of student perceptions, problems and questions should characterize the talk. [Chapter 4, Literary Discourse (treatment classes); Chapter 5, Quality of the Written Assignments; Videotape/ Transcript, Small Group Discussions Using the Reading Response Logs, 22-25, treatment 1 and treatment 2]
3. Writing in response to literature provides both an opportunity for reflection and gives students something to say. It structures a framework for the discourse. [Appendix C.1, Chapter 4, Literary Discourse (post, treatment classes; Teacher and Student Questions (post, treatment classes); Chapter 5, Quality of Written Assignments; Videotape/Transcript, 22-25, treatment 1 and treatment 2]

4. Opportunity for student discourse about the literature should be structured and defined by the teacher so that a purpose, support, and accountability prevail. Teachers create the contexts for discourse that help students become self-reliant rather than other-reliant by helping them to identify and solve problems of interest and consequence to the literature studied. Teachers participate in the discourse as co-readers, responders and facilitators. This supports the apprentice dynamic of learning, a "come with me into the literature" attitude in the class. [Chapter 4, student involvement in the lessons, treatment classes (post); oral exchanges during the lesson (post, treatment); oral tasks (post, treatment); student literary discourse: utterances and questions (post, treatment); Videotape/Transcript, Group 1, 24; Whole Class, 26-29]
DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

1. A follow-up to this study could include observing the treatment teachers over a longer period of time to determine the implementation of the transactive strategies not only to novels, but other literature as well. Unannounced observations, ethnographic field notes and audiotaping would provide a sense of the impact of the inservice as well as the implementation in the classroom.

2. Continuing the work of operationalizing current theories of language, learning and literary criticism for pedagogy builds bridges to practice. Little has been done to impact classroom practice through training and involving classroom teachers in the transition. This encourages a more comprehensive strategy for implementation since it holds language at the center, incorporating reading, writing, listening and speaking.

3. If, as Newkirk suggests, we need to "reclaim the essay," we need to provide the structures and opportunities for teachers to explore the possibilities - probably through inservice. Would changes in essays be possible through explicitly linking the reading
response log to the essay if teachers personally engaged in the process, for instance?

4. To determine changes and improvement in literary essays requires applying a wider range of criteria: audience, purpose, format; the number of drafts; peer and teacher responses during the process; attitudes to writing essays; student accounts of their own processes of writing the essays.

5. Detailed analyses of reading response logs would allow identifying the effect of the reading and writing on subsequent oral discourse, to ascertain how the process of response shapes the oral discourse. Analysis of the response logs would also provide a clearer picture of the strategies readers use to construct meaning from literary texts. Following a small group of students throughout a semester or school year, for instance, through observations, analyses of their response logs, interviews and audiotapes, would provide a view of their developing responses over time and other literary genre.
CONCLUSIONS

This study attempted to organize a number of elements incorporated in response to literature and determine whether related findings in the research would be confirmed in this design. The oral and some of the written discourse changed as a result of the inservice training. Students need to be active agents who interpret and reinterpret what they've been learning. The discourse needs to be characterized as "work in progress." Given the traditional notions of instruction, teachers find it difficult to relinquish centrality and to establish ownership of alternate, student-centred literature pedagogy. Attempts to implement successfully the approaches I have sanctioned requires consistent and ongoing teacher support in inservices that actively model and engage teachers in the transactive strategies introduced. So far as the evidence in this study is concerned, limited teacher inservice led to a multiplicity in content and improvement in student and teacher discourse about the novel and offered some confidence for potential change in literature classrooms.
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APPENDIX A.1

SURREY SCHOOL DISTRICT # 36: GRADE 10 NOVEL STUDY

TEACHER: ______________________  SCHOOL: ______________________

The Ministry prescribed list recommends seven novels for class study in Grade 10. If you have taught any of the novels, please indicate with a check mark in the space provided. If you prefer to teach some novels more than others or have planned to include them in your literature study this year, please indicate that as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taught</th>
<th>Prefer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosie is my Relative</td>
<td>Durrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Farm</td>
<td>Orwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Kill a Mockingbird</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Chrysalids</td>
<td>Wyndham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Fall of Moondust</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death Watch</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I Heard the Owl Call My Name</td>
<td>Craven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information:

1. On the average, how long do you usually take to teach a class novel? ____________________________

2. Any Additional information that might be useful: ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
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### APPENDIX A.2

#### DISTRIBUTION OF GRADE 8 AND 9 ENGLISH MARKS FOR THE GRADE 10 RESEARCH STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>KA</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>GK</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=24</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>n=24</td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td>n=27</td>
<td>n=25</td>
<td>n=139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>x=46</td>
<td>x=52</td>
<td>x=48</td>
<td>x=22</td>
<td>x=45</td>
<td>x=50</td>
<td>x=263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td></td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td></td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = number of students  
\[x\] = number of marks for Grade 8,9

### Average for the Six Classes

- **A** = 12%
- **B** = 32.4%
- **C+** = 23.5%
- **C** = 13.8%
- **C-** = 7%
- **P** = 17.4%
- **F** = 1.7%

### Range of Marks for the 6 Classes

- **A** = 4% to 26.9%
- **B** = 18% to 45.5%
- **C+** = 9.6% to 31.1%
- **C** = 6.5% to 22.0%
- **C-** = 0% to 2.2%
- **P** = 8.7% to 26.0%
- **F** = 0% to 26.0%
APPENDIX A.3

DISTRIBUTIONS OF GRADE 8 AND 9 ENGLISH MARKS OF THE STUDENTS IN THE RESEARCH CLASSES

1. DIANE PETERSEN: EARL MARRIOT

Student Total: 24
Grades Available: 46 (23 x 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. KEN ALLISON: EARL MARRIOTT

Student Total: 26
Grades Available: 52 (26 x 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. RONI PHILIP: GUILDFORD PARK

Student Total: 12
Grades Available: 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **NORM CHAPMAN: GUILDFORD PARK**

Student Total: 27
Grades Available: 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C−</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **RENATA STOPPER: CLOVERDALE JUNIOR**

Student Total: 24
Grades Available: 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **GAIL KRICKAN: GUILDFORD PARK**

Student Total: 25
Grades Available: 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C−</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A.4

Schedule and Procedures of the Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Videotaping</td>
<td>Videotaping Novel #1</td>
<td>Videotaping Novel #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Novel #1</td>
<td>(DLS/Essay) Inservice</td>
<td>DLS/Essay Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Letters to Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intro. to Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Class Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consent Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Questionnaires (Teacher/Student)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Wk</th>
<th>M T W TH F</th>
<th>M T W TH F</th>
<th>M T W TH F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>V3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>V4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V3/I1</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>V5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A.4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intro. to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Teacher/Student)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Wk</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td></td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Videotaping:** Novel 1 (V1 - V3) Novel 2 (V4 - V6)

**Inservice:** I1 to I3
APPENDIX B.1

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION CARD

Teacher: __________________ School: __________________
Class: __________ Date: _______________ Session: __________
Time: _______________ Novel: ____________________________
Assignments: __________________________________________

Physical Features of the Classroom: ________________________________

Describe the activity briefly (include teacher's apparent
purpose, unique features, etc.): ________________________________

Describe the continuity of lesson (its relationship to previous
and succeeding lessons): ________________________________

1. Pupil Involvement (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uninvolved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Content (order of emphasis, 1,2,3, only):

a. Literature _____ b. Reading _____ c. Mass Media _______
d. Composition _____ e. Speech: formal _____ f. Language _______

3. Method (order of emphasis, 1,2,3, only):

a. Lecture _____ b. Recitation _____ c. Student Presentation ______
d. Demonstration _____ e. Discussion _____ f. Groups ______
g. Socratic ______________ h. Teacher operating equipment _______
i. Silent work _______ j. Reading _______ k. Writing _______
APPENDIX B.2

ANALYZING TRANSCRIPTS OF ENGLISH LESSONS

Teacher: ______________________ School: ______________________

Grade/ Block: ___________ Date: _________ Time: ___________

Session: _______ Novel: ________________________________

1. The Teacher's Questioning

a. Are most of the teacher's questions open (i.e. questions which allow for a range of responses and in general give more scope for thinking) or are they closed questions (i.e. those for which only one answer, usually factual, is possible)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Does the teacher ask pseudo questions (i.e. questions which appear to be open but for which the teacher's reception of answers shows that s/he will accept one reply only)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Does the teacher elicit (and build on) the experiences and understanding the pupils bring to the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Pupils’s Responses

a. Are the pupils’ responses typically short, or are they encouraged to develop their replies? Is there evidence that they are encouraged to use exploratory talk – to talk their way into understanding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Exploratory Talk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The Teacher’s Reception of Pupils’ Responses

a. Is the teacher concerned chiefly to evaluate replies (right/wrong; good/bad) or does s/he respond to what has been said? Does s/he encourage pupils to expand on their replies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always judges</th>
<th>Frequently judges</th>
<th>Occasionally responds</th>
<th>Frequently responds</th>
<th>Always responds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(right/wrong;</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>to content</td>
<td>to content</td>
<td>content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good/bad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Do the teacher’s comments on pupils’ replies function as a means of clarifying meanings and increasing understanding, or do they distort pupils’ contributions in order to fit the teacher’s frame of reference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Degree of Conversational Control Exerted by the Teacher

a. Is there a demand that all pupils responses be funnelled through the teacher, or are pupils encouraged to respond directly to one another?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Are pupils given the opportunity to ask their own questions? Are they free to open up new areas of discussion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Small Group Discussions**

a. How is the talk being managed? Is it based on democratic negotiation, or is one member of the group 'playing teacher'? Is there evidence that the group is functioning in a mutually supportive way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Is there evidence that members of the group are listening attentively to one another?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inattentive</th>
<th>Some Attention</th>
<th>Attentive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Is there evidence of collaborative learning – of pupils working together to develop and clarify their understanding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Collaboration</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Full Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Does the group cope satisfactorily with difference of opinion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cannot Cope</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Generally</th>
<th>Encourages Divergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. Do the members of the group allow one another to bring personal experience to bear on what is being discussed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Are there signs that the group has developed/is developing the skills of hypothesizing, marshalling evidence, evaluating evidence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
<th>Scant Evidence</th>
<th>Some Evidence</th>
<th>Clear Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Is there evidence that members of the group are developing/have developed the ability to remain tentative and tolerate uncertainty for longish periods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
<th>Scant Evidence</th>
<th>Some Evidence</th>
<th>Clear Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B.3
TEACHER TALK AND QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Episodes</th>
<th>T0 Mngm't</th>
<th>T1 Recall/Simple Comprehension DATA</th>
<th>T2 Application/Analysis CONCEPT</th>
<th>T3 Synthesis/Evaluation ABSTRACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = \text{talk (utterances)} \quad q = \text{questions} \]
APPENDIX B.4
STUDENT TALK AND QUESTIONS

Teacher ___________________ School ___________________ Grade ____________

Date ___________________ Session ____________ Time ____________

Novel ___________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Episodes</th>
<th>R0 Mngm't</th>
<th>R1 Recall/Simple Comprehension DATA</th>
<th>R2 Application/Analysis CONCEPT</th>
<th>R3 Synthesis/Evaluation ABSTRACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t q</td>
<td>t q</td>
<td>t q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r = response (utterances)   i = inquiry (questions)
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APPENDIX B.5

CLASSROOM TASKS: ORAL AND WRITTEN DISCOURSE

TEACHER: _______ SCHOOL: _______________ GRADE: _______

SESSION: _______ DATE: _______________ TIME: _______

NOVEL: ______________________________________

LOWER ORDER TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM TASK</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TASKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Disciplinary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Administrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 Drawing/Colouring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 Copying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5 Reading Aloud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 Silent Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7 Memorizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8 Revising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9 Carrying out an experiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10 Simple Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11 Reinforcing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12 Looking up information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Imaginative Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Problem-solving, deducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Application Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Analysis Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Synthesis Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Evaluation Tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HIGHER ORDER TASKS**
APPENDIX B.6

DISCOURSE EPISODES

Teacher ___________________ School ___________________ Grade ___________________

Date ___________________ Session ___________________ Time ___________________

Novel __________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VCR</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>DISCOURSE EPISODE</th>
<th>TASK/COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B.7

## LITERARY ELEMENTS AND LEVELS OF RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lit. Elements</th>
<th>(a) Factual</th>
<th>(b) Interpretive</th>
<th>(c) Personal Assoc./Sign.</th>
<th>(d) Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plot/Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Characters/Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Setting/Mood/Atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ideas/Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Language:Style/Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUAL STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE LESSONS

For each student, put a minus (−) in the box or boxes next to each of the activities in which the student participates. If the student participates frequently or with an appreciable degree of involvement or animation, change the mark to a plus (+).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Listens or attends
2. Answers questions
3. Takes part in discussion
4. Reads aloud (singly or in a group)
5. Enacts or mimes
6. Writes
7. Reads
8. Works alone
9. Works in a group
10. Other (specify)

**COMMENTS:**

---

*Fig. 6.2 Observation schedule*
Category: Literature
Title: General Response to Literature (GRL)
Authors: National Assessment of Educational Progress Staff and Consultants
Age Range: Intermediate through postsecondary-adult
Description of Instrument:
Purpose: To describe students' written responses to works of literature.
Date of Construction: 1979
Physical Description: Students are asked to respond to literary works in any way that seems appropriate to them and given time to write out a response. GRL then permits a description or classification of the whole response and of individual statements within the response. Analysis of individual statements (propositions or T-units) reveals some of the personal, literary, and cognitive resources students bring to their responses to literature and their exploration and development of those responses in writing. GRL is presented below in its entirety. Though explorations of some descriptive categories contain references to a brief story and a poem used in the 1979-80 Reading Literature Assessment, GRL is designed to describe comprehensively students' responses to any work of literature.

GRL: Story

Scoring Guide Categories:
EM = Emotional. Respondent attributes emotions or feelings of mood to the text or makes a direct statement of emotion. Examples would include: "The story was sad," "It's touching," "It had a funny feeling," "It was very dramatic," or "I felt sorry for the boy."
RT = Retelling. Respondent summarizes or retells the story (or parts of it). This summary can include statements referencing specific words or lines. (Disregard inaccuracies.)
IN = Inferencing. Respondent goes beyond the text and provides motivations for characters or develops action. Inferencing includes text-based hypotheses of what did happen or predictions about what will happen. For example: "David learned a lesson," "David's parents needed him to pay the bills," or "David feels that his father doesn't love him."
GN = Generalization. Respondent derives general meanings from the story, such as: "Go out and try new things," "It shows that people have feelings that can be hurt and people are the ones that hurt each other," or "Everyone knows you can't run away from your problems."
AN = Analysis—superficial. Respondent mentions superficial characteristics of the text. This includes comments about format, for example: "It could have more details and not so many long words," "I didn't see any misspelled words," "It wasn't long enough," or "The author uses imaginative language."
Y = Analysis—elaborated. Respondent gives an elaborated or substantive discussion of any one of the following special features or literary devices: plot, characters, setting, images, sounds, etc. Included here are discussions of plot veracity and meaningfulness.
OW = Other works—general. Respondent classifies the work as to genre or type and compares the story to other types of works or art forms in general, for example: "It's not like a story I've seen before," "I think it's a good soap opera," or "It is like a myth."
Z = Other works—specific. Respondent compares the story to a specific work which is mentioned by title, such as: "The last paragraph reminds me of an old song, 'Tie a Yellow Ribbon Round the Old Oak Tree.'"
EV = Evaluation. Respondent judges the worth of the work. This judgment also includes such statements as: "It was stupid," "I didn't like it," "It doesn't make sense," "It is nicely written," "It was not exciting or sad," "It has no meaning," or "It is imaginative."

EG = Egocentric. Responses are not text based, but are text relevant. Respondent writes a letter or story of his or her own or writes another story (or excerpt) that he or she has memorized. Other types of statements categorized here are: "I never read stories," "I'm not good with stories," or "I'm sorry to run out on you, I don't want to go to college either."
PR = Personal—analytic. Respondent gives personal reactions to content in an analytic sense—identification with characters, judgments about actions of characters and advice giving, observations about the way society should/does work. Respondent states, for example: "David shouldn't have left home," or "Hopefully his father will tie the cloth on the tree."
X = Personal—global. Respondent gives personal reactions to genre and content in a global sense. Examples would be statements of the following types: "I like stories about nature," "I wish I could write stories like this," or "This is not my kind of story."

Consultants: National. Literary. and Cognitive Resources Students Bring to Their Responses. Individual statements (propositions or T-units) reveals some of the personal, literary, and cognitive resources students bring to their responses to literature and their exploration and development of those responses in writing. GRL is presented below in its entirety. Though explorations of some descriptive categories contain references to a brief story and a poem used in the 1979-80 Reading Literature Assessment, GRL is designed to describe comprehensively students' responses to any work of literature.
READING RESPONSE LOG GUIDE

A response log is one effective way to keep track of your ongoing reading responses. It offers a chance to ask questions, to wonder ALOUD, so to speak, about the literature. In reading the text, take some time every 10 to 15 pages to record your observations. This is not a time to "tell" what happens in the story, but a time to ponder on how what happens STRIKES you.

Your responses will almost certainly vary in length. Sometimes you may want to write half a page, other times, three or four lines. Do not rewrite or revise your responses. The main idea is to record your first impressions. Neatness is limited only to readability.

The following "thoughts" offer possibilities for responding. Don't try to answer all of them in each response. Use the ones that most apply to what you've uncovered in your latest reading.

SUGGESTIONS FOR READING RESPONSES TO LITERATURE

1. In this section, I was impressed or struck by . . .
2. I noticed . . .
3. I wonder about . . .
4. I predict . . .
5. Some questions I have . . .
6. I don't understand . . .
7. Something I now understand . . .
8. Now I sense why . . .
9. An interesting word/ sentence/ thought from the text is . . .
10. Something I appreciate/ don't appreciate about a character or event is . . .

If there are other striking things you uncover in your reading, include them. Do not limit yourself to the suggestions listed above. Each person responds to a text in different ways. The purpose of this journal is not to test your knowledge, but to help you deal with the literature in a personal way, to ask your own questions.
VIEWING GUIDE:
THE EFFECTS OF IMPLEMENTING TRANSACTIVE STRATEGIES
ON ORAL AND WRITTEN RESPONSES TO NOVELS
IN SECONDARY ENGLISH CLASSROOMS
This video companion to the dissertation offers a visual view of the oral responses to literature of students in six Grade 10 English classes. All the students read Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird* and were videotaped at three stages of the novel study. Four of the six teachers participated in developing transactive strategies for teaching literature during three inservice sessions. All six teachers taught a second novel. Each class is represented both in the pre and post sections. Full transcripts of each discourse episode is included.

Considerable effort was expended in locating meaningful and representative class or group discourse episodes. Each presents a brief glance at the teaching of the novels or the inservice training. A heading or a brief statement introduces each discourse episode.

**PRE TREATMENT: READING TO KILL A MOCKINGBIRD**

The Teaching of To Kill a Mockingbird

1. **Introduction**

NC's class independently reading the novel

2. **Reviewing the Chapters 1 to 4** (RP, Lesson)

RP: OK, who do we meet in the first four chapters?

S1: Scout.

RP: Scout.

S2: Jem.

RP: Jem.

S3: Dill.

RP: Dill.

S4: Atticus.

RP: Atticus.

S5: Calpurnia.

RP: Calpurnia. We hear about . . .

S6: Miss Caroline.

RP: Miss Caroline. She's a minor character. But you remembered her. That's great.

S7: Miss Rachel.

RP: Miss Rachel.

S8: Miss Maudie.

RP: Miss Maudie. We don't meet her but we certainly hear about her, don't we?

S9: You hear about Boo.

RP: You hear about Boo. Remember last period we said, "Who is Boo?"

(Student chatter)
RP: What about the town scold? Do you remember her? She's always criticizing all the little kids and, check your books please to see if you can find. . . . Also, there's a young man there who has lice in his hair.

Chorus: Burris

RP: I knew you would remember his name. And what about the young man whose family is too proud to take any money from the teacher?

Chorus: Cunningham's

RP: What's his name?

Chorus: Walter

RP: Walter. Like father, like son, isn't he? They're a very proud family and they don't want to take charity. Who is the town scold?

S: Miss Caroline

RP: Miss Caroline is the teacher and I guess you could say she was the town scold. She's a little confused when she first comes to the area. She didn't relate to the characters.

S: We also met the Ewells.

RP: We met the Ewells. Burris has lice in his hair. A critter in his hair.

S: A cootie.

RP: A cootie. That's right. Thank you very much, Dawn. Miss S. Her name starts with S.

S: Miss Stephanie.

RP: Good for you. Miss Stephanie. OK. Three of these are minor characters and the rest are major characters that we'll continue to see throughout the book.

3. Reviewing Chapters 7 and 8 (DP, Lesson)

DP: What did you notice about what we read last day? What's one thing that happened so far? I think you were reading Chapter 7 and 8. So what happened in Chapter 7 that's sort of intriguing? The story line. Look in your books, OK?

S1: (Unintelligible)

DP: OK. What are they trying to do?

S2: They're trying to know who is Boo Radley.

DP: They already know who he is but what do they want to know more about?


DP: What does he do all day? Remember, how long has Boo been grounded?

Chorus: 37 years, 35 years.

DP: Yah. And we talked about what it's like to be grounded,
right? For a weekend, let alone your whole life. He's now in his thirty's and he's still grounded. Still grounded. Who in the community has seen him? (pause) Well?

Chorus: Miss Maudie.

DP: Miss Maudie. Good for Christine. She remembered.

4. Reviewing Chapter 9 (KA, Lesson)

KA: And anyway, so here we go. So, you read Chapter 9. Now, you remember Scout goes to school and she meets Cecil Jacobs. Cecil Jacobs calls Scout a name. What happened? What did Cecil Jacobs call Scout? He called her a word that might offend most of you. He called her a _________. Her father was a _________.

S: Nigger lover.

KA: Nigger lover, OK? And she really didn't know why she didn't like that expression. Uh, why did Cecil Jacobs do this? Any idea? What's about to happen in Part two of the book? And why is this idea introduced right now? I can't see anybody. Yes (responds to hand up).

S: Because Scout's dad is defending one in the court case.

KA: OK, there's a case coming up. How much do you know about the court case? You know it involves a black man. Do you know his name?

Chorus: Tom Robinson

KA: Tom Robinson. You know that Scout's father has been appointed to defend him, but do you know what he's been accused of? Yes (responds to hand up)

S: Well, he's accused Mr. Robinson of raping Selene.

KA: OK. So rape's the word. Some people find that uncomfortable to say but that's what happens. So, anyway, it's a very controversial case that's about to happen and Scout's father has been appointed to do it and in similar situations there will always be someone appointed to the family, the person who is charged. Scout's father, Scout's father is approached. Do you follow me? Do you know what's different about the way Scout's father is going to deal with the case? Well, I'll give you a hint. Do you know? Can you tell me? What's different about the way than some other person who's been appointed to. . . . Most people involved in the case would just walk in and mouth the part. Yes. (responds to hand up)

S: He's going to try and win even though he can't.

KA: Do you understand that? That's the part that comes out over and over in the play, that, even when you don't even when you know you can't win, you still try.
5. **A General Discussion of the Novel**  (RS, Lesson)

RS: One of the things I want you to notice in this novel is the fact that we have a society, a town, which seems to be quite negative. And then when we look at the people, slowly but surely we see that the people are really . . . .

S: positive.

RS: Well, not positive, but a really rich array with many different types with all these things in there. And these people are all going through during the novel, they're going to rub against each other.

S: Friendship.

RS: Yes. And the thing that I especially in the incident with Walter, where you always have the backdrop of the town and what the people generally are like, with regions in there and do, for homework, I want you each to besides reading Chapter 3, you have to read Chapter 3, I want you to reread the incident with Walter and I want you to tell me specifically about Scout's role as far as other people are concerned. What is it that she does in that particular scene and if you can. . . . Matter of fact, I'd like you guys to start talking about that right now, before the bell goes and turn around and listen to what you have to say, OK? And then each one of you be ready to explain to me next period, "What is Scout's role?"

S: Talk together right now?

RS: Yes, talk to each other.

6. **Students Planning for a Drama Presentation**  (GK, Lesson 2)

S1: You be Dill. You be Scout.

S2: (unintelligible)

S1: Just find Scout. Find out her personality, what she was like.

S3: Mike should be Dill.

S1: Huh?

S3: Mike should be Dill.

S1: C'mon Mike, you should be Dill.

S3: I'll be Jem.

S1: You be Dill. You be Jem. No, find Dill in the book. Find out what he was like.

S4: Where does it end, though?

S1: I don't know. Start at that one. Find out the things he did.

S4: OK. I'll be Dill.

S1: It only has action. It doesn't tell us why he's doing this.
Hey, what about that part where the three of us are acting Atticus out. We're acting out Boo Radley.

Oh.

Oh, that's right. Yah. Yah.

OK, where was that?

Sort of at the beginning here somewhere.

No, it wasn't no. It wasn't at the beginning.

Or where they get caught.

(reading) No.

That's hardly anything.

I think the dinner one is better because then Calpurnia and Atticus are talking but then when we get back to the table, there's two other people.

As the kids get up next, we'll get out of the way and Calpurnia will make the grand entrance. 1, 2, 3.

Children, would you like some lemonade?

Oh, yes please. Iced tea.

It's so hot out here.

Can I have some more, Calpurnia?

Sure. (pours) There you go. I gotta go now.

I know what we can do.

Tell us.

Play Boo Radley.

Boo Radley? How do you play that?

OK, Scout, you can be Mrs. Radley and you just have to come out and sweep the porch and stuff and Dill, you can be Mr. Radley and do whatever you want. Just walk up and down the sidewalk and stuff and we'll spy on you and stuff.

But I don't want to play.

What'sa matter? You still scared?

That's alright. We don't need to play with girls.

No, I want to play. I want to play. I want to play.

Boo, settle down. Aaaahhh! Ow! you have to do something with this boy. He's insane! Stop it. He'll kill us all! He's killing us all!

OK, so what did you get for 5A? It's supposed to be out of 2, right?

(Mumbled response)

OK, that's more like it. OK. Scout's response, uh, her anger is coming out because they're trying to raise her being . . . .
9. Taking a Quiz on the Novel (RP, Lesson)

The students are just completing an assignment in identifying quotes from the novel and shift to writing a quiz.

RP: Just take a few moments to finish off your quotations. It's OK if you don't finish. What I want you to, on the back is a really quick quiz to review what you remember about the questions. You can see it says on the left the names of the characters and on the right the characteristics about those people. Please go through and maybe at the end of each name put next to each number the letter on the right which matches. OK, move through it as quickly as you can.

(Students write the quiz)

10. A Chapter Quiz (NC, Lesson)

[This transcript opens in the middle of a quiz. NC is beginning with Question number 3]

NC: OK, number three. Um, Jem says he's going to go downtown. She says to him, "I'm coming with you otherwise if I don't go with you, you'll have to come through me. You'll have to fight me." And of course, Jem doesn't want to disturb Calpurnia so off they go to town. But of course, Dill has to come, too to they whistle at Dill's window and uh, along comes Dill. Now they go downtown and the reason why Atticus had taken that long extension cord and travel light. Do you know what a travel light is? One of those lights you just hand anywhere, he took a travel light with him. What was the reason he had for that long extension cord and travel light?

S1: Say it again.
NC: Why did he have, he took a travel light, remember?
S1: Yah.
NC: He took it downtown with him. He went downtown. Now we find out why he had the travel light when Jem and Scout and those go down there. They see the reason why he had it. Why'd he go down there?

(Student responds on paper)

11. A Journal Assignment (RP, Lesson)

RP: Last time I talked to you about the journals, you chose a character and you decided to be that person. I would like you to continue on now as we read the book, continue on and maybe write down your feelings about something that has happened in the last few chapters we have read. How do you feel about it as that character? Sort of give me an internal monologue of, um, your feelings or thoughts or maybe even recount what's happening in your life since the last time you wrote or just continue right on from where you started. Would it help if we read out some of our excerpts from last day or would you like to just get started?
S1: Just get started.
RP: OK, is that agreeable with everybody?
S2: I'm not in the mood.
S3: I don't understand this.
S4: I don't understand this.
S3: You just do it again? On the same page?
DP: If you'd have been listening. . . . use the same page. Last week we chose, last time we did it we chose a character. Remember that part? OK, than you started to write notes on the thoughts and feelings of that person, just as if you were that person. Say I was Boo. "Today I went up to the Radley house. Although I am really frightened of the Radley house, I am willing to go up and touch it. In fact, I was dared to". So you're telling whatever happened from that person's point of view. OK? So let's start with that and use the book and tell what's happened to you to begin with. It'll be a good ten minutes.
S5: What chapter are we working out of?
RP: Any chapter you like.

12. Preparing for an Essay Assignment (KA, Lesson)

KA: Also, I uh, started last night to think of uh, how to come up with some assignment, a writing assignment that you could understand and that you could deal with, and
I had some trouble thinking about this story in a way, uh, that I could be sure you would understand. So what I did, I came up with six, six topics, and these are things we can talk about, and uh, and then they will become, we can change the, and we can add others and then whatever we end up with will become your assignment for next period. Do you understand what I'm saying? OK. So the first topic. This is something you can write on, and it says, "How does the author use the mad dog?" when you could read it, read it to you? Do you remember this part of the story? OK. Could you write uh, two or three, two hundred words on that? Do you remember the whole, the story about the mad dog, chapter 10 or 11?

S1: Um, well this dog is, was running . . . . I didn't understand that part actually very much because I didn't think it fit in very well.

KA: Tell me what you don't understand.

S1: Well, just that this dog is coming down the street and the kids saw it and they, uh, they were going to shoot it. Instead of telling Calpurnia, and um, and then Atticus comes home, and uh, he shot the dog because, I don't know, I guess maybe just because it was different and I don't know, probably would have been contagious or whatever.

KA: Well, there's a disease called rabies that dogs can . .

S1: Well, is that what the dog had?

KA: Yes, the dog had rabies and it's, uh, it's fatal. Uh, I think at that time it was fatal. It's not fatal anymore but it's a very serious disease. How many people here have heard of rabies? Anyway, alright. Nicole, what colour was the dog?

S2: Umm, he was, um, a brown, um, he said almost like a reddish brown with a

KA: kind of motley colour

S2: Yah, with spots.

KA: A mixture of colours.

S2: (nods in agreement)

KA: predominately what colours?

S2: White.

KA: Black and white and brown and uh, spotted dog. A liver coloured dog they called it. So, the dog is diseased. At one point before that they, they refer to Maycomb's disease. Do you remember what the town's disease is? They use the word disease in a special way.

S3: Racism.

KA: Racism, OK. So can you see Jason how this incident with the dog prepares us for the second part of the book and stands for, symbolizes, can you see that?

S4: No, I'm not sure. . . .

KA: No, you have to, it's a difficult thing to see. OK. I appreciate that. These questions are all interpretive,
interpretive, but they, what I'm trying to say is that they, they ask you to see beyond the literal, the first level of meaning. And maybe, maybe there shouldn't be any questions like that. Maybe there should be just questions that ask you to tell what happened, you know, explain.

13. Reviewing the Structure of the Standard Five-Paragraph Essay

DP: Last day we talked about what a standard five-paragraph essay should have and this (pointing to the board) is sort of a messy version on the side board. You said the first thing it should have is a topic paragraph. And um, what is the purpose of the topic paragraph?

S1: To introduce the topic.

DP: Yup. We better know what the topic is. I mean, why bother writing the essay, other than the fact that we had to? And also, what else does it say on the board? Yeah, and what is the purpose of the actual essay itself? I'm going to write about this, I hope to have accomplished that when I'm finished. And we also said that it might be a good idea to give the reader an idea of how you intend to cover the topic. For example, if you said, "I am planning to write an essay on To Kill a Mockingbird", would that tell the reader much?

S2: No.

DP: Not at all. Well, what about it? It's a great book, it's huge, thirty one chapters. What are you going to do with it? They would be basically uninformed. Now here's something. When I was going to university and learning all there is to know, although that wasn't really very much in those days about being a teacher, we were told to assume, when you teach, that you're students know nothing. Isn't that an insult? In other words, don't start in the middle of something, start at the beginning because they might not have heard that before. When you write an essay, you get to do the same thing. You're supposed to assume the reader knows nothing. They know nothing. I have read To Kill a Mockingbird several times. I have seen the movie many times. It's one of my favourites. But you have to pretend she has no idea, so I better tell her what you're writing for. Another way to do it is to pretend you're writing for someone in your house who's never read the book so they wouldn't know a lot of the things you would know or I would know. So, you're topic paragraph has to do three things: it has to tell why we're writing the essay, what I'll be writing about
and do I intend to, to show the reader. Otherwise, the reader's lost. And then we said in the middle of the essay, what do we have usually? How many paragraphs?

Chorus: Three

DP: Yeah, usually three. It's a standard five-paragraph essay. It has three in the middle and each paragraph is like a mini paragraph. Each paragraph will have a topic sentence so that the person reading might know what it's about and so on. And then we come to the concluding paragraph and what does the concluding paragraph in an essay do?

S3: Sums up

DP: Sums up is a good way of putting it. We don't want to rewrite the whole essay, but we want to leave the reader with the most important idea.

14. Revising an Introductory Essay Paragraph (DP, Lesson)

DP: I have an example of a topic paragraph for an essay and I'd

just like you to, don't feel like you'll insult me, I just want you to read it and then tell me why you think it isn't very good because it isn't very good.

S1: (reads) In my essay I will tell you about how Atticus tells Jem and Scout when they destroy his new vase nearly.

DP: Do you like that? The way it sounds?

S1: No.

DP: Why not?

S1: Too long.

(Students mumble responses)

DP: Too much facts. What do you mean by too much facts? Right?

S1: Well, it's almost telling too much for the first sentence.

DP: He's right. We're already into the middle of the essay and this is the very first sentence the person is going to read. Too much information. Also, if you were writing this essay and you were writing for someone who had never read the book, what's the, what's the problem then?

Chorus: They don't know what you're talking about.

DP: They don't know about Atticus, Jem, Scout or anything, so you're putting so much in the first sentence they're getting, they're lost. Also, can you name, give me some words in it that sound really trite or boring?

(Chorus of responses)

DP: In my essay. OK, I'm glad you picked that out because you know, I don't want to see it. It's so . . . . well, how will I start. . . . "In my essay, I will."
You don't need that. It's uh, it's uh, I know you're writing an essay and I hope you will do something.

INSERVICE WITH FOUR TEACHERS

Four of the six teachers participated in three inservice sessions engaging in and constructing a curriculum based on transactive strategies for teaching a novel.

Inservice # 1

15. Introduction to Response Strategies (Transactive Teaching)

MK: I think that over the next couple of times, one of the things that is very clear, is that we are going to look at ourselves as readers. And so our own responses, we're going to look at all of us as readers, students and teachers, and what do real readers do, how do they respond, how do we get them [students] to respond in more dynamic, or other ways, um. So all we're going to do today is look at a couple of strategies and then I have an assignment for you, uh, which will be due for our all-day inservice.

MK: So we'll go through uh, these activities in two dimensions. One is that I want to see what is happening to me as a reader and a responder when I did this strategy, what did we learn by doing this?

16. The First Response Strategy: Introducing a Novel

MK: The first thing I'm going to do, um, for this you will need some paper, is to do an opening strategy for beginning a novel. And the novel I would pick, it's one that I've used an inservice before, uh, is a novel by Leon Garfield called Smith. Is it familiar to any of you? (All shake their heads). Great, that's what I was hoping. Let's start off with that title. It's called Smith. Tell me what that brings into mind. What are your perceptions of a novel called Smith? What do you expect? Who is Smith?

NC: Every man
MK: Go ahead, write.

17. Oral Response Strategy on the Title Using the Writing

NC: I, uh, was thinking the universal thing about Smith. That he might be, you know, a sort of French type
novel, uh, philosophy and uh, everyman was like a Smith because it's so common. Um, and then maybe somebody, who, who's made a life for themselves despite this moniker of Smith.

MK: Alright.
NC: You know and then possibly it could be Smith, it's uh, it's uh, profession and uh, it's a story about this smith.

18. Listening and Responding Strategy to the Opening of Smith

MK: Right. I got the same response last week. That's the first time, about the blacksmith, right. So we're looking at something that's quite common and familiar. We're not expecting great things except as a trick to surprise the reader, perhaps. OK. I'll read you the first opening paragraphs and I'd like you to be sort of introduced to Smith and see who he is and just listen from the way Garfield starts his novel. (reads from the novel) Could you tell me what you know now about Smith? Write as quickly as you can. Get it down.

19. Reflecting Orally on the Written Response

MK: Let's have a look at what we've gathered. Now, I've read you two paragraphs. All right, well, we know, uh, he
NC: pickpockets
MK: Pickpockets and what else do we know about him?
RP: He's young.
MK: Yeah, how old?
GK: He's twelve. He's like Oliver.
MK: Yeah, very much, very much that impression.
RP: I expect he had a sort of grab bag of personalities he could draw on.
MK: Mmm, interesting.
NC: He's a street urchin, unbathed, powerful odour.
MK: Mmm. What else?
RS: Probably Victorian London.
MK: Yes, we've got a setting.

20. Reflecting on the Response Process

MK: What happened as you began to compare your thoughts?
RP: Norm thought different things than I did.
MK: There.
RP: I reacted with my emotions to the impressions and you [Norm] heard words. If you'd said to me, "Did you hear this word?" I can't remember hearing you say "fat St. Paul's" at all.
RS: I can't either.
RP: I'm not as detailed a listener as him at all.
NC: No.
MK: Now, what's happening to us as readers? What do we notice about the way we
GK: Certain things, certain things we notice.
MK: I mean we all heard the same words. That's the interesting question, isn't it?
GK: I guess it shows our personalities.
NC: Also, women are more inclined to go whizz on this one.

MK: Books are meant to be talked about, you know. They're like gossip sheets in a way, and we're asked to walk into other people's lives and circumstances.
NC: I've used that very phrase. You can learn. You can really understand what they're all about.
MK: They need to talk about those things. It's very important that kids talk their way through those reading experiences themselves.

21. Oral Reflections on Smith

MK: OK, where are we with Smith? What kind of questions, I mean I thought of first when we... .
NC: I put he's going to be Lord Mayor of London. He has the predilection for dipping into people's pockets. He's suc, suc, he personifies success for us. He's a survivor and he can outthink others.
MK: Alright.
GK: Along those lines, I said he probably doesn't want to be the way he is. He's doing it out of necessity. He may steal from someone without coming to succeed and rise above this.

22. Assigning the Reading Response Log for "I Am the Cheese"

MK: The point is, I'm going to give you a book and ask you to do the same thing because the next part of our session will involve having our students do this. So, that is, that there is no discussion of the novel until the whole novel has been read and confronted.
NC: How much, how many pages do we read before we respond?
MK: Uh, whatever you sort of feel comfortable with. The book has nine chapters... .
RP: So you think... .
MK: Ten to fifteen.
Inservice # 2

23. Starting the Response Process to "I Am the Cheese"

MK: What happened to you in the process of writing that response? We need to just talk about that a little bit. What happened to you?

RP: This was a dilemma for me because I wanted to keep reading and I had to stop and I felt that way until I started writing for a little while. And then when I started writing for a while, I forgot the book and it triggered things in my own memories and associations and I'd want to write about that for a while and so I'd forget about the book for a while and then I'd go back and begin the process again.

RS: As I was reading this thing here, I thought, "Isn't it interesting? All of a sudden I'm very conscious of my reading process.

MK: I want you to go through your own responses for a few minutes. You're reading your own responses, too, and then, uh, we'll move into two groups of three and work through those. Just reflect for a few minutes and review your own process.

24. Small Group Discussion on "I Am the Cheese"

RP: It brings up an element of the bizarre, of evil, of irrationality. An element or irrationality the demands (unintelligible). Once you see authority and truth is invaded by some kind of cancer, some kind of evil, um, the grey man, is he the one who kills them? Is he the one who pretends that he's the authority all along, that's protecting them when in fact, he isn't? Did the father volunteer the information or did he not? Or is the father in fact to blame, was he to blame for going on the trip? Who's on the good side? What side is he on? Did the father get away?

MK: It's a bizarre novel.

NC: It is because of the people that he meets - I used the words in here - the people he meets are grotesque. I mean they really are.

RP: The man, the man he sees in the gas station as he's going along has these huge veins....

MK: Veins

NC: And here he comes back, all these people come back. They come back one after another. There's a catalogue of them. There's Whipper. Hey, I remember Whipper! He was in the damn cafe.

MK: There, you see
NC: And there he is sitting out on the porch and Darby and Lewis who were his friends. He's there and all those guys are there.

MK: Yeah, yeah.

RP: It's just like the movie "Blue Velvet." It's just like it.

NC: Dr. Dupont of course, is Brint.

MK: No, it isn't.

RP: Dr. Dupont is different than Brint.

MK: Dupont is the guy who gives all the medicine and needles. Remember where Adam says at one time that he's kind and everything?

NC: I think Dr. Dupont is Brint.

MK: Do you?

NC: Yes, I do.

RP: Can you show us why?

NC: Because there's been a one to one correspondence between the baddies in the book and characters in the sanatorium in the end.

25. Whole Group Discussion of "I Am the Cheese"

RS: One of the things we were talking about is the total powerlessness of Adam and it's one of the things that I think maybe I have a little difficulty with - that there is no hope for him.

MK: Yeah.

RS: Adam has no power, even at, I mean he's been so thoroughly stirred and fried and everything that you do to cheese, that you, he can't really change himself. There is no hope.

MK: That's quite an image.

RP: He's still holding out, that's the pathetic part.

RS: No, he's not. Why would he be holding out?

RP: I think he still has information he isn't giving up.

MK: Do you?

RP: Mmm.

NC: Well, it's possible. I mean, he's still inside the sanatorium. He's still riding around.

RP: He's still, he's still withdrawing. He's still shutting off and there's no response so he doesn't give out answers. Um, he's still dealing with, with I know I have to tell him everything because I don't have another way out. But I haven't yet told him everything. Maybe I'm going to eventually, he's going to be

MK: Do you think that?

NC: Because he's going on another trip tomorrow.

GK: I thought he was taking a gun to his father, now whether. . (loud chorus of responses)
MK: Yeah.
RP: What about page 12 where he talks, this is what is really the feeling of a gun, too.
MK: Did you have that, too?
RP: Oh, absolutely! I thought that was a gun. Um. . . .
GK: Well, maybe the pig's more powerful with a gun.
RP: (reading) "See, I thought when I had found the red cabinet downstairs in the den and I lay there barely breathing and knew what I was doing." And to me, I think of the den as the place where the secrets were kept. You know, all the
MK: Is that where the file
RP: The birth certificate, and you know, there's no hint there, but on page 13: "I went to the cabinet in the den and took out a gift for my father. I wrapped it in aluminum foil and wrapped it again with newspaper, scotch taping all securely. Then I went down and got on my pants, shoes and jacket." Now that to me, gave me the clue for a gun.
RS: Now I think the wonderful thing, Mary, is that you've let us do that [the reading response log] because if I hadn't gone through this process, I wouldn't have believed a word you said!

26. Clarifying Classroom Procedures for Reading The Novel

RP: OK, so you can give them the class time for getting them to read the novel. They do the response journal in process as we did. And then you read it and then you come in to discuss? Or you come in and discuss and then they add to their journal?

RP: So for Wednesday, you'd like us to take a section of the next novel we're going to do, and do a response journal similar to what we've done and come prepared with?
MK: Yeah.

Inservice # 3

The purpose of this session is to introduce the strategies for teaching the second novel based on the teacher's experience with the reading response log and the subsequent discussions.

27. Reflections on Reading with the Response Log

RS: You have got - rereading The Chrysalids, which I have
already read, I don't know how many times now. All of a sudden, when I'm, when I know I'm going to do a response journal, I'm conscious of the fact that I read it differently. It's always, I mean I try to read it like, oh, like it was my first time. And I find myself, like um, "Oh, this is in here, oh, right."

MK: See, I say the same kinds of things.
RS: And if find that really interesting. My reading is changing slightly. There's a shift in there. And I say, there's a shift in there for the better, you know. And uh,
RP: Thinking more.
RS: Yeah, uh, I'm not just an unconscious consumer of the word like escapist type literature, uh, you know, that uh, a real dialogue with the author.

28. Explaining the Classroom Procedures for Reading and Writing

MK: And the purpose of this journal is not to test your knowledge but to help you deal with the literature in a personal way, to ask your own questions. Now we've gone through, we've done our reading and writing and now we have all this writing. On the due date you take these response logs home and you talk to them, just like you're talking to yourself, in the margins. You know, "Ask this in your group, uh, This is interesting, I never thought of this before." You talk to them like you're talking to them.

RP: Are you talking about - just throwing out here - between the time when you're finished and when they're actually going to do the work. This figure here is when I'm going to take them home and then respond the next day.

MK: Right.
RP: Then we read the responses, including this section here?
MK: Mmm.
RP: I was just going to say that, um, I found this comment in the article about, um, not limiting the response. Not saying there has to be a certain amount or, that's not uh, good idea. And uh, the kids were talking about it the other day because some of the teachers had given them a response journal in the school and told them it had to be a certain, that it had to be two pages per chapter, per chapter. And so one girl who read Wuthering Heights ended up having sixty-eight pages, you know, and she was, she was you know, they had a talk about that and I could hear the responses to doing these journals, and they asked me how I felt about his because they, you know, knew I was involved in this.
And that was good feedback, you know, to hear from the older students, you know, to hear what they were doing and how much, but I noticed you said there shouldn't be a limit.

29. The Effects of Reading and Writing the Novel

NC: I think we often assume that kids have a lot less on the ball than they actually have and you take a science text or something like that and we always assume that unless there is someone up at the front dishing it out, uh, they're not going to be able to understand it and uh, I think that's about ninety percent nonsense. You let them read it and uh, talk to each other about bits and pieces they don't understand and by the time they've finished talking to each other they'll be very knowledgeable about what they want to talk to you about.

MK: Yah, you know what I said earlier about being a resource instead of the answer man or person. I think that that is a different concept of teaching. We are very accustomed to center stage.

NC: Now before, um, that makes a lot of sense. They have to wait for us. We don't teach them to learn for themselves. That's the trouble. And uh, this maybe does. You, uh, learn yourself and the teacher can help you when you get jammed on something. By and large, you should really get it yourself. You've got to be the center of your own learning.

30. Teachers' Written Reflections of Responding in Writing

GK: Oh the log, (reads from her paper) response logs opened my eyes to tremendous possibilities for encouraging kids to read. I thought of practical things first like my vocabulary can be increased, my perception of my reading process, their perception of their reading process could be uncovered more. Expressing themselves on paper uncovered, could be there. With some practice, we may find ourselves doing this often. I started, I noticed later when I read it over that instead of saying "they may find this or that", I was going "we."

MK: Ah, that is a nice transcribining.

GK: Yeah, it will give us fuel to feed the fire for discussions. With discussions we can learn more, pass more ideas around and brag about the .......... improve our written and verbal communication. But most of all, my kids will be encouraged to read, not just English texts, but other books and poetry as well. I, I've
always seen myself as a teacher, as a converter. First it was a PE converter, wanting them to be there. Now it's as a reader.

31. Clarifying the Uninterrupted Reading and Writing

NC: What she [RP] had there [previous lessons on Animal Farm] was some neat stuff there that uh, she does with Animal Farm. Discussions on the parallels between government some of the well, you open your exercise on political parties and so on and so on. Now there was some, some very vivid and electrifying stuff there, there yeah. Now clearly, if she goes in there and chucks this on the desk and says, "OK, George Orwell's Animal Farm guys, We're going to get to about page 20 today and you're going to respond to these, this sort of question. Um, some of those things that she did up to now are going to go by the wayside, and in its place is going to go certainly a knowledge of the text, without a doubt about that. Uh, um how will she fit in and how will Roni use some of the reading material?

MK: It'll be after

RP: I'll intersperse one...

MK: After. You don't intersperse it at this point because you don't interrupt their reading. There's no interruption of their reading process until they're finished. But I will tell you that the very first day or so, you'll be there helping them through it, so they'll have some sense that they're on the road. And uh, the second thing is when they've read the book and you can read their journals and they've been into discussion, you can as a community decide what you want to do with this book. They will take ownership of the book and you can contribute, uh, and you can make a suggestion, but really, the struggle with it is not done when they're done the reading.

NC: I have no problems with it, I uh, think, um, one's inclined to come on to the stage of the classroom with all sorts of whiz bangs and gewgaws. Very often, you whiz bang and gewgaw them to death and forget that the text, the text is quite enough of a whiz bang if you let it happen.

POST TREATMENT: READING THE SECOND NOVEL

Students and teachers in all six classes read a second novel. The control and treatment 1 classes read Animal Farm, the treatment 2 classes, The Chrysalids. No
intervention occurred for the control classes. Treatment classes read and responded to the novel in a reading response log during their reading, delaying discussion until reading and writing responses had been completed. The response logs guided the subsequent discourse of the novel. Videotaping occurred at the same three stages of study.

32. Discussion on the Opening of "Animal Farm"  
(DP, Lesson 5, control class)

The discussion of the text opens with drawing historical parallels to the novel.

DP: What is the equivalent in the book, in Chapter 1, to Karl Marx's plan of the Communist Manifesto? What's the equivalent?
S1: Um. it's really like (unintelligible)
DP: No, no we're talking only Chapter 1 remember? I mean some of you know more, Raymond but don't let on that you do. OK, pretend that you don't.
S2: The pig, um, tells everyone his idea and everyone seems to take it from him.
DP: Yeah. Who is that pig? What's his name?
S2: Majors.
DP: Majors, yeah. Old Majors. Now I think that George Orwell was sort of smart because he took the name Majors, um, he could have had any name he wanted to but he, uh, has the pig called Majors, and so Majors and Marx are the same, as far as Orwell is concerned. Alright.
S3: Majors is Karl Marx?
DP: Majors the pig and Karl Marx, OK? We said that Karl Marx wrote a book, the Communist Manifesto and what did Majors do? What did all the animals, can you, can you find a spot in Chapter 1 that sort of does what the Communist Manifesto did? Look through Chapter 1. We'll find it stands out.
S3: The song.
DP: The song, yeah. What page is it?
S4: 13.
DP: Page 13. The roles, of, what did Major call his dream? That's the name of the song, Beast of England, so the Beast of England song is equivalent to the Communist Manifesto. And what did the Communist Manifesto say about communism? What did "Beasts of England" talk about?
S3: Animalism.
DP: Animalism.
Providing the Historical Context to Animal Farm
(KA, Lesson 5, control class)

KA: You have read, or just about read, this story and before, I, I would guess that none of you know very much about the Russian Revolution. That's my guess. Is that, am I correct?

Chorus: Yah.

KA: Is there anyone who remembers anything about it? So what I need to do, Chris, what I need to do, is that I needed to somehow give you information and the nicest way to give you information is to turn on a video and have a bunch of professionals read about it, show you something, express it well and read it back. Or have a very nice short article in easy terms that you read in fifteen minutes and have, and leave it at that. I've been looking for two weeks and I can't find anything like that so what you've got is me. And the only good I can do is explain to you what I know about the Russian Revolution and then have you see how it ties into the book.

KA: So anyways, Moses the Raven, take a guess, what, what could Moses represent? From what you know about the story. He's a bird, a big, black bird. He sits out and drinks. Uh, what in your old way of doing things, there was always two strong forces in society. There was the monarchy and the, the other strong force in the middle ages, the, and uh, and Russia was still in the middle ages and medieval times, was the (pause) phew, the church. OK? So Moses the Raven represents organized religion in Russia, also called the USSR. Do you know why it's called the USSR? Do you know why? Well, have you ever looked at Russian writing? Does it look like English writing?

Chorus: No.

KA: No, because they have a different alphabet and so they don't, don't, they're abbreviations are different. So in the story, Moses represents the church.

Students and Teacher Reading and Writing Through the Novel
(NC, Lesson 5, Treatment 1)

Discussion of Historical Parallels and Comparison Questions
(DP, Lesson 6, control class)

DP: What two animals are struggling for power on the farm?
Chorus: Snowball and Napoleon
DP: Yeah, and which one loses?
Chorus: Snowball
DP: Snowball loses! So who would Snowball be equivalent to, then? Chorus: Trotsky.
DP: Trotsky, yeah. So those kind of obvious equivalents are spelled out on the sheet for you.

DP: You were asked to do in Chapter 1, number 2, and in Chapter 2, you were asked to do numbers 2, and 3 and in Chapter 3, 1 and 4. OK? Then on Friday I asked you to do just number 2 on Chapter 4. Now we just talked about this, but it's a good way, it's very important that you know this and so I'm going to ask you in Chapter 5, and that's today's assignment. In Chapter 5 you are going to do number 1 and number 2.

36. **Handing Back the Reading Response Logs**
(RP, Lesson 5, treatment 1 class)

The students have completed the reading and writing and the teacher has collected and responded to the reading response logs. She returns them to the students.

RP: Now one of the wonderful things is, one of the things I noticed in reading the journals last night is how different everyone's comments and ideas were. How everybody in the room came into this assignment with different ideas. You noticed different things. Some of you noticed things that I didn't notice and I've read the book five times. Little details like for instance, Mrs. Jones. Some of the things that Mrs. Jones did, comments about Mrs. Jones. I would say to Mrs. Kooy, "Gee, I never thought of that!" And she would read a comment and say, "Look at this. Isn't this great?" But now I'm going to give back your journals, and I'm going to give you a couple of minutes to read through the. Now, there's no rush. I don't want you to skim through really fast. I want you to go through and read now what you've written from beginning to end and our comments. And I'll give you a few minutes to do that. Now while you're doing that, you're going to find that there's some questions in there that you never did find the answer for. Now put an "x" or a circle around that. Now, you're going to find a question that you do have an answer for, you understand what that's all about now. I'd like you to put a check mark on that. OK? That's the first step. And then when you finish, we'll come back together and we'll go on to the next stage. So here's John's and Chris's.

S1: Look at this. I don't remember this. I think it's in
Chapter 3.
(Students re-reading their own response logs)

37. Small Group Assignment: Drawing Historical Parallels
   (KA, Lesson 6, control class)

S1: He realized that he gave too much power to the humans so then he gave it to the other guys.

S2: But it's also like the ideas change. Like, they won't stay the same after Major died. You know how they change. Like the pig, the pigs decided to make up all these rules. They're the ones who don't break it. (looking at his paper) I don't know how to word that one.

(camera scan of the other groups working on the writing assignment)

38. Small Group Sharing of the Reading Response Logs
   (NC, Lesson 5, Treatment 1)

NC: The next stage is the stage of using your friend's abilities, people resources that you have in this room, i.e. each other, to see what each other have done with the text and to see what ideas you can pick up. Now as I told you first thing this morning, um, reading your stuff gave me, I was able to pick up quite a bit and hopefully when you read, uh, two or three or four other ones, you'll be able to see things and ways of approaching that will benefit the next response journal you do.

Group 1
S1: He's telling what happened. . . .
S2: Was he?
S1: Yeah, he's telling about the clouds and all that.
S3: Yeah, he's talking about the Raven.
S1: Oh, when he discusses the Raven.
S2: Only Rebecca didn't get that.

Group 2
S1: In the first war or something.
S2: No way!
S3: Remember when he kicks the guy in the head?
S2: Yeah, and then he goes . . . .

Group 3
S1: So, do you have a point of view? Everybody's got a point of view.
Small Group Discussion Using the Reading Response Logs
(RP, Lesson 5, treatment 1)

S1: Yah. I noticed that they were breaking the commandments, too.
S2: I was so slowly and gradually, that's the pits.
S3: They were breaking them. They were writing up new ones.
S1: New ones.
S2: But that's just it. It sounds really stupid. But have you noticed like in life? How people do that? They're like, they're hypocritical?
S4: They set things and then . .
S2: They say "I don't want you to, You can't do this" and then they do it themselves and they make it look like it's OK.
S1: Yah.
S2: This is like, I put in here, it's about politics because it's like leaders. The pigs are the leaders but they're leading the blind and dumb because they don't think for themselves. They just go, you know, S3: That's what communism's all about. They had one leader like when they had elected him as president. There's only one candidate.
S4: What's the use of having an election, really?
S2: Even though they found out that they didn't like it.
S3: To make people think they had a choice. Yah, they didn't think they'd have a choice because they'd die.
S2: That's how it was with Hitler. If they weren't soldiers for his army then they'd kill them. I think that's how they felt. But in the end, I think that they should have just left or killed him. I don't think S4: They'd have had a riot then. Killed off Napoleon. It would have been a better story.
S1: I think it got confusing at the end.
S3: Yah.
S2: I think it sort of answered itself from the beginning. It circled over and over.
S4: I don't get this. The humans understand animals. That's stupid. That's really dumb.
S1: And when they sang that "Beasts of England" song then all the humans could understand them.
S2: How could they hear them? They couldn't hear him before.
S4: Yah, really.
S2: And some of the adults were stupid. They couldn't, they can't write or anything.
S4: Yeah. They wouldn't do that. Like when they had that riot thing. They wouldn't go into a garden, I wouldn't go into a garden and take a gun. They're going to be rushing in and turn me into pulp or something.
S2: Yah, I know.
S4: That's really dumb.

40. Writing Assignments in Small Groups
(KA, Lesson 6, control class)

Group 1
S1: I'll do the long one and you do that one, Snowball and Trotsky. You can do the third one and I'll do the second and I'll end it, I'll say basically, we enjoyed Animal Farm.

Group 2
S1: Yeah, something like that. But how does, he's seen many revolutions. Oh, just say he's seen many things come and go. He's seen many - I don't know - something come and go in his life time.
S2: Any suggestions, Lori?
S1: Um, um, yeah, I know: seen many. . . . Well, he hasn't seen many revolutions. . . .

Group 3
S1: They got the sheep. Read all that garbage, anyways. Yah, they got the sheep to follow them blindly, without thinking.
S2: Yeah, we already got that.
S1: They just make the sheep follow them without thinking. They just, at moments of question, at moments when the animals were wondering about them, they, you know, get the sheep to start prodding. . . .

41. Small Group Discussion from the Reading Response Logs
(GK, Lesson 5, Treatment 2)

Group 1
S1: What do you think?
S2: I got the late seventeenth to early 19th century.
S3: That's what it said: the 20's and 30's. I have it here somewhere.
S2: It's science fiction.
S1: I don't understand. With all the things that happen, it sounds like its in the future.
S2: Sounds like. It says right in the book.
S1: Does it?
S2: Yah, right in the book. The seventeenth to the nineteenth.
GK: Where? Can you find that?
S2: I have it written down.
S3: It says the eighteenth and nineteenth.
S3: The seventeenth.
GK: Well, find it. Find it in the book.
S3: Well, I read the book.
GK: So you read something about it?
S3: Yeah.
GK: So he's focusing it on . . . Oh, I see what you mean. What you guys are talking about are the Wakanuk people. It's about the seventeenth century type of behaviour. Is that what you're saying?
S2: Yah.
GK: Could that mean it actually took place in that time?
S2: Well, it seems like that.
GK: It seems like that. They're acting like the seventeenth century people but it could be in the future where they . . .
S2: It could be . . .

Group 2
S1: This is an alien story?
S2: I thought it was. Look it. (shows him the novel) Look at right at the front of the book. They all have aliens on the front. That looks like an alien to me.
S1: Don't just look at the picture, dummy.
S3: What page are we on?
S1: Page 1.
S2: I like this picture.
S3: Wait a minute.
S1: Read the first sentence: "When I was quite small I would sometimes dream of a city - which was quite strange because it began before I knew what a city was."
S2: I wonder what it's supposed to be like? They talk about the Old People. I wonder if there's a, like it happened . . .
S1: In France or something . . .
S3: It does seem like in the future.
S2: You know what happened. There could have been a nuclear holocaust.
S3: It can be in the future, because the future . . .
S2: Remember his dream?
S1: Yah.
S2: And they were talking about how great these Old People were?
S1: His dream.

42. Discussing Concepts of the Novel in Small Groups
   (RS, Lesson 6, treatment 2)
S1: What we have to do is to find pages for each of these to support.
S2: Yah, sure. Well the deviations, they represent fear, right because they sent them away, right?
S1: Fear, sort of, the badlands, the badlands represent. ..
S2: The badlands represent what happened after the war. They were the cause of the war, right?
S1: What war?
S2: There was a nuclear war then.
S1: Deviations also represent the war then.
S2: Yah, but they also represent, well, they don't represent, they bring fear, don't they.
S1: Bring fear.
S2: What do they, they represent, the, uh, they represent.
   . . . Oh, what do you call it?
S1: The results.
S2: The results of the war.
S1: Like when you see, what does a dove represent?
S2: Peace.
S1: Peace.
S2: Freedom.
S1: So when you think of deviations, what do you think of?
S2: Star Trek.
S1: There you go. That's what you have to do. You don't think of the results of the war.
S2: Deviations. What do they represent? They represent abnormal people.

43. Continuing Whole Class Discussion
   (DP, Lesson 5, control class)

DP: Who do you think in the novel sort of represents the czar running Russia? Who represents the ruler running the farm? Michael?
S1: Farmer Jones.
DP: Farmer Jones.
S1: Jones.
DP: Farmer Jones. And instead of the farmer having a family, Kelly, who does he have instead?
S2: Animals.
DP: Yes. He has the animals he's in charge of and what sort of animals, sort of, does he care about especially?
S2: The raven.
DP: The raven Moses, and . . .
S2: The dogs.
DP: The dogs and also, he sort of favours somebody else as well.
S3: The cat.
DP: I never thought about the cat. The cat sort of comes and goes. But what other farm animal does he have a special liking for?
Chorus: Mollie.
DP: Mollie, yah. Although they're not really members of the family like say, the czar's family, you could say Jones is certainly representative of that class.

44. Assembling Questions for Whole Class Discussion
(NC, Lesson 6, treatment 1)

NC: In the groups some ideas have come up and I've been part to some of them as I've been on my way around. Now what I'd like you to do is, perhaps as a group, one the back of one of the response journals, write down, one, two, three or four things that came up in your group that you would like to be sure don't get missed in a group discussion.

NC: And the things that you think everybody else ought to think about or discuss.
S1: Can't figure out . . . .
S2: Why is there only seven commandments?
NC: Why seven? OK, the thing is thrown out to everybody. Why is there only seven commandments?
S3: Because they couldn't think of three more.
NC: They couldn't think of three more. Simple answer. They couldn't think of three more.
S4: Dumb.
NC: Anything else? Yes?
S5: (unintelligible)
S6: Not a questions. It's on this just yet. Let's just see if we can exhaust it. Couldn't think of three more. Yah?
S7: That's probably all they could come up with.
NC: That's virtually what he said.
S3: No, but you think of ten, right?
NC: Why am I thinking of ten? That's a good point.
(A number of students trying to answer)
NC: There's supposed to be ten. Why is it supposed to be ten.
S4: All religions.
NC: All religions say there should be ten. And the Christian one in particular says there should be ten. Use?
S8: Well, religions say you use the word "commandments" instead of the word "law" right? Commandments.
NC: You can tell they're using the same thought processes and should be. Anything else on this question of commandments. That's it. It's tied into religion. Some of you feel cheated. There's only seven and there
should be ten. The explanations come from somebody else on the floor here. Well, what's wrong with seven if you can't think of any more? Then seven can be fine. On commandments. Are we done about commandments? OK. Now then, this group up here. Are you ready with another one?

S5: Why did they take the skull out of Major before they buried him?
NC: Why did the pigs take the skull?
S5: Yah.
NC: I heard a word over there that I think, well, you know this is me doing, shall I select what you hear or be quiet and you'd hear it?
S5: What did you say?
S6: As a shrine.
NC: As a shrine. (points to next student)
S7: Why did the animals let them boss them around? I mean they could have just realized that what was being done to them was unfair.
NC: Now wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. We've got a whole flock of opinions. Nobody's listening to each one specifically. Why did Napoleon boss them around?

45. Whole Class Discussion Using Student Questions
(RS, Lesson 6, treatment 2)

RS: Alright, then, one by one, and let's see if the other groups could come up with those answers. The Chrysalids.

S1: What is the question?
RS: The question is, "What are the Chrysalids?"
S1: I had my hand up.
S2: I get to talk.
S1: I think they're the people who have ESP. They're that little group.
RS: Yes, no, put your hand up.
S1: How do you know the answer?
S2: I think the author's trying to say chrysalids means chrysalids, like uh, what am I trying to say?
S3: Like a cocoon.
S2: Yah, like a cocoon. And um, he's psyches things, right? So David's group were also like psycho people or whatever and everybody else is sort of dying off and there's a new race being born. Is that. . . . ?
RS: What do you think, Erin?
S4: The chrysalids could also mean the people in Waknuk and the fact that they were inside the cocoon and like Matthew said, these people were powerless and were breaking out of the cocoon to go somewhere else. They were finding other parts of the world.
S5: He said it perfectly.
RS: OK. Does anybody . . . Matthew, where did you find out about the chrysalids? Is this a new word?

S2: I just looked it up in the dictionary and that's what I found.

S1: Is it an English word?

RS: It's an English word and that's what the chrysalids is. OK?

And now the next question that came was, "Where was Waknuk?"

S4: In The Chrysalids. (Laughter)

RS: Tyler?

S6: In Labrador. That's what it says a hundred times or something like that.

S7: It's on the east coast of Canada. You know, where the maritime provinces are.

S2: No, it isn't.

S7: Yes, it is.

RS: Suzanne.

S2: It's Labrador.

RS: Suzanne. It's Suzanne's question. Let her explain it.

S8: I know, but what I meant was, OK, they all got sent to the fringes but why would they just because of deviations, just some physical deformity? Were they scared of them or something?

S9: Well, yah.

(Others mumble concurrence)

S7: They were scared. . . .

RS: Yes.

S10: They were scared there would be more deviations than normal people so they got. . . .

S6: How?

S10: In Waknuk, or whatever, there'd be more deviations than normal people so they banned them to the fringes.

S7: Multiply.

S10: Multiply. And then there'd be more deviations than normal people so they banned them to the fringes.

RS: What could you say to that?

S8: Say, that the normal people would be overrun by deviations.

RS: OK, Erin?

S4: I have another question. They say that they got what the true human was out of the Bible. Was that the old Bible or? Does the Old have five toes . . .

S8: Yah.

RS: Well, no, I think that we have to, uh, what is it that Is it our Bible?

S4: They say they got if from the Bible, but what I want to know is, was that our Bible?

S9: Yes.

S4: Or one that was already made?
S10: It was our Bible.
RS: Was it?
S4: Where did you get that?

46. Preparing for the Essay Writing Assignment
(DP, Lesson 5, control class)

DP: Obviously, what's one person we're going to want to know more about?
S1: Karl Marx
DP: Karl Marx. (writes on board). Somebody else.
S2: Lenin.
DP: Lenin. (writes on board) Who's that other communist leader? One of the other early ones?
S2: Stalin.
DP: Stalin. (writes on board) And, there's another name that you need to know a little bit about and that is Trotsky.
S3: Trotsky.
DP: Trotsky. Alright. Now Trotsky is very special because he you need to know about him so that you understand when you read further on in the book, the curious relationship between two other pigs, Napoleon and Snowball. We've got 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 people, but there's always going to be one or two people in this room who don't, say, "Well, I don't mind hearing about people but I'm really not too sure. I'd rather know about something else." So what might be interesting to know about besides the people?
S2: The revolution.
DP: Well, the revolution. The revolution, yah. (writes on board) Now the revolution didn't happen in one day or one week. It happened over a long period of time so therefore, we need to know a little bit about the roots. That's one thing. (writes on board) We said that Karl Marx wrote his Communist Manifesto in England. He wasn't near Russia. So he couldn't have started it. Where did it come from? Roots means, where did it come from? Everybody sort of knows?
S4: This is an essay?
DP: This is not going to be an essay at all. It won't be a five-paragraph essay. It won't be a real report the same way you're used to writing. The thing is, is Dave Neilson and Kevin are both going to, are both going to find out about what happened to the family. They're the only ones who are going to do that. So what they find out is going to be shared with the rest of the class. You don't have to stand up and make a big speech out of it. It's just a matter of sharing your
information. It's just a question of gathering the information and sharing it with the rest of us.

47. **Preparing to Write an Essay on the Novel**  
   (NC, Lesson 6, treatment 1)

NC: What I'd like you to do is to make a start as though you were starting an essay. One of the five that we've discusses this afternoon here.

S1: We don't have to. . . . Benjamin.

NC: Five minutes. Let's get started. You write as much as you can in five minutes. I'm going to tell you go in a moment or two. I'm going to time it for exactly five minutes. When it's all up, it's up, I'm going to ask you to stop.

(All students writing)

NC: What I want you to think about is this: when you choose your own topic, Andy, the sort of work we did here where we brainstormed as a group, you have to do as an individual. You take your topic and you do as good a job as you are able in the same manner as we did. And when you've got that raw material in front of you at least, you'll be ready to put it into some sort of shape. It helps to get some thoughts flowing. So I'd like you to remember that. You can use one of the things we've already done. Of course, you've been given a good start on those or if you choose another, try to do the same thing.

**INTERVIEWS WITH THE FOUR TREATMENT TEACHERS**

48. **Closing Remarks on Pedagogy: Inservice # 3**

RP: For my first three or four years of teaching I was much more innovative, much more courageous, much more student-centred. And then, as I taught the senior grades and became more enmeshed within the school system and the traditional approaches, I found myself becoming much more traditional, you know. All of a sudden, you talk about exams now and preparing students for university, and I've sort of lamented this - that I'm torn between my philosophy and also fitting into the system.

MK: Yah, and that's sort of a genuine struggle.

RP: And this makes me feel better because it's my natural approach and how I, more closely to how I used to teach.
49. Teaching The Skills

NC: I think through this process of writing journals doesn't sort of, the process doesn't preclude all of the skills that we as teachers have learned over the years.

RP: Actually, it complements them.

NC: Yah, I mean you've got to still know how to ask questions in the class and try to elicit as many responses from as many kids as you can.

MK: And that's a problem

NC: It's a special skill.

MK: It's a problem and it's one of the reasons that you want to be able to do group work because

NC: Yah.

MK: where our kids do much, much better. I had a girl once say, " I have never said one word out loud in high school until I got to this class because we could work in small groups.

RP: Mmm. Mmm.

MK: And also, she did say that, "Now that I'm able to write everything, I have time to look at it before I can say something. So, you know for some kids, and for a lot of us, just being able to think on your feet is so intimidating. There are some kids who will never risk for fear of failing.

50. The Reading Response Log in the Literature Class

NC: I think what you did, you sort of gave validity to having the class actually sit down and read the bloody novels in class time and you gave them something valuable to do with that time as well as reading that would provoke them when they came to discussion. And boy, just the action of having read the book, having written something which sort of makes sure your brain is turned on while you're reading - what a lethal combination because then they have something to fight with.

Others: Yah.

NC: And then they just had a bawl!

51. Developing Understanding of the Novel Through Questions

NC: The response log prepares you for the questions like "red in The Red Pony.

MK: Oh, yah.
NC: I mean, you become very well aware of the novel. You've gone into it in a lot of depth, as much as you're able yourself, you discuss it with confreres and so on and your awareness is suddenly spiked up way higher than it would have normally been. And then when you're confronted by those old traditional questions, you come as a much better informed reader.

MK: Oh, yah, but in schools we persist in asking questions that we already know the answers to so it becomes a very artificial kind of, it's almost monologic, not dialogic.

RP: But you can't stop that. I don't think to ask a question it's not a even wrong to ask a question you know the answer to.

MK: Why?

RP: I have been asked questions that others thought they might have the answers to but I might not have thought about that. I don't have to agree with their interpretation, I don't even have to know the answer but it's made me think about something.

MK: Then is the question the appropriate response? I guess that's my question.

RP: Not if it dominates everything. That's when it's wrong. Because most of the time the kids can come up with the questions themselves. Like the questions the kids came up with in my class that we put on the board were really neat questions, you know. And they made me think. They made me ask questions myself.

MK: Mmm. Mmm.

RP: About their questions.

MK: Yup.

RP: I think that, I think there has to be a dialogue between. You can't lose the dialogue between. The teacher has to be, to be involved, too.

MK: Oh, yes. I'm not saying that, but is the role than to be question-asker or to be conversational participant?

RP: Oh, conversational participant.

GK: Mmm. Mmm. I wonder if this is where the questions are effective, though. Like when they start asking questions. Like, I hadn't mentioned "prejudice" at all in The Chrysalids yet that kept coming up and that's one of the biggies.

NC: Yes.

GK: And they brought it up by themselves.

RS: Certainly with The Chrysalids and my students certainly brought up everything that I thought had to be brought up. But if something hadn't been brought up . . .

MK: But that's your role.

RS: See, that's my role. That's where I agree with you with the. . . There comes a point with me as a teacher if nobody in my class had made the leap between systems, government systems, somehow or other, then I
would bring it up. It would be my job to teach that somehow or other. Hopefully, I would get
MK: The somehow or other, of course, is the next question.
How do you get that across so they could take ownership?
RS: Yes, yes, mmm.
RP: You know there were three groups and I knew which was group one and group two and group three. I noticed right away that when the questions for their group came up that they had drafted themselves, that they still had questions about them. They were still thinking about them. Just because they had questions and had written them down, didn't mean that they had the answers.
MK: No, well, wasn't that the point?
RP: That was the point and you see that was the wonderful thing about it. It wasn't just "Here are the questions we've made up and we know the answers" and that's the end. It still provided a chance for discourse and discussion.
MK: Right, yah.
RP: And they still debated them and discussed them so that you coming in wouldn't have known which group had put which questions up.
MK: No, I didn't.
RP: You couldn't tell.

52. Whole Class Discussion: A Comparison

RS: The last taping in my class it was really interesting because I thought the discussion was a lot slower but much more thoughtful and
MK: Mmm.
RS: I almost found it a little bit frustrating to some extent and I thought to myself, "God, how can you be so frustrated by this?" That they were really busy looking at the book all the time.
MK: Yah.
GK: They did do that which was excellent. They were getting into it.
RP: My kids debated that. Kids at the front were actually flipping through the book to look for things.
RS: Oh, yah. And I thought, "Oh, come on now." You want the spontaneous discussion and just, "Oh, it said so in the book." But because I think they really have, they have a different awareness of the book.
NC: That's right.
RS: Now all of a sudden, they say, "Oh, yah. I know where I can find this!"
GK: Isn't that what we want them to do, though? We want them to do that.
RS: Oh, I know. My head talk is saying, "God, you're so stupid for being frustrated by this" because I want this to happen and yet at the same time I think, "Oh, come on, let's speed it up a little."

MK: Mmm.

GK: I tried not to tell them. I wanted to tell them it's pretty well here or there and the other and I kept holding back so they would find their own answers. It was hard holding back, though.

53. The Effects of Sharing Responses

RS: It was neat today. I had asked them to do themes and they said, as they read their things, "You got that from my journal, didn't you?" And that happened about say at least, five or six times.

GK: What did you say?

RS: Oh, no they said it to the kids reading the themes and I think that they, I mean I think that they remembered what they had read in somebody else's journal.

MK: Yah.

54. Improvement in the Quality of Writing

GK: You know the writing with some of the kids on the lower end of the scale improved since doing The Chrysalids. It improved from doing To Kill a Mockingbird. It was more artificial and then they were writing their own opinions about The Chrysalids and their writing improved. Not drastically, but it improved.

MK: OK, so that's one other - right.

RP: What aspect of their writing improved?

GK: Oh, they structured it better. It followed logical sort of patterns so that as a reader I could read it much more easily than the first essay which gets sort of all over the place. Here and there an example and then they sort of forgot something, and then over there. . . .

MK: See, I think when

GK: They got better.

MK: If they feel that they can give you something that you don't already have - whatever that is - their impressions of a novel, their response to a character. If that's an honest uh, you know, question for them, then I think that they have opportunity to be logical.

55. Testing and the Reading of the Second Novel
RS: Now I don't know about the rest of you, but I honestly felt like it would be really stupid for me to give a test on this novel.

RP: Oh, I agree. Me, too.

NC: Yah, and will I just want the essay, that's all.

RS: Yah, and that's what I do like. That's why I like this particular technique because it does address what you said and that is each of those kids who aren't readers because I think my experience has been with, that they are, everyone of those kids is reading now.

RP: That's a tool of power. If you can read, you have power.

NC: That's right.

RP: Over your own life and in life.

NC: That's right. Damn right.

RP: You know, and that is the tool. Because every single kid in my class finished that book and knew it.

MK: Yah.

RP: They weren't behind anybody else.

NC: What a change that was!

RP: They could stand up and make a statement about that book and hold their heads up with anybody in that room. Every kid did it!

MK: That's the power of writing and that power

NC: And reading

MK: Yes, well, that's right.

NC: Of real reading and writing!

INTERVIEWS WITH STUDENT GROUPS IN THE TREATMENT CLASSES

56. Reflecting on Doing the Reading Response Logs

MK: And in your class we looked at Animal Farm and I just wondered if you could just talk about the whole business of writing your way through the novel. Just any impressions that you have based on your own experiences.

Leslie: The reason I liked it is, I have a really, I have a problem of, I have something in my mind and I forget it and by the time I finish reading the book, then I have, my questions are still there but I don't remember what they are, so I don't get to know the book that well.

MK: Mmmm.

Leslie: I just sort of read, "Oh, well, I'll come to this later. Maybe it'll answer it and it doesn't and then I don't really care to ask anybody because I've already finished the book, so there's no point. . . .

MK: Oh, O.K.
Leslie: That's why I like those journal things because then I can answer my own questions because I know what they are.

MK: Good enough. Fair enough. Go ahead.

Kyla: I don't know. Well, actually, I like doing the response journals because like she said, you forget what everything was that you were thinking about because I do that too. I'll be reading something - it's interesting or something - and I forget everything that I'm doing and I just can't remember at the end of the book. I don't know, it was I thought more about it when I wrote it down.

Cory: I found it [response log] almost made you have to learn story because, because you're always reading over your notes which just gave you, you just kept on reading them over and trying to find something and by the end, I had a really good grasp of what the story was about and the characters.

Tammy: And you had to concentrate more. And because you're concentrating, you're learning. Because you couldn't, there's no way you could write anything down if you're not concentrating.

Tammy: And also, like the way you have to do it when you analyze the story because of the way your response journal is. You have to analyze it [the novel] through, all the way through. Not just the characters, not just the action, all of it.

Shareen: I found it useful because I learned more from ite the writing, I guess. I don't know.

MK: Now why do you think that is?

Shareen: I understood it more by writing from it. Reading a chapter or whatever.

Angela: And it was helpful too, right, after you've done it you can look it over and "Oh, yah, right!"

Brent: I don't like doing it. I don't like doing questions any better but doing questions asks specific, to list specific things that happen whereas I do this as I go forget it after I write anyway, so . . . .

Travis: Yah, I found that writing it down did actually make your thoughts more clear and helping you in what you were going to say in front of the class and stuff.

Shanen: Well, before when I was reading, I would read the
chapter and then I'd stop and someone would ask me a questions and I couldn't tell them what I'd just read. I couldn't. But now I can.

57. Doing the Response Log a Second Time

Cory: It's also when you have a little more experience with it because definitely the second time for me was a lot easier. The first time I was struggling a bit at the beginning. Of course, as I kept reading, it became a little more easier. When I'm reading I'm just so used to just reading without doing anything else and then having to actually stop and think, "Wait a second. I should write this down." But as we got to Julius Caesar, I was already to do it.

MK: This is unbelievable

58. Sharing Your Written and Oral Responses with Others

MK: Did you find it easier to defend your opinion when you had those notes?

Chester: Mmmm. It was good to be able to contrast with other students how they felt about the book. And if they had different feelings, they, you could always, like you say, defend your own, your own feelings about the story, so...

Travis: And when you talk about things you can get a lot deeper and kind of get farther and farther into the conversation than if you're writing it down because if you're writing it down, it's just kinda like, there's nothing to challenge you. Like, but, when you've got other people asking you questions, you kind of have to challenge yourself and think things through.

Travis: Actually, in a lot of cases, people wrote different stuff then what I did, like, uh, she wrote that I was the only person that related it [the novel] to the Ku Klux Klan, the way prejudism was there and the way that they thought that they were the superior race and all that. And, um, I don't know, I usually would get into disagreements in the conversations and stuff so I think it was my own personal opinion that I threw in there. But when you did get in the class, the conversation you'd end up either giving other people your opinion or compromise your own opinion, which is good... So you learn from other people.
what people are thinking. I may not agree with it but it's still a valid opinion. In some of it, I mean, it's something that I missed and look, you see how they saw it and it's something else you can put down.

59. **Comparing the Journal to Comprehension Questions**

Tammy: I find that it, because of your response journal, don't just learn the facts. You learn the inside feelings and emotions better than you do the facts. Before with questions, you just have to write down facts and not what feeling the story gives you. When you do the response journal, you feel that [the novel].

Benny: The journals, like I said, make you understand the better because you make the questions up that you want to be answered, like that you want to be answered, that the book should, that you want the book to answer. And when writing it down in the journal, it gets answered later on in the book. It makes you understand the book better and rather than when the teacher gives you questions and alls you do is give you questions to make you look through the book and read the book and I found it [the response journal] made the students read the book more and get into the book more than just having questions and flipping through pages trying to find themsers.

Travis: But, uh, we did also answer a lot of questions just in the oral discussions in our class.

Benny: Yah.

MK: But who asks those questions in the oral discussions?

Patrick: The teacher

Benny: The students

Travis: The students, remember? Remember she wrote our questions on the board for us?

Brent: She asked us what questions we wanted to know that the book didn't give us the direct answer to.

Julie: She asked us and she, well, would walk around the groups too, and she would find out what questions we didn't know and . . . .

Brent: Of course, Ms. Stopper would help. . . .

Julie: Then she would write them down on the board. Any questions that a group wouldn't know. And I like that better, I guess.

Dawn: I didn't like it because I'd rather do questions. I didn't like thinking of my own questions. It's too hard.

Sabina: But when you do questions, when the teacher asks you questions, you just only get one point of view, but
when you think of your own questions, you kinda, I don't know, get your own point of view.

Dawn: Yah, But there's questions, you can have questions like, "in your opinion" and then you can have your own opinion. You don't have to write your own questions and then get other people's opinions.

Sabina: Yah, you might catch something other people didn't catch. We're all ganging up on you.

Leslie: Yes, when you answer a question the teacher wrote for you, it's either right or wrong but when you write it yourself, it can go really deep. You can start talking about this which goes into another subject and you get to understand the book through his point of view, from the way he was writing it, but when you have the questions from the teacher, it's just something they may have picked up and that you don't really understand and it's confusing you because you don't get sometimes know it from the teacher's point of view and sometimes, we can be a lot deeper than the teacher.

60. Writing the Response Journal and Quizzes

Tammy: Well, when we were doing To Kill a Mockingbird, I didn't really read when we were supposed to. It didn't interest me at all. To sit down and read and have a quiz just didn't interest me at all. But to do a response log, it interests me. It gave me more of a feeling to start writing.

Shanen: Yah. When we were doing Mockingbird questions, you just skim over it for the important facts. That's all I did, just.

Kyle: You felt kind of rushed because you had a test on it. You just kinda, he gave you so long to read like two or three chapters. You just had to go at it.

MK: A little speed reading exercise.

Chester: Thing about it is, when you do your test, you're so rushed, right. But when you do your response journal, you learn. I think you learn even more than just doing a quiz like that. You learn a lot more.

61. Connecting the Response Log to the Essay

Cory: It's a lot easier to look back at the story when you have those notes - if you're doing an essay for it.

Group: Oh, yah.

Shanen: You know what changed? Before I couldn't write an essay. It was like, "How can I get all these words in?" And now, now I can. It's like, like this sort of made you.
Cory: Because it puts your ideas into perspective as you it, so you can look at it and it's much easier to grasp an idea instead of trying to think over the whole book in your mind and trying to pick out certain key elements in it and you have them already right there.

62. Asking Questions

MK: Who's job is it to ask questions?
Travis: The students because the student is the one that's got to learn and if somebody else is asking all the questions for him, it's kinda like, oh, um, what's going on here? The teacher is supposed to teach you in a way, so, you should ask yourself the questions, I think, and try to figure them out yourself. And if you can't figure them out, then the teacher should step in, instead of having the teacher give you a big list of questions and you haven't learned to find them. Because they make you do things you don't really care about or things that don't really have to do with you or the way you think, you know. So, I find that when you go through and make your own questions - it's the same thing in life. You learn a lot more about yourself and about what you want.

63. Re-Viewing the Reading Response Log

Leslie: That's something like when she gives us those questions, it sorts of limits our answers but when we figure them out ourselves, like we can use our whole brain and go on to wherever. . . . .

Sabina: Do you know what I think would be really neat would be to go over these questions in a couple of years and then, like. . . .
MK: Yah.
Leslie: And look at your sheets and then. . . .
Sabina: In Grade 12 and still have those sheets and then go over it and do it all again.
Leslie: To see if we'd have the same questions. . . .
Sabina: And see if we'd have the same questions or if we'd understand a bit more. . . .
Leslie: Or see if they've grown, intellectually.
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